University of Huddersfield

Research Excellence Framework 2021

Equality Impact Assessment   June 2021

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

The purpose of this equality impact assessment (EIA) is to evaluate the impact of the REF 2021 processes on different groups of academic staff, and in particular to identify actions which might improve the participation in future REF exercises through changes to policies, procedures and processes. In collaboration with Human Resources, the Director of Research and Enterprise prepared the EIA which was reviewed by the Research Excellence Framework Oversight Committee, prior to publication.

2 Background

As an employer and a public body, the University has a statutory obligation under the Equality Act 2010 to ensure that REF procedures do not discriminate unlawfully against individuals because of age, disability, sex identity, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation or because they are pregnant or have recently given birth.

The University treats all members of staff on permanent, open-ended (indefinite), fixed-term and part-time contracts equally and is committed to the Fixed Term Employee 2000 and Part Time Worker Regulations 2002.

Each institution submitting to REF was required by the funding bodies to develop, document and apply a code of practice on the fair and transparent identification of staff with significant responsibility for research (SRR); determining who is an independent researcher (IR); and the selection of outputs, including approaches to supporting staff with circumstances.

Previous research assessment exercises (e.g. RAE 2008, REF 2014) were based on selecting staff and raised concerns that such an approach had potentially deleterious effects on individuals, their career choices, progression and morale. For REF 2014 analysis of the UOH staff submitted indicated that sex balance was an issue with underrepresentation of females in several units of assessment (UOA). There was a slight positive impact to non-white British groups and staff who declared a disability within the exercise.

The University's code of practice for REF 2021 was prepared in the context of the principles of equality and diversity and all relevant legislation and was designed to support the University in making a fair and transparent identification (as opposed to selection) of staff with SRR, determining IR status and selecting outputs. The code was informed by the University Equal Opportunities and Diversity Policy.

The University is an Athena SWAN Bronze Award holder, is a Stonewall Global Diversity Champion, a Disability Confident Employer, a signatory to the Race Equality Charter and holds the HR Excellence in Research Award.

Measures taken to embed equality and diversity in the REF included mandatory 'REF 2021 Equality and Diversity' specific training for all members of staff involved in the governance of the REF and those engaged in decision making. This

complemented on-line 'Unconscious Bias' and 'Diversity in the Workplace' programmes which were also mandatory. Equality and diversity focused workshops took place ahead of a mock REF exercise in 2020 for UOA Coordinators and Associate Deans Research and Enterprise. The code of practice was widely communicated to all academic staff and published on the intranet and external web pages.

As a key measure to support equality and diversity in research careers, the University put in place safe and robust procedures to recognise the effect that an individual's circumstances may have had on their productivity over the REF period (2014-2020). The impact of those circumstances were reflected in the University's expectations of the contributions of individuals to the output pool. As per REF requirements, a separate report has been prepared covering the staff circumstances aspect of the REF submission.

3 Scope

This EIA covers the identification process for 'significant responsibility for research' (SRR), 'independent researcher' (IR) and the selection of outputs. For SRR the analysis is based on an anonymised comparison of the protected characteristics of the pool of eligible staff (those on Teaching and Research contracts) with those of the staff identified as SRR. For IR the eligible pool is those on Research Only contracts. For outputs the comparison is between the proportion of outputs submitted by anonymised attributed authors with specific protected characteristics compared to the demographic of the submitted staff e.g. the proportion of outputs attributed to staff who have declared themselves as disabled compared to the proportion of disabled staff submitted.

The purpose of this EIA is to evaluate the impact of the REF 2021 processes on different groups of academic staff identified by their self-declared protected characteristics in an anonymised way to enable an assessment of the fairness of policies and procedures used in REF 2021. In addition actions are identified which could enhance equality and diversity in the participation in future REF exercises.

The protected characteristics available in the University's HR system for analysis are:

Protected Characteristic	Category
Sex	Female
	Male
Ethnicity	African
	Arab
	Bangladeshi
	Caribbean
	Chinese
	Indian
	Irish
	Not Known

Protected Characteristic	Category
	Other Asian Background Other Black Background Other Ethnic Background Other Mixed Background Other White Background Pakistani Prefer not to say White and Asian White and Black African White and Black Caribbean White British Gypsy or Traveller
Disability	Disabled Not disabled Prefer not to say Not known
Sexual Orientation	Bi Gay Man Straight/Heterosexual Lesbian/Gay Woman Not known Prefer to self-describe Prefer not to say
Religion	Agnostic Atheist Buddhist Buddhist-Hinayana Buddhist-Mhayana Christian Christian-Orthodox Christian-Protestant Christian-Roman Catholic Confucianism Hindu Islam-Shiite Islam-Sunni Jewish Judaism-Hassidic Judaism-Orthodox Judaism-Reformed Muslim No Religion Shintoism Sikh Taoism Other Prefer not to say Not known
Age	25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65+

Protected Characteristic	Category
Marital Status	Civil Partnership
	Divorced
	Estranged
	Married
	Not known
	Not Specified
	Other
	Partner
	Single
	Widowed
Maternity Leave Taken	No
	Yes

The policies and procedures reviewed are described in the University's REF 2021 code of practice and replicated in sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 below.

3.1 Identifying staff with significant responsibility for research

Staff at the University with significant responsibility for research are those for whom:

a. Explicit time and resources are made available
- Specific workload allocation for research
- Access to facilities to carry out research

and

b. Engage actively in independent research
- Meet the research activity elements of the criteria for main supervisor for doctoral post graduate research students described in the University regulations; explicitly:
    i. Must hold a doctoral degree
    ii. Will be undertaking high-quality research of an internationally recognised standard
- Member of a Research Centre or Institute within the University

and

c. It is an expectation of their job role
- Job description includes research
- Annual research objectives are specified in appraisal

The Associate Deans Research and Enterprise (ADREs) in each School are responsible for identifying which staff have significant responsibility for research based on the criteria described above. The research activity elements of the supervision criteria in the University doctoral research degree supervision regulations are used for the purposes of REF SRR identification and are:

- PhD (or other doctoral research degree) qualified
- Published research of 2* quality or better as a demonstration of the undertaking of high-quality research of an internationally recognised standard

The non-research related criteria in the University regulations which refer to employment contract duration and supervisor training are not used for SRR identification. The exclusion of the criterion relating to contract duration ensures that there is equality in the process for staff on fixed term contracts.

3.2 Determining research independence

The criteria to be used for the identification of staff who are independent researchers are based on those specified in paragraphs 128-134 the REF Guidance on Submissions (REF2019/01) and paragraphs 187-189 in the Panel criteria and working methods (REF2019/02).

A core set of three indicative criteria have been accepted by all REF Main Panels (A, B, C & D). In addition to these generic criteria Panels C&D consider two additional criteria as indicative of research independence in their disciplines.

For REF Panels A and B (Units of Assessment 1 to 12) **one** of the three criteria below must be satisfied:

- leading or acting as principal investigator or equivalent on an externally funded research project
- holding an independently won, competitively awarded fellowship where research independence is a requirement. Refer to an illustrative, but not exhaustive, list of independent fellowships
- leading a research group or a substantial or specialised work package

For REF Panels C and D (Units of Assessment 13 to 34) **one** of the five criteria below must be satisfied:

- leading or acting as principal investigator or equivalent on an externally funded research project
- holding an independently won, competitively awarded fellowship where research independence is a requirement. Refer to an illustrative, but not exhaustive, list of independent fellowships
- leading a research group or a substantial or specialised work package
- being named as a Co-I on an externally funded research grant/award
- having significant input into the design, conduct and interpretation of the research

The Associate Deans Research and Enterprise (ADREs) in each School are responsible for identifying which staff are independent researchers based on the criteria describe above.

3.3 Selection of outputs

The total number of outputs submitted by each UOA must be equal to 2.5 times the combined FTE of the staff (SRR and IR) identified for submission. A minimum of one output will be required for each submitted member of staff. There will be no minimum

requirement for submitting the outputs of former staff. No more than five outputs may be attributed to any individual member of staff (including former staff).

Staff who have been identified as SRR or IR (the submitter pool) submit up to five outputs plus two reserves into the University's research information system (Pure), reducing the number nominated to take account of double weighting where appropriate.

The pool of outputs submitted by staff will be checked for eligibility, assessed locally on the basis of originality, significance and rigour, and assigned a star rating based on the REF criteria (see Annex A in the REF Guidance on Submissions (REF2019/01)).

The process for selection of outputs will utilise peer review by discipline based experts within and outside the University. The UOA Coordinator (UOAC) and the Associate Dean Research and Enterprise (ADRE) will agree the names of two internal members of academic staff, or one internal and one external, to review the self-nominated outputs. UOACs must ensure that at least 1 output from each member of staff in the submitter pool has been externally reviewed.

The UOAC will review the assessments of quality to determine and enter a predicted star rating for each output into Pure. To avoid conflicts of interest, for outputs nominated by the UOA Coordinator themselves, the ADRE or Deputy UOA Coordinator will assign star ratings and agree the name of the external reviewer. Predicted star ratings are available for individuals to see for their own outputs in Pure.

For eligible former members of staff, the UOAC will identify which outputs should be included in the output pool and arrange for the assessment and rating entry into Pure as described above.

The primary criterion in the selection of outputs will be quality, guided by the rules relating to the output eligibility of the minimum of one and a maximum of five outputs for submission per individual in the submitter pool.

REFOC will consider an initial selection of outputs for each UOA based on quality. Decisions on which outputs to put forward to the final submission will take the following into account:

- Maximising the number of Open Access compliant outputs to ensure that no more than 5% per UOA are non-compliant (or 1 for UOAs where the total number required is 20 or less)
- The fit with the strategy in each UOA and its environment statement
- Where outputs have been assessed as the same quality, but not all are needed to meet the total number required (2.5/FTE unless unit reductions have been sought and approved), to ensure that the diversity of the staff is represented as far as possible

3.4 Summary of Advisor and Decision Maker Roles

Area	Advisors	Decision Makers
SRR	Line Managers, Research Group Leaders	Associate Deans R&E
Independent Researcher	Line Managers, Research Group Leaders	Associate Deans R&E
Research Outputs	Academics, Internal and External assessors, UOA Coordinators, Associate Deans R&E	REF Oversight Committee
Impact Case Studies	UOA Coordinators, Associate Deans R&E, External assessors	REF Oversight Committee
Institution Environment Statement	Director R&E	REF Oversight Committee
UOA Environment Statements	UOA Coordinators, Associate Deans R&E	REF Oversight Committee
Individual Circumstances		IC Panel
Appeals		REF Appeals Panel

3.5 Who is potentially affected?

The REF has a potential impact for all eligible staff who met the REF Category A requirements of being employed on an Academic contract or Research Only contract of at least 0.2FTE on the census date of 31 July 2020. For the University this was 886 members of academic and research staff. Research Assistants were excluded from the REF on the basis that they were employed explicitly to carry out the research of others.

Of the eligible staff, 797 were on Academic contracts and 90 were on Research Only contracts. 589 staff were identified as SRR or IR, 533 were on Academic contracts and 56 were on Research Only contracts. One member of staff was employed 50% on an Academic contract and 50% on a Research Only contract so the eligible staff total is 887 when SRR and IR are considered separately.

3.6 EIA process

For the SRR process analysis a baseline staff pool was comprised of those staff eligible for REF who were employed on a permanent, fixed-term or part-time Academic (Teaching and Research) contract of at least 0.2FTE on the census date of 31 July 2020. An anonymised set of data showing the distribution of the number of staff, by each of the protected characteristics described above, before and after the application of the SRR identification process to the baseline pool, was prepared by HR and then variations in the outcomes compared to the baseline demographic for each set of protected characteristics were identified and considered.

For the IR process analysis a baseline staff pool was comprised of those staff eligible for REF who were employed on a permanent, fixed-term or part-time Research Only contract of at least 0.2FTE on the census date of 31 July 2020. The EIA process was as for SRR.

For the outputs anonymised data was provided by HR based on the staff member attribution for each submitted output. A comparison was made between the proportion of outputs submitted by attributed authors with specific protected characteristics compared to the demographic of the submitted pool of staff e.g. the proportion of outputs attributed to staff who have declared themselves as disabled compared to the proportion of disabled staff submitted.

The 19 UOAs (academic discipline areas) for which the University provided REF submissions were:

UOA number	UOA name	FTE staff submitted	Headcount staff submitted
3	Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	52.3	55
4	Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	31.8	33
5	Biological Sciences	29.8	30
8	Chemistry	27	28
11	Computer Science and Informatics	27.2	29
12	Engineering	84.7	88
13	Architecture, Built Environment and Planning	16.6	18
17	Business and Management Studies	85.6	89
18	Law	12	12
20	Social Work and Social Policy	40.5	46
23	Education	24.7	29
24	Sport and Exercise Sciences, Leisure and Tourism	7	7
26	Modern Languages and Linguistics	9	10
27	English Language and Literature	11.9	13
28	History	12.5	14
32	Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory	29.2	35
33A	Music	30.35	32
33B	Drama	9	10
34	Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information Management	11	11

In January 2019 an equality analysis was carried out for the draft processes for SRR identification, IR identification and output selection by ADREs and UOA Coordinators (and deputies). This highlighted that there was a risk that unconscious bias amongst decision makers and/or advisors could be detrimental to protected groups. The assessment for SRR and IR identification led to the decision to include the University's on-line 'unconscious bias' and 'diversity in the workplace' modules as a key mandatory strand of the training programme for ADREs, UOA Coordinators (and

deputies), the REF Oversight Committee and the REF Appeals Panel, in addition to mandatory REF tailored training in equality and diversity.

In May 2019, an anonymised analysis of the staff identified as SRR and IR for a mock REF exercise, compared to the whole REF eligible academic staff pool, by the protected characteristics of sex, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, religion, age, marital status and maternity leave was undertaken. The data, analysis and findings were reviewed by the REF Oversight Committee on 30 May 2019. Taking account of all protected characteristics, only the analysis of sex showed an overall impact from the SRR and IR identification processes. The proportion of males in the combined SRR and IR group increased by 7 percentage points to 62% compared to the baseline of 55%. The conversion rate for females to SRR and IR was 20 percentage points less than that for males at an institutional level (61% compared to 81%). At UOA level, the conversion rates were more positive for females than males in some instances, and vice versa in others. The overall outcome was not unexpected as the University is in a transitional period where not all members of staff on Academic (T&R) contracts have significant responsibility for research. This is due to a number of factors, including staff currently studying for a doctoral level degree and those with doctorates who have not yet matured into independent researchers. The EIA provided the University with confidence that the processes for SRR and IR identification were fair from an equality perspective and hence no changes were made to the criteria for SRR or IR prior to the submission of the code of practice in June 2019.

4 Analyses

Data for each of the personal characteristics is provided in tables at the end of this document.

The number of staff in the baseline was 886 on the REF census date of 31 July 2020. After the identification processes for SRR and IR had been completed 589 staff were deemed to be eligible for REF submission. This is an overall conversion rate of 66%.

In general this EIA is based on analysis of data at institutional level, except where the institutional data indicates further analysis at UOA level would have some value.

4.1 SRR

4.1.1 SRR - Sex (Annex, Table 1A and Table 1B)

The baseline pool, from which staff were identified as being SRR totalled 797 staff members. Of this pool 419 people are male (53%) and 378 are female (47%). Overall, the SRR process revealed 533 people as being identified for submission; this is a 'conversion rate' of 67%.

Of the 533 identified as SRR, 325 are male (61%) and 208 are female (39%). The process hence shifted the male to female ratio by 8 percentage points, from the pool baseline of 53:47 to the identified grouping of 61:39. In terms of conversion rate by sex, the percentage of male staff identified as SRR is 78%, and for female staff it is 55%, representing a 23% overall difference.

At unit of assessment (UOA) level the variance in conversion rate for females and males is tabulated below:

	Variance in % identified SRR (Female - Male)
Institution (all UOAs)	-22.54%
UOA3 Allied Health Professions, Nursing and Pharmacy	-30.51%
UOA4 Psychology	5.88%
UOA5 Biological Sciences	-33.33%
UOA8 Chemistry	-8.33%
UOA11 Computer Science and Informatics	15.38%
UOA12 Engineering	13.79%
UOA13 Architecture and Built Environment	11.43%
UOA17 Business and Management Studies	-15.78%
UOA18 Law	-23.81%
UOA20 Social Work and Social Policy	-3.03%
UOA23 Education	-51.10%
UOA24 Sport and Exercise Sciences	0.00%
UOA26 Modern Languages and Linguistics	0.00%
UOA27 English Language and Literature	14.29%
UOA28 History	0.00%
UOA32 Art and Design	-4.58%
UOA33A Music	-8.40%
UOA33B Drama	0.00%
UOA34 Communication, Culture and Media Studies	-14.29%

There is a range of variances in the conversion rate to SRR for females compared to males and more favourable outcomes for females in some UOAs compared to others where males fared better; in other UOAs the conversion rates for both females and males were the same (UOAs 24, 26, 28 and 33B).

Six UOAs (3, 5, 17, 18, 23 and 34) have notable variances in favour of males, and four UOAs (11, 12, 13, and 27) notable but smaller variances in favour of females. Further analysis was restricted to the largest of these UOAs where more than 5 staff were identified as not-SRR (3, 12, 13, 17, 18 and 23).

In the UOAs 3, 17, 18 and 23 where variances are in favour of males the predominant reason that both female and male staff were not identified as SRR was that they were studying for a doctorate (77 females out of 119 and 18 males out of 35) at the census date and hence did not meet one of the key criteria for SRR. In

addition, 23 females and 14 males met the doctorate qualification criterion but had not generated international quality research outputs by the census date and hence were identified as not SRR. 22 staff were exempt from registering for a doctorate during the REF period of whom 19 were female.

In the UOAs 12 and 13 where variances are in favour of females, the predominant reason that both female and male staff were not identified as SRR was that they are studying for a doctorate (11 out of 18) and hence did not meet one of the key criteria for SRR. Less than 6 met the doctorate qualification criterion but had not generated international quality research outputs by the census date. Less than 6 staff were exempt from registering for a doctorate during the REF period.

The main reason why staff have been identified as not-SRR is that they were at the census date ineligible to act as main supervisor for doctoral students, either because they are not yet qualified with a doctorate themselves or they have a doctorate but are not yet engaged in international quality research. This applies to both males and females, indicating that action is required to support members of staff on Academic (T&R) contracts from both sexes with the research aspects of their career development i.e. to gain doctorates and publish international quality research outputs.

There will always be a small pool of people on Academic (T&R) contracts who will never meet the SRR criteria as they are exempt from studying for a doctorate. These people, who are more likely to be female based on the analysis above, include staff on contracts of ≤0.5FTE and members of staff who are due to leave the University before they could complete a doctorate e.g. those scheduled to retire and staff on fixed term contracts.

4.1.2 SRR - Ethnicity (Annex, Table 2)

The majority of staff in the baseline are White British (65%) and this group remains in the majority after the SRR identification process (56%). The next largest groups are Other White Background (base 13%, SRR 17%) and Chinese (base 4%, SRR 6%). In the 19 ethnic categories, the variances in percentage SRR compared to SRR eligible are as follows:

Ethnicity	%SRR - %baseline
African	-0.01%
Arab	0.25%
Bangladeshi	0.12%
Caribbean	0.06%
Chinese	1.80%
Indian	-0.07%
Irish	0.62%
Not Known	0.43%
Other Asian Background	0.81%

Ethnicity	%SRR - %baseline
Other Black Background	-0.06%
Other Ethnic Background	0.06%
Other Mixed Background	0.12%
Other White Background	4.27%
Pakistani	0.12%
Prefer not to say	0.43%
White and Asian	0.00%
White and Black Caribbean	0.06%
White British	-8.89%
Gypsy or Traveller	-0.13%

Compared to White British, all other groups have had a more favourable outcome, with those in the Other White Background group the most successful, followed by the Chinese group. The majority of variances are within the range -1% to 1%. The number of staff in the baseline and identified as SRR for the three largest groups and the remainder are:

Ethnicity	Number in base	Number identified as SRR
White British	515 (64.62%)	297 (55.72%)
Other White Background	105 (13.17%)	93 (17.45%)
Chinese	32 (4.02%)	31 (5.82%)
All other groups	145 (18.19%)	112 (21.01%)

78% of the baseline are White British or of another White Background, with slightly less (73%) SRR staff in those two ethnicity groups, indicating a slight positive bias towards non-whites.

4.1.3 SRR - Disability (Annex, Table 3)

The overall proportion of staff in the baseline who had declared a disability is 5% (39 staff). This reduces to 4% (19 staff) in the pool of staff identified as SRR. Not all UOAs contained staff who had declared a disability.

4.1.4 SRR - Sexual Orientation (Annex, Table 4)

631 (79%) of staff in the baseline define their sexuality as straight/heterosexual. Of those identified as SRR the percentage reduces by only 1%. The total number of SRR eligible staff defining their sexuality as bisexual, gay man or lesbian/gay woman is 46 (6%) which is less than half of those who prefer not to say (106, 13%). In terms of staff identified as SRR the proportion (bisexual, gay man or lesbian/gay woman) falls slightly to 32 (5%). In the 7 sexual orientation categories, the variances in percentage SRR compared to SRR eligible are as follows:

Sexual Orientation	%SRR - %baseline
Bi	0.31%
Gay Man	-0.38%
Straight/Heterosexual	-0.94%
Lesbian/Gay Woman	-0.44%
Not known	0.31%
Prefer to self-describe	0.19%
Prefer not to say	0.96%

The data indicate no evidence of bias related to sexuality.

4.1.5 SRR - Religion (Annex, Table 5)

Of those that have a religion and declare it, the majority (269) describe themselves as No Religion. This accounts for 34% of the baseline and 35% (186) of those identified as SRR. The second largest group is Christian which is 23% (182) of the baseline and 20% (105) of those identified as SRR. This group has the largest variance in percentage SRR compared to SRR eligible for any category at -3.14%.

In the 17 religion categories, the variances in percentage SRR compared to SRR eligible are as follows:

Religion	%SRR - %baseline
Agnostic	0.30%
Atheist	0.79%
Buddhist	0.37%
Christian	-3.14%
Christian - Orthodox	0.37%
Christian - Protestant	-0.32%
Christian - Roman Catholic	0.36%
Hindu	0.12%
Islam - Sunni	0.24%
Jewish	0.19%
Muslim	0.55%
No Religion	1.15%
Sikh	-0.13%
Other	-0.45%
Prefer not to say	-0.48%
Unknown	0.06%

The data indicate no evidence of bias related to religion.

4.1.6 SRR - Age (Annex, Table 6)

The age profile of the SRR identified group compared to baseline varies as follows:

Age group	Number of staff (base)	Number of staff (SRR)	%SRR-%baseline
25-34	91	62	0.21%
35-44	226	160	1.66%
45-54	252	158	-1.98%
55-64	187	120	-0.95%
65+	41	33	1.05%

There is a slight drop of 2% in the 45-54 age group and 1% in the 55-64 age group, balanced by a 1.7% increase in the 35-44, 1% in the 65+ and 0.2% in the 25-34 age groups, indicating no evidence of bias against younger members of staff from an institutional perspective.

4.1.7 SRR - Marital Status (Annex, Table 7)

Of those that have declared a marital status, the majority describe themselves as Married. This accounts for 56% (444) of the baseline and 56% (299) of those identified as SRR. The second largest group is Single which is 26% (205) of the baseline and 27% (145) of those identified as SRR. This group has the maximum percentage variance for any category at 1.48%. In the 10 marital status categories, the variances are as follows:

Marital Status	%SRR - %baseline
Civil partnership	0.06%
Divorced	-0.76%
Estranged	0.00%
Married	0.39%
Not known	-0.19%
Not specified	0.37%
Other	-1.07%
Partner	-0.33%
Single	1.48%
Widowed	0.06%

The data indicate no evidence of bias related to marital status.

4.1.8 SRR - Maternity Leave (Annex, Table 8)

47 (12%) of the 378 baseline female staff have taken maternity leave in the REF period. In the SRR identified group, 25 (12%) have taken maternity leave, a neutral outcome.

The data indicate little evidence of bias related to having taken maternity leave.

4.2 IR

56 out of 90 eligible staff were identified as IR across 19 UOAs, an overall conversion rate of 62%.

Only 3 UOAs had 6 or more Research Only staff in the baseline pool and of those only 2 UOAs had 6 or more staff identified as IR:

UOA number	UOA name	IR Eligible Staff	IR Identified Staff
11	Computer Science and Informatics	9	≤5
12	Engineering	47	29
33A	Music	10	10
Total		**90**	**56**

Where required, analysis regarding IR identification has only been carried out for UOA12 and UOA33A to avoid potentially misleading outcomes and the identification of individuals.

4.2.1 IR - Sex (Annex, Table 9A and 9B)

The baseline pool, from which staff were identified as being IR totalled 90 staff members. Of this pool 69 people are male (77%) and 21 are female (23%). Overall, the IR process revealed 56 people as being identified for submission; this is a 'conversion rate' of 62%.

Of the 56 identified as IR, 41 are male (73%) and 15 are female (27%). The process hence shifts the male to female ratio by 4 percentage points, from the pool baseline of 77:23 to the identified grouping of 73:27. In terms of conversion rate by sex, the percentage of male staff identified as IR is 59%, and for female staff it is 71%, representing a 12% overall difference. Overall this is a better outcome for females than for SRR, but numbers are relatively small.

For UOA12 26 males out of 43 in the base are identified as IR representing a conversion rate of 60% similar to the overall outcome for the IR process across all UOAs. For UOA33A, 6 males out of 6 in the base are identified as IR, a conversion

rate of 100%. The number of females in the baseline for both UOA12 and UOA33A is less than 6.

4.2.2 IR - Ethnicity (Annex, Table 10)

The majority of staff in the baseline are White British (34%) and this group remains in the majority after the IR identification process (34%). The next largest groups are Chinese (base 21%, IR 20%) and Other White Background (base 18%, IR 25%). In the 15 ethnic categories, the variances from base are as follows:

Ethnicity	%IR - %baseline
African	-0.44%
Arab	-2.66%
Bangladeshi	-1.11%
Chinese	-1.47%
Indian	-0.44%
Irish	0.67%
Not Known	-2.22%
Other Asian Background	2.02%
Other Ethnic Background	1.35%
Other White Background	7.22%
Pakistani	-0.87%
Prefer not to say	-1.11%
White and Asian	-1.11%
White and Black African	0.67%
White British	-0.52%

The largest change can be seen in the Other White Background group (7%). The remainder have variances within the range -3% to 2%. The number of staff in the baseline and identified as IR for the three largest groups and the remainder are:

Ethnicity	Number in base	Number identified as IR
White British	31 (34.44%)	19 (33.93%)
Other White Background	16 (17.78%)	14 (25.00%)
Chinese	19 (21.11%)	11 (19.64%)
All other groups	24 (26.67%)	12 (21.43%)

52% of the baseline are White British or of another White Background, with a higher proportion (59%) of IR staff in those two ethnicity groups, indicating a slight positive bias towards whites in the IR identification process. Numbers are however relatively small and it would be inappropriate to conclude any bias related to ethnicity.

4.2.3 IR - Disability (Annex, Table 11)

Less than 6 members of staff in the IR baseline had declared a disability. This remained unchanged in the pool of staff identified as IR. Not all UOAs had staff who had declared a disability.

4.2.4 IR - Sexual Orientation (Annex, Table 12)

78 staff (87%) in the baseline define their sexuality as straight/heterosexual. Of those identified as IR the percentage increases by only 3%. In the 4 sexual orientation categories, the variances in percentage IR compared to IR eligible are as follows:

Sexual Orientation	%IR - %baseline
Bi	0.24%
Straight/Heterosexual	2.62%
Lesbian/Gay Woman	0.67%
Prefer not to say	-3.53%

Numbers are however relatively small and it would be inappropriate to conclude any bias related to sexual orientation.

4.2.5 IR - Religion (Annex, Table 13)

Of those that have a religion and declare it, the majority (29) describe themselves as No Religion. This accounts for 32% of the baseline and 34% (19) of those identified as IR. The second largest group is Christian which is 14% (13) of the baseline and 16% (9) of those identified as IR. The third largest group is Atheist which is 13% (12) of the baseline and 16% (9) of those identified as IR. In the 12 religion categories, the variances in percentage IR compared to IR eligible are as follows:

Religion	%IR - %baseline
Agnostic	-0.87%
Atheist	2.74%
Buddhist	-2.66%
Christian	1.63%
Christian - Orthodox	2.02%
Christian - Roman Catholic	-0.44%
Hindu	-1.11%
Islam - Sunni	0.91%
Muslim	-3.97%
No Religion	1.71%
Other	0.24%
Prefer not to say	-0.20%

The largest change can be seen in the Muslim group (-4%) and the other groups have variances within the range -3% to 3%. Numbers are however relatively small and it would be inappropriate to conclude any bias related to religion.

4.2.6 IR - Age (Annex, Table 14)

The age profile of the IR identified group compared to baseline varies as follows:

Age group	Number of staff (base)	Number of staff (IR)	%IR-%baseline
25-34	33	17	-6.31%
35-44	41	27	2.66%
45-54	12	9	2.74%
55-64	≤5	≤5	0.24%
65+	≤5	≤5	0.67%

There is a reduction of 6% in the 25-34 age group balanced by increases of 3% in each of the 35-44 and 45-54 age groups. Numbers are however relatively small and it would be inappropriate to conclude any bias related to age.

4.2.7 IR - Marital Status (Annex, Table 15)

Of those that have declared a marital status, the majority (86%) describe themselves as Married or Single, with the same percentage identified as IR. In the 6 marital status categories, the variances are as follows:

Marital Status	%IR - %baseline
Married	-0.48%
Not known	0.67%
Not specified	0.67%
Other	-1.11%
Partner	0.71%
Single	-0.48%

The variances range from -1% to 1%, indicating no demonstrable bias related to marital status.

4.2.8 IR - Maternity Leave (Annex, Table 16)

Less than 6 members of staff in the IR baseline have taken maternity leave. This remained unchanged in the pool of staff identified as IR.

4.3 Outputs

The baseline pool, from which staff were identified as being SRR or IR and submitted to REF totalled 589 staff members. Overall, the outputs selection process resulted in 1319 outputs, each of which were attributed to one of the 589 identified staff.

Outputs submitted by staff previously employed by the University were not included in the analysis. Outputs which were double weighted have been counted as 2 attributions for the relevant individual.

The analysis below is based on a comparison of the baseline demographic with the attribution of outputs for each of the personal characteristics.

4.3.1 Outputs - Sex (Annex, Table 17)

Of the baseline pool of 589 staff identified as SRR or IR, 366 people are male (62%) and 223 are female (38%).

This analysis is based on a comparison of the proportion of male to female staff submitted to REF, with the distribution of the attribution of outputs by sex.

The attribution distribution for the institution as a whole is 66% male and 34% female indicating that there is a shift in the male to female ratio of 4 percentage points from the baseline pool of 62% male and 38% female. The average number of outputs attributed to females is 2 and for males 2.38. There may be several reasons for the lower figure for females e.g. part or full-time status, academic or research only contract, individual circumstances with an impact on production of research outputs, maturity of research career aspects of their job roles etc.

At unit of assessment (UOA) level the variance in output attribution to base is tabulated below:

	Number of outputs	Variance in % outputs with Male attribution to base	Variance in % outputs with Female attribution to base
Institution (all UOAs)	1319	4.05%	-4.05%%
UOA3 Allied Health Professions, Nursing and Pharmacy	130	11.40%	-11.40%
UOA4 Psychology	78	9.21%	-9.21%
UOA5 Biological Sciences	70	6.67%	-6.67%
UOA8 Chemistry	66	8.77%	-8.77%
UOA11 Computer Science and Informatics	60	3.91%	-3.91%
UOA12 Engineering	212	1.37%	-1.37%
UOA13 Architecture and Built Environment	35	-3.65%	3.65%
UOA17 Business and Management Studies	193	4.09%	-4.09%
UOA18 Law	27	5.56%	-5.56%
UOA20 Social Work and Social Policy	101	1.68%	-1.68%
UOA23 Education	57	2.60%	-2.60%
UOA24 Sport and Exercise Sciences	18	-3.97%	3.97%
UOA26 Modern Languages and Linguistics	23	3.48%	-3.48%
UOA27 English Language and Literature	30	-0.51%	0.51%
UOA28 History	28	-3.57%	3.57%
UOA32 Art and Design	72	0.04%	-0.04%
UOA33A Music	68	1.84%	-1.84%
UOA33B Drama	23	9.57%	-9.57%
UOA34 Communication, Culture and Media Studies	28	-4.55%	4.55%

The three UOAs with the largest number of outputs submitted (UOA12, UOA17, UOA 20) show variances of 4% or less in favour of males. Those units with the largest change (8.8% or more) in favour of males are UOA3, UOA4, UOA8 and UOA33B, a mix of STEM and non-STEM disciplines. Similarly those with the largest change (3.5% or more) in favour of females are UOA13, UOA24, UOA28 and UOA34, again a mix of STEM and non-STEM disciplines.

Although there is an overall change in favour of males at institutional level, there is variation at UOA level with some favouring females, albeit to a lesser extent than for males. This indicates a need to continue to support females in particular to achieve their full potential from a research perspective, whilst not forgetting about the males either in some disciplines. This should enable a larger pool of high quality outputs to be available for future REF exercises, which might result in a redressing of the imbalance in output attribution. The University will continue to provide career development workshops within the academic Schools in line with its strategy to support all academic staff to be research qualified and active. Indeed the University Athena SWAN action plan 2020 already addresses this aspect by committing to such workshops as well as qualitative focus groups for academic females to establish what support is needed to progress their careers. Based on this EIA, males also need to be given similar opportunities.

4.3.2 Outputs - Ethnicity (Annex, Table 18)

The majority of submitted staff are White British (54%) and this group remains in the majority and unchanged at 54% for attributed outputs. The next largest groups are Other White Background (base 18%, attributed outputs 19%) and Chinese (base 7%, attributed outputs 7%). In the 19 ethnic categories, the variances are as follows:

Ethnicity	%attributed outputs - %baseline
African	0.10%
Arab	-0.01%
Bangladeshi	-0.04%
Caribbean	-0.09%
Chinese	-0.53%
Indian	0.54%
Irish	0.19%
Not Known	0.14%
Other Asian Background	-0.44%
Other Black Background	-0.09%
Other Ethnic Background	-0.17%
Other Mixed Background	-0.22%
Other White Background	0.86%
Pakistani	0.20%
Prefer not to say	-0.54%
White and Asian	0.19%
White and Black African	0.06%
White and Black Caribbean	-0.09%
White British	-0.05%

There are no variances outside the range -0.5% to 0.9%. The number of staff in the baseline and attributed outputs for the three largest groups and the remainder are:

Ethnicity	Staff in base	Attributed outputs
White British	316 (53.65%)	707 (53.60%)
Other White Background	107 (18.17%)	251 (19.03%)
Chinese	42 (7.13%)	87 (6.60%)
All other groups	124 (21.05%)	274 (20.77%)

There is no demonstrable bias relating to ethnicity.

4.3.3 Outputs - Disability (Annex, Table 19)

The overall proportion of staff in the baseline who had declared a disability is 3% (20 staff). This reduces to 2% for attributed outputs (29 outputs). Not all UOAs contain staff who had declared a disability.

4.3.4 Outputs - Sexual Orientation (Annex, Table 20)

467 (79%) of staff in the baseline define their sexuality as straight/heterosexual. 1022 outputs were attributed to straight/heterosexual staff; this is 77% of the total outputs and a 2% reduction compared to base. The total number of submitted staff defining their sexuality as bisexual, gay man or lesbian/gay woman is 31 (5%) which is less than half of those who prefer not to say (79, 13%). In terms of attributed outputs (bisexual, gay man or lesbian/gay woman) the proportion increases slightly to 6% (77). In the 7 sexual orientation categories, the variances in attributed outputs compared to base are as follows:

Sexual Orientation	%attributed outputs - %baseline
Bi	0.49%
Gay Man	0.08%
Straight/Heterosexual	-1.80%
Lesbian/Gay Woman	0.01%
Not known	0.44%
Prefer to self-describe	0.17%
Prefer not to say	0.61%

The data indicate no evidence of bias related to sexuality.

4.3.5 Outputs - Religion (Annex, Table 21)

In the base pool of submitted staff, of those that have a religion and declare it, the majority (205) describe themselves as No Religion. This accounts for 35% of the baseline. 469 outputs were attributed to this group of staff, 36% of the total outputs. The second largest group is Christian which is 19% (114 staff) of the baseline. 230 outputs were attributed to this group (17%).

In the 17 religion categories, the variances in percentage attributed outputs to base are as follows:

Religion	Number of submitted staff	Number of attributed outputs	% attributed outputs - %baseline
Agnostic	21	43	-0.31%
Atheist	48	112	0.34%
Buddhist	11	29	0.33%
Christian	114	230	-1.92%
Christian - Orthodox	13	33	0.29%
Christian - Protestant	9	30	0.75%
Christian - Roman Catholic	25	53	-0.23%
Hindu	6	20	0.50%
Islam - Sunni	15	36	0.18%
Jewish	≤5	10	0.25%
Muslim	21	42	-0.38%
No Religion	205	469	0.75%
Sikh	≤5	2	-0.19%
Other	13	30	0.07%
Prefer not to say	76	158	-0.92%
Unknown	7	22	0.48%

The variances in proportions of attributed outputs to base range from -1.9% to 0.8%. The data indicate no evidence of bias related to religion.

4.3.6 Outputs - Age (Annex, Table 22)

The age profile of the proportion of attributed outputs compared to the submitted staff baseline varies as follows:

Age group	Number of submitted staff (base)	Number of attributed outputs	%attributed outputs - %baseline
25-34	79	155	-1.66%
35-44	187	406	-0.97%
45-54	167	376	0.15%
55-64	122	302	2.18%
65+	34	80	0.29%

The collective 2.6% reduction in the 25-34 and 35-44 age groups is balanced by an increase in the 45 and over age groups, a very slight indication of positive bias towards older members of staff from an institutional perspective, but not overly concerning.

4.3.7 Outputs – Marital Status (Annex, Table 23)

Of those that have declared a marital status in the submitted staff group, the majority describe themselves as Married. This accounts for 55% (323) of the baseline and 57% (756) of the attributed outputs. The second largest group is Single which is 29% (169) of the baseline and 24% (315) of the attributed outputs. This group has the maximum percentage variance for any category at -4.81%. In the 10 marital status categories, the variances are as follows:

Marital Status	Number of submitted staff	Number of attributed outputs	%attributed outputs - %baseline
Civil partnership	≤5	7	0.02%
Divorced	12	25	-0.14%
Estranged	≤5	10	0.08%
Married	323	756	2.48%
Not known	8	21	0.23%
Not specified	13	27	-0.16%
Other	13	27	-0.16%
Partner	41	124	2.44%
Single	169	315	-4.81%
Widowed	≤5	7	0.02%

The data indicate no bias against staff who are married or in a civil partnership.

4.3.8 Outputs – Maternity Leave (Annex, Table 24)

28 of the 223 baseline female staff (12%) have taken maternity leave in the REF period. 41 outputs (9%) were attributed to staff who have taken maternity leave, a slightly negative outcome. Numbers are however relatively small and it would be inappropriate to conclude any bias related to maternity leave.

5 Conclusions

Taking account of all protected characteristics, only the analysis by sex shows an overall impact from the SRR and IR identification processes. At institutional level, for SRR the impact on females is negative but for IR it is positive.

The proportion of males in the SRR group increases by 8 percentage points to 61% compared to the baseline of 53%. The conversion rate for females to SRR is 23% percentage points less than that for males at an institutional level (55% compared to 78%).

The proportion of males in the IR group decreases by 4 percentage points to 73% compared to the baseline of 77%. The conversion rate for females to IR is 12 percentage points more than that for males at an institutional level (71% compared to 59%).

The SRR outcome was not unexpected as the University is in a transitional period where not all members of staff on Academic (T&R) contracts have significant responsibility for research. This is due to a number of factors, including staff currently studying for a doctoral level degree, more of whom are female, and those with doctorates who have not yet matured into independent researchers. The cultural change is ongoing and will take a few more years, particularly for those staff studying on a part-time basis for a doctorate who will take 6 or more years to qualify from registration.

For staff identification, at an institutional level, the ethnicity profile reflects the general predominance of White British and other White Background staff in the academic and research workforce. There was an overall slight positive impact for BAME groups in SRR identification. The analysis indicates no evidence of bias related to disability, sexual orientation, religion, age, marital status or maternity leave.

This indicates a balanced approach and the benefits of using objective criteria as set out in the University of Huddersfield's Code of Practice for the identification of SRR and IR staff from the eligible base groups in the UOAs.

For the output selection process only the analysis by sex shows an overall impact. The REF does not require all identified staff to submit the same number of outputs, hence the minimum of 1 and maximum of 5 rule, so there would not be an expectation that the attribution of outputs would be evenly distributed across all protected characteristics. However this does not mean that the University should not continue with a programme of career support for its academic staff and this EIA supports this approach.

At institutional level, for females the output attribution distribution decreases by 4 percentage points to 34% compared to the submitted staff baseline of 38%. The average number of outputs attributed to females is 2 and for males 2.38. Although there is an overall change in favour of males at institutional level, there is variation at UOA level with some favouring females, albeit to a lesser extent than for males. This indicates a need to continue to support females in particular to achieve their full potential from a research perspective, whilst not forgetting about the males either in some disciplines.

The process for selection of outputs is primarily based on an assessment of the quality of a pool of outputs from which the final selection is made. The implication of the analysis points towards some of the outputs attributed to females being of a lower quality than those of their UOA colleagues and hence not chosen for the final submission. Research career support is the pragmatic response.

6 Action Plan

The primary actions arising from this EIA relate to supporting academic staff with gaining their research doctorates, publishing work of an international standard and enabling research career development. The actions are:

1. Provide mentoring and support for all Academic staff studying for doctorates to enable completion in a timely manner (within 6 years of enrolment) in all UOAs
2. Provide mentoring and support for all Academic staff with doctorates to publish work of an international standard
3. Implement and monitor the University's HR Excellence in Research action plan to support the career development of Research Only staff, particularly those on fixed term contracts
4. Monitor the University's aspects of Athena SWAN action plan which are targeted at supporting the career development of female Academic staff, whilst ensuring that male Academic staff also engage in the identification and provision of support programmes appropriate to their needs

Representative actions from the Athena SWAN (AS) and HR Excellence in Research (HREiR) action plans are reproduced below:

Action Point Reference	Action description	Responsibility	Timescale	Success Measures
AS 3.5 Develop, promote and assess coaching and mentoring provision to provide support for women for career progression	Compile records of those taking up scheme by gender. Promote coaching and mentoring scheme on Staff Hub and through Staff Development email distribution. Develop feedback questionnaire for mentee/coachee	Head of People & Organisational Development Head of People & Organisational Development Head of People & Organisational Development	Annually 6 monthly End 2021	Records of partnering of mentors and mentees and coaches and coaches Increased uptake of the coaching and mentoring scheme Record of quality/effectiveness of coaching/mentoring provision
AS 3.6 Improve the appraisal process to increase staff levels of satisfaction with	In Athena SWAN Staff Survey 2022, 2024 ask for views on new appraisal process, which includes promotion/ progression questions.	Head of HR	2022 and 2024	Aim for at least 70%, 75% respectively of respondents in 2022, 2024 AS Staff Survey to be satisfied with the discussions at their most recent appraisal.

Action Point Reference	Action description	Responsibility	Timescale	Success Measures
discussions held.				
AS 3.7 Provide career progression support for academic staff to ensure staff receive quality and timely guidance.	Promote/raise awareness of career progression workshops/training. Deans continue to nominate women for Aurora Leadership for Women course. Review process of nomination of staff on Aurora Leadership for Women course or equivalent.	Deans and HR Director Deans & EDI Officer University EDI Enhancement Committee Chair & Head of HR	Bi-annual Annual End 2020	Aim for over 50% of female respondents saying they felt support was available to them for career progression by 2024. Agreed process of nomination and follow up of attendees. Investigation results.
AS 3.8 Provide career progression support for academic staff by providing pump-priming grant funding through the University Research Fund.	Increase (or at minimum maintain at least 33%) proportion of women on URF allocation committee.	URF Allocation Committee/ University Research Committee	Frequency of URF fund allocation	URF funds continue to be allocated in an equitable process both centrally and by school and allowing breakdown by protected characteristics.
HREiR EC13 Researchers report significantly lower satisfaction levels than other staff at the University in QoWL.	Review outcomes from researchers across the University from the biannual Quality of Working Life Survey with the aim of improving satisfaction ratings.	University Research Committee	April 2023	Satisfaction levels for Research Only staff in line with or exceeding University Benchmarks for Mixed Portfolio staff for QoWL, Question 54.
HREiR ECM5 Engage with opportunities to contribute to policy development aimed at creating a more positive research environment	Schools to review existing provision of seminar and reading groups and share best practices. Gauge interest for a researcher focussed one day event to be held	Associate Deans Research and Enterprise Director of Research and Enterprise & Head of	Jan 2022 Dec 2022	>70% of researchers report feeling mostly or completely that they belong within the University Community. >70% of researchers report feeling mostly or completely that they

Action Point Reference	Action description	Responsibility	Timescale	Success Measures
and culture within their institution	within the period of the action plan.	Researcher Environment		belong within the University Community.
HREiR ECR5

Consider opportunities to contribute to policy development aimed at creating a more positive research environment and culture within their institution | Run Institutional Survey and focus groups. Institutional Survey to include a question which enables reporting from: PGRs; staff doing a PhD; research only staff; and mixed portfolio staff. | Director of Research and Enterprise | Dec 2021 or 2022 | Maintain or improve response rate for Institutional Survey for research only and mixed portfolio staff. |
| HREiR PCD14

Provide researchers with opportunities, and time, to develop their research identity and broader leadership skills | Promoting a research intensive culture is a key priority. Consider ways to improve linking of researchers to UoH Areas of Strategic Research Importance and associated institutions and centres. | PVC Research and Enterprise & Associate Deans Research and Enterprise | Dec 2021 | Increase in collaborative projects submitted for funding and / or co-supervision of PhDs |
| | There are a high number of staff undertaking PhDs, this was a particular area of concern in both the Institutional and CROS surveys. Review current support provision for staff postgraduate researchers and make recommendations. | Head of Researcher Environment | Survey May 2021, Recommendations July 2021 | Include new institutional question in CEDARS on Staff PhDs and report to Graduate Board and University Research Careers Oversight Group. |
| HREiR PCDM1

Engage in regular career development discussions with their researchers, including holding a | Undertake a dissemination exercise to ensure all researchers and managers of researchers are aware of the new Academic Appraisal system. | Head of HR | Jun 2021 | All (100 %) of research only and mixed portfolio staff to have an annual Appraisal (PDPR). The PDPR applies to all permanent and fixed term staff across our University. |

Action Point Reference	Action description	Responsibility	Timescale	Success Measures
career development review at least annually.				
HREiR PCDM2 Mentoring for researchers is highlighted as a priority from the Institutional Survey	Disseminate best practice around research mentoring.	Associate Deans Research and Enterprise, Head of Researcher Environment & Head of People & Organisational Development	June 2024	Monitoring through Institutional Survey and focus groups

Note that the HR Excellence in Research plan was developed to include all academic staff not just those on Research Only contracts and to also recognise that early career researchers and those staff studying for a PhD may need specific support. As a result the HR Excellence in Research action plan also reflects actions 1 and 2 above and enables the male Academic staff aspect in action 4 to be addressed.

Annex - Data Tables

Table 1A Sex – SRR and baseline numbers and proportions by UOA

		Total Headcount	Male	Female	% Male	% Female
All Cat A T&R staff	Base	797	419	378	52.57%	47.43%
SRR staff	SRR	533	325	208	60.98%	39.02%
UOA3	Base	128	42	86	32.81%	67.19%
Allied Health Professions, Nursing and Pharmacy	SRR	53	26	27	49.06%	50.94%
UOA4	Base	34	17	17	50.00%	50.00%
Psychology	SRR	33	16	17	48.48%	51.52%
UOA5	Base	34	19	15	55.88%	44.12%
Biological Sciences	SRR	29	19	10	65.52%	34.48%
UOA8	Base	30	24	6	80.00%	20.00%
Chemistry	SRR		22	≤5		
UOA11	Base		26	≤5		
Computer Science and Informatics	SRR		22	≤5		
UOA12	Base	67	58	9	86.57%	13.43%
Engineering	SRR	59	50	9	84.75%	15.25%
UOA13	Base	27	20	7	74.07%	25.93%
Architecture and Built Environment	SRR		12	≤5		
UOA17	Base	123	68	55	55.28%	44.72%
Business and Management Studies	SRR	89	54	35	60.67%	39.33%
UOA18	Base	23	9	14	39.13%	60.87%
Law	SRR	12	6	6	50.00%	50.00%
UOA20	Base	66	33	33	50.00%	50.00%
Social Work and Social Policy	SRR	43	22	21	51.16%	48.84%
UOA23	Base	65	17	48	26.15%	73.85%
Education	SRR	29	14	15	48.28%	51.72%
UOA24	Base	14	7	7	50.00%	50.00%
Sport and Exercise Sciences	SRR		≤5	≤5		
UOA26	Base		≤5	≤5		
Modern Languages and Linguistics	SRR		≤5	≤5		
UOA27	Base		7	≤5		
English Language and Literature	SRR		6	≤5		
UOA28	Base	13	6	7	46.15%	53.85%
History	SRR	13	6	7	46.15%	53.85%
UOA32	Base	74	33	41	44.59%	55.41%
Art and Design	SRR	34	16	18	47.06%	52.94%
UOA33A	Base	24	17	7	70.83%	29.17%
Music	SRR	22	16	6	72.73%	27.27%
UOA33B	Base		6	≤5		
Drama	SRR		6	≤5		
UOA34	Base	14	7	7	50.00%	50.00%
Communication, Culture and Media Studies	SRR		6	≤5		

Table 1B – Sex - conversion rates to SRR from baseline for Male and Female staff by UOA

		Total headcount	Male	Female
All Cat A T&R staff	Base	797	419	378
SRR staff	SRR	533	325	208
	% identified	66.88%	77.57%	55.03%
UOA3	Base	128	42	86
Allied Health Professions, Nursing and Pharmacy	SRR	53	26	27
	% identified	41.41%	61.90%	31.40%
UOA4	Base	34	17	17
Psychology	SRR	33	16	17
	% identified	97.06%	94.12%	100.00%
UOA5	Base	34	19	15
Biological Sciences	SRR	29	19	10
	% identified	85.29%	100.00%	66.67%
UOA8	Base	30	24	6
Chemistry	SRR		22	≤5
	% identified		91.67%	
UOA11	Base		26	≤5
Computer Science and Informatics	SRR		22	≤5
	% identified		84.62%	
UOA12	Base	67	58	9
Engineering	SRR	59	50	9
	% identified	88.06%	86.21%	100.00%
UOA13	Base	27	20	7
Architecture and Built Environment	SRR		12	≤5
	% identified		60.00%	
UOA17	Base	123	68	55
Business and Management Studies	SRR	89	54	35
	% identified	72.36%	79.41%	63.64%
UOA18	Base	23	9	14
Law	SRR	12	6	6
	% identified	52.17%	66.67%	42.86%
UOA20	Base	66	33	33
Social Work and Social Policy	SRR	43	22	21
	% identified	65.15%	66.67%	63.64%
UOA23	Base	65	17	48
Education	SRR	29	14	15
	% identified	44.62%	82.35%	31.25%
UOA24	Base		7	7
Sport and Exercise Sciences	SRR		≤5	≤5
	% identified			
UOA26	Base		≤5	≤5
Modern Languages and Linguistics	SRR		≤5	≤5
	% identified			
UOA27	Base		7	≤5
English Language and Literature	SRR		6	≤5
	% identified		85.71%	

		Total headcount	Male	Female
UOA28	Base	13	6	7
History	SRR	13	6	7
	% identified	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
UOA32	Base	74	33	41
Art and Design	SRR	34	16	18
	% identified	45.95%	48.48%	43.90%
UOA33A	Base	24	17	7
Music	SRR	22	16	6
	% identified	91.67%	94.12%	85.71%
UOA33B	Base		6	≤5
Drama	SRR		6	≤5
	% identified		100.00%	
UOA34	Base	14	7	7
Communication, Culture and Media Studies	SRR		6	≤5
	% identified		85.71%	

Table 2 Ethnicity – SRR and baseline numbers

Key to table:

A	African
B	Arab
C	Bangladeshi
D	Caribbean
E	Chinese
F	Indian
G	Irish
H	Not Known
I	Other Asian Background
J	Other Black Background
K	Other Ethnic Background
L	Other Mixed Background
M	Other White Background
N	Pakistani
O	Prefer not to say
P	White and Asian
Q	White and Black African
R	White and Black Caribbean
S	White British
T	Gypsy or Traveller

		Total head-count	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T
All Cat A T&R staff	Base	797	15	≤5	≤5	≤5	32	17	22	10	19	≤5	≤5	11	105	17	16	≤5	0	≤5	515	≤5
SRR staff	SRR	533	10	≤5	≤5	≤5	31	11	18	9	17	≤5	≤5	8	93	12	13	≤5	0	≤5	297	0
	% Base	100	1.9				4.0	2.1	2.8	1.3	2.4			1.4	13.2	2.1	2.0				64.6	
	% SRR	100	1.9				5.8	2.1	3.4	1.7	3.2			1.5	17.5	2.3	2.4				55.7	

Table 3 Disability - SRR and baseline numbers

		Total Head-count	Declared Disability Number of Staff	Declared Disability %
All Cat A T&R staff	Base	797	39	4.89%
SRR staff	SRR	533	19	3.56%

Table 4 Sexual Orientation - SRR and baseline numbers

Key to table:

A	Bi
B	Gay Man
C	Straight/Heterosexual
D	Lesbian/Gay Woman
E	Not known
F	Prefer to self-describe
G	Prefer not to say

		Total head-count	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
All Cat A T&R staff	Base	797	17	15	631	14	11	≤5	106
SRR staff	SRR	533	13	8	417	7	9	≤5	76
	% Base	100	2.13	1.88	79.17	1.76	1.38		13.30
	% SRR	100	2.44	1.50	78.24	1.31	1.69		14.26

Table 5 Religion - SRR and baseline numbers

Key to table:

A	Agnostic
B	Atheist
C	Buddhist
D	Christian
E	Christian - Orthodox
F	Christian - Protestant
G	Christian - Roman Catholic
H	Hindu
I	Islam - Sunni
J	Jewish
K	Muslim
L	No Religion
M	Sikh
N	Other
O	Prefer not to say
P	Unknown

		Total head-count	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
All Cat A T&R staff	Base	797	26	52	12	182	12	16	33	8	16	≤5	21	269	≤5	20	113	10
SRR staff	SRR	533	19	39	10	105	10	9	24	6	12	≤5	17	186	≤5	11	73	7
	% Base	100	3.26	6.52	1.51	22.84	1.51	2.01	4.14	1.00	2.01		2.63	33.75		2.51	14.18	1.25
	% SRR	100	3.56	7.32	1.88	19.70	1.88	1.69	4.50	1.13	2.25		3.19	34.90		2.06	13.70	1.31

Table 6 Age - SRR and baseline numbers

		Total headcount	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-54	Age 55-64	Age 65+
All Cat A T&R staff	Base	797	91	226	252	187	41
SRR staff	SRR	533	62	160	158	120	33
	% Base	100%	11.42%	28.36%	31.62%	23.46%	5.14%
	% SRR	100%	11.63%	30.02%	29.64%	22.51%	6.19%

Table 7 Marital Status – SRR and baseline numbers

Key to table:

A	Civil Partnership
B	Divorced
C	Estranged
D	Married
E	Not known
F	Not specified
G	Other
H	Partner
I	Single
J	Widowed

		Total head-count	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
All Cat A T&R staff	Base	797	≤5	24	6	444	12	15	28	55	205	≤5
SRR staff	SRR	533	≤5	12	≤5	299	7	12	13	35	145	≤5
	% Base	100%		3.01%	0.75%	55.71%	1.15%	1.88%	3.51%	6.90%	25.72%	
	% SRR	100%		2.25%		56.10%	1.31%	2.25%	2.44%	6.57%	27.20%	

Table 8 Maternity Leave Taken - SRR and baseline numbers

		Total headcount	Maternity Leave Number of Staff	Maternity Leave Taken %
All Cat A T&R female staff	Base	378	47	12.43%
SRR female staff	SRR	208	25	12.02%

Table 9A Sex – IR and baseline numbers and proportions for UOA12 and 33A

		Total Headcount	Female	Male	% Female	% Male
All Cat A RO staff	Base	90	21	69	23.33%	76.67%
IR staff	IR	56	15	41	26.79%	73.21%

Table 9B Sex - conversion rates to IR from baseline for Male and Female staff by UOA

		Total headcount	Female	Male
All Cat A RO staff	Base	90	21	69
IR staff	IR	56	15	41
	% identified	62.22%	71.43%	59.42%
UOA12	Base		≤5	43
Engineering	IR		≤5	26
	% identified			60.47%
UOA33A	Base		≤5	6
Music	IR		≤5	6
	% identified			100.00%

Table 10 Ethnicity – IR and baseline numbers

Key to table:

A	African
B	Arab
C	Bangladeshi
D	Caribbean
E	Chinese
F	Indian
G	Irish
H	Not Known
I	Other Asian Background
J	Other Black Background
K	Other Ethnic Background
L	Other Mixed Background
M	Other White Background
N	Pakistani
O	Prefer not to say
P	White and Asian
Q	White and Black African
R	White and Black Caribbean
S	White British
T	Gypsy or Traveller

		Total head-count	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T
All Cat A RO staff	Base	90	≤5	≤5	≤5	0	19	≤5	≤5	≤5	≤5	0	≤5	0	16	≤5	≤5	≤5	≤5	0	31	0
IR staff	IR	56	≤5	≤5	0	0	11	≤5	≤5	0	≤5	0	≤5	0	14	≤5	0	0	≤5	0	19	0
	% Base	100					21.1								17.8						34.4	
	% IR	100					19.6								25.0						33.9	

Table 11 Disability - IR and baseline numbers

		Total Headcount	Declared Disability Number of Staff
All Cat A RO staff	Base	90	≤5
IR staff	IR	56	≤5

Table 12 Sexual Orientation - IR and baseline numbers

Key to table:

A	Bi
B	Gay Man
C	Straight/Heterosexual
D	Lesbian/Gay Woman
E	Not known
F	Prefer to self-describe
G	Prefer not to say

		Total head-count	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
All Cat A RO staff	Base	90	≤5	0	78	≤5	0	0	8
IR staff	IR	56	≤5	0	50	≤5	0	0	≤5
	% Base	100			86.67				8.89
	% IR	100			89.29				

Table 13 Religion - IR and baseline numbers

Key to table:

A	Agnostic
B	Atheist
C	Buddhist
D	Christian
E	Christian - Orthodox
F	Christian - Protestant
G	Christian - Roman Catholic
H	Hindu
I	Islam - Sunni
J	Jewish
K	Muslim
L	No Religion
M	Sikh
N	Other
O	Prefer not to say
P	Unknown

		Total head-count	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
All Cat A RO staff	Base	90	≤5	12	≤5	13	≤5	0	≤5	≤5	≤5	0	10	29	0	≤5	≤5	0
IR staff	IR	56	≤5	9	≤5	9	≤5	0	≤5	0	≤5	0	≤5	19	0	≤5	≤5	0
	% Base	100		13.33		14.44							11.11	32.22				
	% IR	100		16.07		16.07								33.93				

Table 14 Age - IR and baseline numbers

		Total headcount	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-54	Age 55-64	Age 65+
All Cat A RO staff	Base	90	33	41	12	≤5	≤5
IR staff	IR	56	17	27	9	≤5	≤5
	% Base	100%	36.67%	45.56%	13.33%		
	% IR	100%	30.36%	48.21%	16.07%		

Table 15 Marital Status – IR

Key to table:

A	Civil Partnership
B	Divorced
C	Estranged
D	Married
E	Not known
F	Not specified
G	Other
H	Partner
I	Single
J	Widowed

		Total head-count	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
All Cat A RO staff	Base	90	0	0	0	39	≤5	≤5	≤5	9	39	0
IR staff	IR	56	0	0	0	24	≤5	≤5	0	6	24	0
	% Base	100%				43.33				10.00	43.33	
	% IR	100%				42.86				10.71	42.86	

Table 16 Maternity Leave Taken - IR and baseline numbers

		Total headcount	Maternity Leave Number of Staff
All Cat A RO female staff	Base	21	≤5
IR female staff	IR	15	≤5

Table 17 Sex – % attributed Outputs compared to baseline demographic by UOA

	Total	Male	Female
Headcount submitted staff all UOAs	589	366	223
Percentage submitted staff		62.14%	37.86%
Number of attributed outputs	1319	873	446
Percentage attributed outputs		66.19%	33.81%
Variance in percentage compared to base		4.05%	-4.05%
UOA3 Allied Health Professions, Nursing and Pharmacy	55	28	27
Percentage submitted staff		50.91%	49.09%
Number of attributed outputs	130	81	49
Percentage attributed outputs		62.31%	37.69%
Variance in percentage compared to base		11.40%	-11.40%
UOA4 Psychology	33	16	17
Percentage submitted staff		48.48%	51.52%
Number of attributed outputs	78	45	33
Percentage attributed outputs		57.69%	42.31%
Variance in percentage compared to base		9.21%	-9.21%
UOA5 Biological Sciences	30	19	11
Percentage submitted staff		63.33%	36.67%
Number of attributed outputs	70	49	21
Percentage attributed outputs		70.00%	30.00%
Variance in percentage compared to base		6.67%	-6.67%
UOA8 Chemistry		23	≤5
Percentage submitted staff			
Number of attributed outputs	66	60	6
Percentage attributed outputs		90.91%	9.09%
Variance in percentage compared to base		8.77%	-8.77%
UOA11 Computer Science and Informatics		24	≤5
Percentage submitted staff			
Number of attributed outputs	60	52	8
Percentage attributed outputs		86.67%	13.33%
Variance in percentage compared to base		3.91%	-3.91%
UOA12 Engineering	88	76	12
Percentage submitted staff		86.36%	13.64%
Number of attributed outputs	212	186	26
Percentage attributed outputs		87.74%	12.26%
Variance in percentage compared to base		1.37%	-1.37
UOA13 Architecture and Built Environment	18	13	≤5
Percentage submitted staff			
Number of attributed outputs	35	24	11
Percentage attributed outputs		68.57%	31.43%
Variance in percentage compared to base		-3.65%	3.65%
UOA17 Business and Management Studies	89	54	35
Percentage submitted staff		60.67%	39.33%
Number of attributed outputs	193	125	68
Percentage attributed outputs		64.77%	35.23%
Variance in percentage compared to base		4.09%	-4.09%

	Total	Male	Female
UOA18 Law	12	6	6
Percentage submitted staff		50.00%	50.00%
Number of attributed outputs	27	15	12
Percentage attributed outputs		55.56%	44.44%
Variance in percentage compared to base		5.56	-5.56
UOA20 Social Work and Social Policy	46	22	24
Percentage submitted staff		47.83%	52.17%
Number of attributed outputs	101	50	51
Percentage attributed outputs		49.50%	50.50%
Variance in percentage compared to base		1.68%	-1.68%
UOA23 Education	29	14	15
Percentage submitted staff		48.28%	51.72%
Number of attributed outputs	57	29	28
Percentage attributed outputs		50.88%	49.12%
Variance in percentage compared to base		2.60%	-2.60%
UOA24 Sport and Exercise Sciences		≤5	≤5
Percentage submitted staff			
Number of attributed outputs	18	7	11
Percentage attributed outputs		38.89%	61.11%
Variance in percentage compared to base		-3.97%	3.97%
UOA26 Modern Languages and Linguistics		≤5	6
Percentage submitted staff			
Number of attributed outputs	23	10	13
Percentage attributed outputs		43.48%	56.52%
Variance in percentage compared to base		3.48%	-3.48%
UOA27 English Language and Literature	13	7	6
Percentage submitted staff		53.85%	46.15%
Number of attributed outputs	30	16	14
Percentage attributed outputs		53.33%	46.67%
Variance in percentage compared to base		-0.51%	0.51%
UOA28 History	14	6	8
Percentage submitted staff		42.86%	57.14%
Number of attributed outputs	28	11	17
Percentage attributed outputs		39.29%	60.71%
Variance in percentage compared to base		-3.57%	3.57%
UOA32 Art and Design	35	17	18
Percentage submitted staff		48.57%	51.43%
Number of attributed outputs	72	35	37
Percentage attributed outputs		48.61%	51.39%
Variance in percentage compared to base		0.04%	-0.04%
UOA33A Music	32	22	10
Percentage submitted staff		68.75%	31.25%
Number of attributed outputs	68	48	20
Percentage attributed outputs		70.59%	29.41%
Variance in percentage compared to base		1.84%	-1.84%

	Total	Male	Female
UOA33B Drama		6	≤5
Percentage submitted staff			
Number of attributed outputs	23	16	7
Percentage attributed outputs		69.57%	30.43%
Variance in percentage compared to base		9.57%	-9.57%
UOA34 Communication, Culture and Media Studies		6	≤5
Percentage submitted staff			
Number of attributed outputs	28	14	14
Percentage attributed outputs		50.00%	50.00%
Variance in percentage compared to base		-4.55%	4.55%

Table 18 Ethnicity – % attributed Outputs compared to baseline demographic

Key to table:

A	African
B	Arab
C	Bangladeshi
D	Caribbean
E	Chinese
F	Indian
G	Irish
H	Not Known
I	Other Asian Background
J	Other Black Background
K	Other Ethnic Background
L	Other Mixed Background
M	Other White Background
N	Pakistani
O	Prefer not to say
P	White and Asian
Q	White and Black African
R	White and Black Caribbean
S	White British
T	Gypsy or Traveller

	Total	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T
Headcount submitted staff All UOAs	589	11	≤5	≤5	≤5	42	12	19	9	20	≤5	≤5	8	107	14	13	≤5	≤5	≤5	316	0
Percentage submitted staff	%	1.9				7.1	2.0	3.2	1.5	3.4			1.4	18.2	2.4	2.2				53.7	
Number of attributed outputs	1319	26	11	4	1	87	34	45	22	39	1	9	15	251	34	22	7	3	1	707	0
Percentage attributed outputs	%	2.0	0.8	0.3	0.1	6.6	2.6	3.4	1.7	3.0	0.1	0.7	1.1	19.0	2.6	1.7	0.5	0.2	0.1	53.6	
Variance in percentage compared to base	%	0.1				-0.5	0.6	0.2	0.2	-0.4			-0.3	0.8	0.2	-0.5				-0.1	

Table 19 Disability - % attributed Outputs compared to baseline demographic

	Headcount submitted staff	Headcount declared disability	% staff declared disabled	Total outputs submitted	Total outputs attributed to disabled staff	% attributed outputs	Variance %outputs to base
All UOAs	589	20	3.40%	1319	29	2.20%	-1.20%

Table 20 Sexual Orientation - % attributed Outputs compared to baseline demographic

Key to table:

A	Bi
B	Gay Man
C	Straight/Heterosexual
D	Lesbian/Gay Woman
E	Not known
F	Prefer to self-describe
G	Prefer not to say

	Total	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Headcount submitted staff All UOAs	589	15	8	467	8	9	≤5	79
Percentage submitted staff	%	2.55	1.36	79.29	1.36	1.53		13.41
Number of attributed outputs	1319	40	19	1022	18	26	9	185
Percentage attributed outputs	%	3.03	1.44	77.48	1.36	1.97	0.68	14.03
Variance in percentage compared to base	%	0.49	0.08	-1.80	0.01	0.44		0.61

Table 21 Religion - % attributed Outputs compared to baseline demographic

Key to table:

A	Agnostic
B	Atheist
C	Buddhist
D	Christian
E	Christian - Orthodox
F	Christian - Protestant
G	Christian - Roman Catholic
H	Hindu
I	Islam - Sunni
J	Jewish
K	Muslim
L	No Religion
M	Sikh
N	Other
O	Prefer not to say
P	Unknown

	Total	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
Headcount submitted staff - All UOAs	589	21	48	11	114	13	9	25	6	15	≤5	21	205	≤5	13	76	7
Percentage submitted staff	%	3.6	8.2	1.9	19.4	2.2	1.5	4.2	1.0	2.6		3.6	34.8		2.2	12.9	1.2
Number of attributed outputs	1319	43	112	29	230	33	30	53	20	36	10	42	469	2	30	158	22
Percentage attributed outputs	%	3.3	8.5	2.2	17.4	2.5	2.3	4.0	1.5	2.7	0.8	3.2	35.6	0.2	2.3	12.0	1.7
Variance in percentage compared to base	%	-0.3	0.3	0.3	-2.0	0.3	0.8	-0.2	0.5	0.1		-0.4	0.8		0.1	-0.9	0.5

53

Table 22 Age - % attributed Outputs compared to baseline demographic

	Total	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-54	Age 55-64	Age 65+
Headcount submitted staff - All UOAs	589	79	187	167	122	34
Percentage submitted staff	%	13.41	31.75	28.35	20.71	5.77
Number of attributed outputs	1319	155	406	376	302	80
Percentage attributed outputs	%	11.75	30.78	28.51	22.90	6.07
Variance in percentage compared to base	%	-1.66	-0.97	0.15	2.18	0.29

Table 23 Marital Status – % attributed Outputs compared to baseline demographic

Key to table:

A	Civil Partnership
B	Divorced
C	Estranged
D	Married
E	Not known
F	Not specified
G	Other
H	Partner
I	Single
J	Widowed

	Total	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Headcount submitted staff - All UOAs	589	≤5	12	≤5	323	8	13	13	41	169	≤5
Percentage submitted staff	%		2.04		54.84	1.36	2.21	2.21	6.96	28.69	
Number of attributed outputs	1319	7	25	10	756	21	27	27	124	315	7
Percentage attributed outputs	%	0.53	1.90	0.76	57.32	1.59	2.05	2.05	9.40	23.88	0.53
Variance in percentage compared to base	%		-0.14		2.48	0.23	-0.16	-0.16	2.44	-4.81	

Table 24 Maternity Leave Taken - % attributed outputs compared to baseline demographic

	Headcount submitted female staff	Headcount maternity leave taken	% staff maternity leave taken	Total outputs submitted by female staff	Total outputs attributed to maternity leave taken	% attributed outputs	Variance %outputs to base
All UOAs	223	28	12.56%	446	41	9.19%	-3.37%