

Edinburgh Napier University

FINAL Equality Impact Assessment
REF2021 Code of Practice
POST-SUBMISSION ANALYSIS

Edinburgh Napier University – Equality Impact Assessment

<p><i>School/Service Area</i></p> <p>Research Innovation and Enterprise Office</p>	<p><i>Date of Assessment</i></p> <p>15 June 2021</p>	<p><i>Name of the proposal to be assessed</i></p> <p>REF2021 Code of Practice: Stage 4 Final analysis (Post submission)</p>	<p><i>Person/s responsible for the assessment</i></p> <p>REF Project Manager and HR Inclusion Committee</p>
<p><i>Who was present at the EIA?</i></p> <p>REF Project Manager</p>	<p><i>Is this a new or existing proposal?</i></p> <p>Existing: REF2021 Code of Practice</p>		<p><i>When will this proposal be reviewed?</i></p> <p>The REF2021 EIA has been conducted at three previous intervals throughout the REF preparation cycle. Available here. The University's REF2021 Code of Practice criteria will be evaluated as part of an internal REF evaluation project in Autumn 2021 and recommendations will be made relating to its continued use as a means by which to identify Staff with Significant Responsibility for Research in the new REF cycle.</p>

<p>1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the Code of Practice.</p>	<p>The Joint UK funding councils require that each institution making a submission to REF2021 develop, document and apply a Code of Practice (CoP) on the fair and transparent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. identification of staff with significant responsibility for research, as agreed with staff (where a University is not submitting 100% of Category A eligible staff) ii. determining research independence iii. selecting Outputs for submission <p>The University is required to ensure that REF procedures do not discriminate unlawfully against, or otherwise have the effect of harassing or victimising individuals from protected characteristics (because of age, disability, gender identity, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation or because they are pregnant or have recently given birth).</p> <p>The Code of Practice has been developed based on the REF 2021 Guidance on Submissions and the guidance given by the Joint UK Funding Councils on the Code of Practice. The content has been driven by the principles of: Objectivity; Non-discrimination and Transparency.</p> <p>Aims: The ultimate goal is to ensure fairness in the University's REF2021 submission, adhering to the parameters of the REF guidance relating to staff and outputs.</p> <p><i>achieved by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilising Workload Allocation consistently across all Category A eligible staff in all UoAs to identify staff with Significant Responsibility for Research (0.2 FTE, per FTE per year (pro rata for P/T staff) • Utilising the University's 'MyContribution' Personal Development Review process to agree, record and review research objectives • Utilising the agreed three criteria for research independence, applied consistently, relative to the UoA/ discipline • Utilising the University's Research Information Management System (Worktribe) automated algorithm for the selection of Outputs based on highest quality* • Ensuring that all those involved in decision-making, have received bespoke REF2021 E&D training. <p><i>*Manual overrides have been implemented due to inefficiencies in automated algorithm but in doing so, the principles of CoP have been adhered to and formally recorded for audit purposes. See section 16.</i></p>
--	--

<p>2. <i>Who is intended to benefit / who is affected from the Code of Practice and in what way?</i></p>	<p>The Code is intended for all staff meeting the definition of Category A eligible (p/g 117 Guidance on Submissions).</p> <p>The Code outlines the criteria which will be applied consistently to the Cat A eligible staff pool, to identify the Cat A submittable staff pool.</p> <p>The Code is intended to benefit the Cat A eligible staff pool, by providing clear criteria, applied consistently, by which to identify those staff with Significant Responsibility for Research or Research Independence and thus included in the submittable pool for REF2021.</p> <p>The Code also outlines the criteria and processes for selection of Outputs (based on the REF guidance relating to minimum and maximum requirements), based on highest quality/ merit only and it provides a commitment to staff that attributing more or less papers to an individual for the REF2021 submission, will not be seen as a reflection of the value placed on that individual's contribution to the research environment at Edinburgh Napier University.</p> <p>The Code of Practice also benefits the University as a whole by having transparent criteria and processes in place, by which to ensure adherence to the REF guidance and rules on submission and avoid appeal.</p>
--	---

<p>3. <i>What outcomes are wanted from the Code of Practice?</i></p>	<p>The desired outcome from the Code of Practice is:</p> <p>To achieve submission of all staff with Significant Responsibility for Research and research independence and ensure that our REF procedures do not discriminate, harass or victimise individuals from a protected characteristic.</p> <p>Another desired outcome is to achieve an optimal REF2021 submission for the University, working within the parameters of the framework.</p> <p>Desirable Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the University's criteria and procedures, as outlined in the Code of Practice for the i. identification of staff with SRR, ii. Identification of independent researcher and iii. Selection of Outputs, does not discriminate against any of the protected characteristics • Ensure that the University's criteria is applied fairly, equitably, transparently and consistently across all REF Units of Assessment • Ensure that there is a clear and appropriate process for declaring mitigation (in line with the REF2021 guidance) • Ensuring there is a transparent, independent appeals process in place • Ensuring that role holders with responsibility for the application of REF2021 criteria are trained under a bespoke programme of REF2021 Equality and Diversity training
--	---

<p>4. How have you consulted on the Code of Practice including those from protected groups? What were their views?</p>	<p>Development of the Code of Practice has included a thorough programme of institution-wide consultation at various stages of development, including:</p> <p>Open campus meetings on all three campuses, engagement with staff representative groups – Academic Union Representatives, consultation with the University Leadership Team, the University’s Research and Innovation Committee, Academic Board and the REF2021 Steering Group. Staff have also been invited to provide feedback through a dedicated REF2021 CoP email address.</p> <p>All reasonable attempts have been made to publicise the Code of Practice to staff on leave or working away from the University through means of communication familiar to them.</p> <p>Communications to all staff via the ‘all staff’ email directory and on the staff intranet, has ensured that staff from across all of the protected groups have been included in the communications and have had equal opportunity to feed into the consultation process. Similarly, the University Committees as referenced above are constituted with due regard to a representative balance of diversity, meaning staff from across the protected groups have been present at these Committees and involved in the development.</p> <p>Feedback on the development of the Code has been positive, with staff and academic union representatives signalling that they are in agreement with the criteria, working within the parameters outlined by the REF guidance and in light of the data sources available within the University.</p> <p>In developing this Code of Practice, the institution has considered the content of the Edinburgh Napier REF2014 CoP, alongside the outcomes of the final 2014 Equality Impact Assessment, conducted post submission, which found the practices of selection in REF2014 to be fair and transparent.</p> <p>Further, the University has considered the report by the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP) relating to good practice in REF2014, to inform the content of the REF2021 CoP.</p> <p>It is designed to complement the University’s existing recruitment and staff development policies, all of which have been subject to equality impact assessment and which comply with the Equality Act 2010.</p> <p>All staff in the Category A eligible pool have been notified in writing of the decision on their SigRes status and given an opportunity to appeal via the formal appeals process. No such appeals were received.</p>
--	---

<p>5. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?</p>	<p>Factors which could contribute / detract from the outcomes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inclusive communication strategy, ensuring that all staff are aware of the content of the Code of Practice; how it is being implemented; and how it affects them • A comprehensive E&D training programme for all role holders involved in the application of the Code, to ensure it is implemented consistently and with due regard for staff with protected characteristics • Robust and consistent processes for allocating and recording Workload Allocation • Robust and consistent processes for Objective setting at the Personal Development Review 'MyContribution' • A clear (voluntary) and consistent process for the declaration of circumstances which may have affected research productivity in the period (for Output reduction) • A clear appeals process, which is independent to the decision-making process • Effective School Equality Monitoring Groups in operation to analyse Workload allocation • A robust scoring process to assess Output quality against the REF criteria • An effective automated algorithm within Worktribe, which selects Outputs only on the basis of quality* • A commitment to staff that the volume of Outputs attributed for REF2021 is no reflection of the value that individual contributes to the research environment <p><i>*Manual overrides have been implemented due to inefficiencies in automated algorithm but in doing so, the principles of CoP have been adhered to and formally recorded for internal audit purposes. See section 16.</i></p>
---	--

<p>6. Does this proposal have a positive impact on equality? What evidence is there to support this? Could it do more?</p>	<p>The Code has been developed with consideration of factors which might affect staff from across the protected characteristic groups. Recognition has been given to staff working part time, with a fractional research allowance applied for these staff members. Line managers are trained in unconscious bias and the University is committed to implementing reasonable adjustments, where appropriate.</p> <p>Data analysis has been conducted at relevant stages in the preparation of the REF2021 submission, utilising protected characteristic data, to evaluate if there is any evidence of any group/s of individuals being unfairly treated.</p> <p>The analysis includes a list of identified actions to be taken forward by the REF Steering Group or the University more broadly, in respect of other University policies which might warrant review based on the findings.</p> <p><u>EIA intervals:</u></p> <p>Stage 1 – Initial screening on the criteria outlined in the REF2021 Code of Practice using data put forward to mini-REF2018 (conducted in September 2018) – Staff data</p> <p>Stage 2 – Screening on the criteria within the Code of Practice, following any final amendments to the code and based on issue of formal letters identifying staff as SRR or independent (conducted in May 2019) – Staff data</p> <p>Stage 3 – Monitoring prior to submission (conducted in June 2020) – Staff data and Output selection (<i>Delayed due to Covid – conducted November 2020, on staff only as final selectin of outputs not yet confirmed</i>).</p> <p>Stage 4 - Final EIA (conducted post-submission July 2021) – Staff and Outputs selection</p> <p>Relevant data analysis is provided below (where data allows): Whilst the data is available at a UoA level, the data sets are considered too small to draw any meaningful conclusions. The EIA analysis below is based on data for the overall University submission. <i>Data at UoA level has been provided to UoA leaders and School Inclusion Monitoring Groups throughout the process for the purpose of local monitoring.</i></p> <p>NB: The Cat A pool below (555) exceeds the figure reported to HESA (527) as it represents a more inclusive group of staff with all research-only staff at grade 6 and above included in the count (independent and non-independent).</p>
--	---

7. Is it likely that the proposal **could** have a positive or negative impact due to gender (including pregnancy and maternity)? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

The Code should have no impact (positive or negative) due to gender, as the criteria has been applied consistently to all individuals.

All managers with responsibility for allocating research time take part in **unconscious bias training and bespoke REF E&D training** to avoid direct or indirect discrimination on the basis of any protected characteristics.

Whilst it is possible that a higher proportion of female staff might be on fractional contracts, working part-time, **the CoP takes accounts for this by applying a fractional expectation** of research time allocation to identify SRR.

NO

Final EIA Evidence: Gender Profile as at 31 July 2020

Gender Profile	Female		Male		Total
		%		%	
Cat A eligible pool	247	45%	308	55%	555
SigRES (Submitted)	104	39%	162	61%	266
Proportion deemed SRR from eligible pool	42%		53%		48%

On application of the University's criteria for identification of SRR and Independent Researcher, the proportion of submitted staff Male to Female is 61% to 39%. This compares with a total Category A eligible pool of 55% to 45%.

53% of the eligible Male staff pool are submitted according to the criteria, compared with 42% of the Female eligible pool.

The data suggests that Males are more likely to be deemed Significantly Responsible for Research (submitted) than Females, however discussions at local inclusion group level where this particular trend applies, provides assurance that the criteria has been applied consistently on the basis of WAM allocation in exchange for research objective deliverables. Furthermore, the University received no formal appeals on the basis of CoP criteria implementation.

ACTION: Present EIA findings to the University Inclusion / Gender Equality Steering Group.

ACTION: Continue to monitor workload allocation by protected group through the School Inclusivity Monitoring Groups and Line managers to ensure that all staff with ambitions to progress from 'developing in research' to significantly responsible for research' are effectively supported with a clear trajectory/ research action plan.

<p>8. Is it likely that the proposal could have a positive or negative impact on minority ethnic groups? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>The Code should have no impact (positive or negative) on ethnic groups as the criteria for identifying SRR or independent researcher are being consistently applied.</p> <p>All managers with responsibility for allocating research time take part in unconscious bias training and bespoke REF E&D training to avoid direct or indirect discrimination on the basis of protected characteristics.</p>		<p>NO</p>	<p>Final EIA Evidence: Ethnic Profile as at 31 July 2020</p> <table><tr><th>thnic Profile</th><th>Asian</th><th>%</th><th>Black</th><th>%</th><th>Mixed</th><th>%</th><th>Other</th><th>%</th><th>White</th><th>%</th><th>Unknown</th><th>%</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><td>Cat A eligible pool</td><td>24</td><td>4%</td><td>6</td><td>1%</td><td>4</td><td>1%</td><td>29</td><td>5%</td><td>464</td><td>84%</td><td>28</td><td>5%</td><td>555</td></tr><tr><td>SigRES (Submitted)</td><td>15</td><td>6%</td><td>1</td><td>0%</td><td>3</td><td>1%</td><td>17</td><td>6%</td><td>217</td><td>82%</td><td>13</td><td>5%</td><td>266</td></tr><tr><td>Proportion deemed SRR from eligible poc</td><td>63%</td><td></td><td>17%</td><td></td><td>75%</td><td></td><td>59%</td><td></td><td>47%</td><td></td><td>46%</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> <p>There is no evidence of discrimination in the application of criteria relating to ethnicity.</p> <p>ACTION: Continue to monitor workload allocation by protected group through the School Inclusivity Monitoring Groups.</p>	thnic Profile	Asian	%	Black	%	Mixed	%	Other	%	White	%	Unknown	%	Total	Cat A eligible pool	24	4%	6	1%	4	1%	29	5%	464	84%	28	5%	555	SigRES (Submitted)	15	6%	1	0%	3	1%	17	6%	217	82%	13	5%	266	Proportion deemed SRR from eligible poc	63%		17%		75%		59%		47%		46%		
thnic Profile	Asian	%	Black	%	Mixed	%	Other	%	White	%	Unknown	%	Total																																														
Cat A eligible pool	24	4%	6	1%	4	1%	29	5%	464	84%	28	5%	555																																														
SigRES (Submitted)	15	6%	1	0%	3	1%	17	6%	217	82%	13	5%	266																																														
Proportion deemed SRR from eligible poc	63%		17%		75%		59%		47%		46%																																																
<p>9. Is it likely that the proposal could have a positive or negative impact due to disability? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>The Code of Practice is unlikely to have an impact on individuals with a disability. The University promotes the implementation of reasonable adjustments to facilitate engagement with all four strands of academic activity (Research; Learning & Teaching; Enterprise and Professional Practice.</p> <p>The University’s ‘allocating research time policy’, recommends that research time should be allocated in meaningful blocks to allow for effective research activity to occur. This is considered as part of the discussions relating to annual objectives at the ‘MyContribution’ meetings, where appropriate and where the individual has disclosed their disability. This includes application of the flexible working policy if appropriate.</p>		<p>NO</p>	<p>Final EIA Evidence: Disability Profile as at 31 July 2020</p> <table><tr><th>Disability Profile</th><th>Yes</th><th>%</th><th>No</th><th>%</th><th>Unknown</th><th>%</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><td>Cat A eligible pool</td><td>44</td><td>8%</td><td>472</td><td>85%</td><td>39</td><td>7%</td><td>555</td></tr><tr><td>SigRES (Submitted)</td><td>20</td><td>8%</td><td>229</td><td>86%</td><td>17</td><td>6%</td><td>266</td></tr><tr><td>Proportion deemed SRR from eligible poc</td><td>45%</td><td></td><td>49%</td><td></td><td>44%</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> <p>There is no evidence of discrimination in the application of criteria relating to disability. 45% of the eligible pool of staff with a disability is being submitted, as compared with 49% of those without a disability.</p> <p>ACTION: Present findings to Inclusion Committee and promote disclosure of disability through HR Connect self-service, and highlight support services.</p>	Disability Profile	Yes	%	No	%	Unknown	%	Total	Cat A eligible pool	44	8%	472	85%	39	7%	555	SigRES (Submitted)	20	8%	229	86%	17	6%	266	Proportion deemed SRR from eligible poc	45%		49%		44%																										
Disability Profile	Yes	%	No	%	Unknown	%	Total																																																				
Cat A eligible pool	44	8%	472	85%	39	7%	555																																																				
SigRES (Submitted)	20	8%	229	86%	17	6%	266																																																				
Proportion deemed SRR from eligible poc	45%		49%		44%																																																						

10. Is it likely that the proposal **could** have a positive or negative impact on people due to sexual orientation? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

The Code should have **no impact (positive or negative) on sexual orientation** as the criteria for identifying SRR / independent staff are being applied consistently.

All managers with responsibility for allocating research time, take part in **unconscious bias training and bespoke REF E&D training** to avoid direct or indirect discrimination on the basis of protected characteristics.

NO

Final EIA Evidence: Sexual Orientation Profile as at 31 July 2020

Sexual orientation	Bisexual	%	Gay	%	Hetrosexu	%	Lesbian	%	Unknown	%	Total
Cat A eligible pool	3	1%	17	3%	287	52%	5	1%	243	44%	555
SigRES (Submitted)	1	0%	10	4%	152	57%	1	0%	102	38%	266
Proportion deemed SRR from eligible poc	33%		59%		53%		20%		42%		

There is **no evidence of discrimination** in the application of criteria relating to sexual orientation.

ACTION: Present EIA findings to the University's LGBT+ network group

11. Is it likely that the proposal **could** have a positive or negative impact on people due to their age? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

The Code of Practice is unlikely to have an impact on individuals due to their age.

Whilst age could reflect a shorter period in post as an independent researcher (though not always as the definition of ECR applies to career stage not age), the Code mitigates the impact of this in the following ways:

- 1) Early career researchers (of any age) **can apply for a mitigation against the minimum of one Output, allowing them to be submitted without penalty**
- 2) The University has stated that **the volume of Outputs** attributed to an individual for the purpose of REF submission is **not a reflection of the value placed** on that individuals’ contribution to the research environment. Furthermore, the University has not set a minimum threshold contribution according to career stage. This is in recognition that staff at the start (ECR) or very end (approaching retirement) of their career might legitimately have fewer outputs to contribute, but should still be included on the basis of the SigRes criteria.

NO

Final EIA Evidence: Age and Career Stage as at 31 July 2020

Age Profile	25-35	%	35-45	%	45-55	%	55-65	%	65-75	%	75 or over	%	Total
Cat A eligible pool	47	8%	159	29%	169	30%	162	29%	17	3%	1	0%	555
SigRES (Submitted)	27	10%	99	37%	85	32%	48	18%	7	3%	0	0%	266
Proportion deemed SRR from eligible poc	57%		62%		50%		30%		41%		0%		

ECR Profile	ECR Yes	%	ECR No	%	Total
Cat A eligible pool	72	13%	483	87%	555
SigRES (Submitted)	47	18%	219	82%	266
Proportion deemed SRR from eligible poc	65%		45%		

The data shows that staff under 45 are more likely to be submitted according to the University’s REF Code of Practice criteria.

The data demonstrates that 65% of the eligible ECR community are being submitted with at least one output and are thus very well represented in the submission.

This is reflective of the University’s revised appointment and promotion framework which was launched in 2015, with a strategic focus on recruitment of new staff with an active research profile as well as continued development opportunities for ECRs.

ACTION:

School Inclusion Monitoring Groups to monitor allocation of research time and research objectives to ensure equal opportunity at all ages and stages of career.

12. Is it likely that the proposal **could** have a positive or negative impact on people due to their religious belief (or none)? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

The Code should have **no impact (positive or negative) due to religious belief** as the criteria is consistent and is being consistently applied.

The University is committed to implementing **reasonable adjustments to accommodate circumstances relating to religion** and these are considered as part of the discussions relating to annual objectives at the 'MyContribution' meetings, where appropriate.

All managers with responsibility for allocating research time take part in **unconscious bias training and bespoke REF E&D training** to avoid direct or indirect discrimination on the basis of protected characteristics.

NO

Final EIA Evidence: Religious Profile as at 31 July 2020

Religion Profile	Christian	%	No Belief	%	Other	%	Unknown	%	Total
Cat A eligible pool	115	21%	179	32%	39	7%	222	40%	555
SigRES (Submitted)	60	23%	96	36%	22	8%	88	33%	266
Proportion deemed SRR from eligible poc	52%		54%		56%		40%		

There is **no evidence of discrimination** in the application of criteria relating to religious belief.

ACTION: Present findings to University Inclusion committee

13. Is it likely that the proposal **could** have a positive or negative impact on people with dependants/caring responsibilities? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

The Code of Practice is unlikely to have an impact on individuals with caring responsibilities. The University promotes the implementation of **reasonable adjustments** to facilitate engagement with all four strands of academic activity (Research; Learning & Teaching; Enterprise and Professional Practice).

The University's 'allocating research time policy', recommends that **research time should be allocated in meaningful blocks** to allow for effective research activity to occur. This is considered as part of the discussions relating to annual objectives at the 'MyContribution' meetings, where appropriate and where the individual has disclosed their caring responsibilities. This includes application of the **flexible working policy** if appropriate.

Furthermore, for individuals working part-time (because of caring responsibilities or otherwise), the CoP takes account of this by applying a **fractional expectation of research time allocation**.

NO

Final EIA Evidence: Caring Responsibility Profile as at 31 July 2020

Insufficient data available for meaningful analysis.

POINT: Low disclosure rate

ACTION: Work with the University's Carers Network to promote disclosure and signpost support networks (recognising that caring in the workplace remains a hidden issue)

Final EIA Evidence: Maternity Profile as at 31 July 2020

Mat Leave Profile					
	Yes	%	No	%	Total
Cat A eligible pool	52	9%	503	91%	555
SigRES (Submitted)	26	10%	240	90%	266
Proportion deemed SRR from eligible pool	50%		48%		

There is **no evidence of discrimination** in the application of criteria relating to maternity leave.

ACTION: Present findings to University's Inclusion committee.

<p>14. Is it likely that the proposal could have a positive or negative impact on people due to them being transgender or transsexual? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>The Code should have no impact (positive or negative) on transgender / transsexual groups as the criteria for identifying SRR / independent staff are being applied consistently.</p> <p>All managers with responsibility for allocating research time take part in unconscious bias training and bespoke REF E&D training to avoid direct or indirect discrimination on the basis of protected characteristics.</p> <p>The University promotes the implementation of reasonable adjustments to facilitate engagement with all four strands of academic activity (Research; Learning & Teaching; Enterprise and Professional Practice).</p>	NO	<p>Final EIA Evidence: Transgender Profile as at 31 July 2020</p> <p>Insufficient data available for meaningful analysis.</p> <p>ACTION: Continue to promote inclusivity across the University and work with colleagues in the inclusion committee to raise awareness.</p>																																							
<p>15. Is it likely that the proposal could have a positive or negative impact on people due to their marital or civil partnership status? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>The Code should have no impact (positive or negative) on Marital status as the criteria for identifying SRR / independent staff are being applied consistently.</p> <p>All managers with responsibility for allocating research time take part in unconscious bias training and bespoke REF E&D training to avoid direct or indirect discrimination on the basis of protected characteristics.</p>		<p>Final EIA Evidence: Marital Profile as at 31 July 2020</p> <table><tr><td>Marital Profile</td><td>Married</td><td>%</td><td>Other</td><td>%</td><td>Single</td><td>%</td><td>Unknown</td><td>%</td><td>Total</td></tr><tr><td>Cat A eligible pool</td><td>319</td><td>57%</td><td>91</td><td>16%</td><td>112</td><td>20%</td><td>33</td><td>6%</td><td>555</td></tr><tr><td>SigRES (Submitted)</td><td>142</td><td>53%</td><td>47</td><td>18%</td><td>62</td><td>23%</td><td>15</td><td>6%</td><td>266</td></tr><tr><td>Proportion deemed SRR from eligible poc</td><td>45%</td><td></td><td>52%</td><td></td><td>55%</td><td></td><td>45%</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> <p>There is no evidence of discrimination in the application of the Code of Practice criteria in relation to marital status.</p> <p>ACTION: Present findings to University Inclusion committee.</p>	Marital Profile	Married	%	Other	%	Single	%	Unknown	%	Total	Cat A eligible pool	319	57%	91	16%	112	20%	33	6%	555	SigRES (Submitted)	142	53%	47	18%	62	23%	15	6%	266	Proportion deemed SRR from eligible poc	45%		52%		55%		45%	
Marital Profile	Married	%	Other	%	Single	%	Unknown	%	Total																																
Cat A eligible pool	319	57%	91	16%	112	20%	33	6%	555																																
SigRES (Submitted)	142	53%	47	18%	62	23%	15	6%	266																																
Proportion deemed SRR from eligible poc	45%		52%		55%		45%																																		

16. Output Selection Processes:

*Is it likely that the proposal **could** have a positive or negative impact on people with protected characteristics? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?*

*There should be no impact on people with protected characteristics in the context of output selection. The Code outlines the criteria and processes for **selection of Outputs** (based on the REF guidance relating to minimum and maximum requirements), **based on highest quality/ merit only** and it **provides a commitment to staff** that attributing more or less papers to an individual for the REF2021 submission, will not be seen as a reflection of the value placed on that individual's contribution to the research environment at Edinburgh Napier University.*

The process for output scoring is robust and involves input from independent external assessors, with no affiliation to Edinburgh Napier University or any of the authors.

*All staff involved with final scoring / moderation have attended **unconscious bias training and bespoke REF E&D training** to avoid direct or indirect discrimination on the basis of protected characteristics.*

Final EIA Evidence: Output selection as at 31 July 2020

The University utilised an automated system algorithm for the final selection of Outputs based only on quality. In Units where there was a surplus of equally scoring outputs beyond the quota required, the algorithm was not sufficiently intelligent enough to allocate the outputs in a fair and transparent manner. As such, a manual process for selection was implemented in these instances, in order to fairly distribute the outputs across the affiliated staff members, and ensure an equal spread.

Throughout the process of REF preparation the University has maintained its commitment that the volume of outputs submitted by an individual is no reflection of contribution and the volume of outputs submitted per individual has not been used as a measure of performance.

17. Disclosure of circumstances for reductions:

*Is it likely that the proposal **could** have a positive or negative impact on people with protected characteristics? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?*

The process for declaring circumstances for reduction in outputs is intended to have a **positive impact** for staff with protected characteristics, allowing for staff to be submitted without the minimum of one, or by reducing the quota of outputs for the unit.

It is the individual's decision as to whether these circumstances are declared or not. As an institution, individual circumstances will not be submitted unless staff have consented to declare voluntarily and any case for reductions will only be based on such voluntary declarations.

Final EIA Evidence: Reductions as at 31 July 2020

The University received just five declarations of requests for reductions on the basis of circumstances via the voluntary process. None of the requests have been utilised for a request for output reductions, as they did not represent a disproportionate effect on the overall production of the unit.

With consent from the individuals concerned, the respective UoA leader and Head of Research were notified of the voluntary declaration, in order to ensure that sufficient support was provided to the individuals concerned.

The very low volume of declarations could reflect an issue in reluctance from staff to self-declare. Alternatively, it could signal effectiveness in the process, clearly reflecting the commitment that no undue pressure be put on staff and that declarations should be made only on a voluntary basis.

ACTION: School Inclusion Monitoring Groups and line managers should continue to promote and support self-declaration of circumstances which may have an effect on a staff members' productivity or workload, to ensure that appropriate support / reasonable adjustment is provided to staff.

18. Appeals:

*Is it likely that the proposal **could** have a positive or negative impact on people with protected characteristics? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?*

The process for appeals is intended to have a **positive impact** for staff with protected characteristics, allowing for staff to raise concern relating to the implementation of the Code of Practice.

Final EIA Evidence: Reductions as at 31 July 2020

The University received no formal requests for appeal and the appeals panel did not convene during the REF2021 cycle.

16. How will you monitor the actual impact that your proposal has had following its implementation? When will you do this?

This final EIA is being used to assess the impact of the implemented REF2021 Code of Practice. A summary of the outcome is provided below.

<p>17. Summary. Summarise the outcome of this Equality Assessment, and state any actions you will be taking as a result.</p>	<p>The final analysis suggest there is no evidence of discrimination in the criteria or the application of the criteria, on the basis of one or more of the Protected Characteristics. Further, there are processes and policies in place to avoid discrimination and promote reasonable adjustments to be made, in order to include staff from protected groups.</p> <p><u>POST-SUBMISSION ACTIONS:</u></p> <p>Action: School Inclusion Monitoring Groups should continue to operate in each School to analyse the workload allocation from an E&D perspective, highlighting any concerns to the REF Steering Group.</p> <p>Action: REF Team and University Inclusion committee to develop improved School-level inclusion data reports to assist with workload monitoring. This should seek to combine multiple characteristic analysis (e.g ECR and gender).</p> <p>Action: A REF2021 post-submission evaluation project is being conducted to assess the effectiveness of REF processes and this will include an evaluation of the effectiveness of the CoP and whether it is fit for purpose for future REF cycles.</p>
---	--