

Equality Impact Assessment  
T- Stream Allocation Process  
2013

**Please complete and return by email to Mohammed Hameed, Diversity Partner**  
[m.hameed@napier.ac.uk](mailto:m.hameed@napier.ac.uk)

Faculty/Service Area <b>Faculty of Health, Life and Social Sciences</b>	Date of Assessment <b>21st March 2013</b>	Name of the proposal to be assessed <b>“T stream” allocation process</b>	Person responsible for the assessment <b>Prof. Mark G. Darlison</b>
Who was present at the EIA? <b>Jennifer Murray, Thanos Karatzias, Peter Barlow, Gerri Matthews-Smith, Mark Darlison &amp; Mohammed Hameed</b>	Is this a <b>new</b> or <b>existing</b> proposal?  <b>New</b>		When will this proposal be reviewed?  <b>March 2014</b>
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the proposal		The “T stream” allocation process will be used by the Faculty of Health, Life and Social Sciences to distribute protected time for research, based on an individual’s previous and proposed outputs (refereed publications and grant applications). This process, which we believe to be equitable, is necessary because a culture change is underway in how research is supported within the Faculty, and this aligns to the Faculty’s newly-adopted research strategy. This equality impact assessment is intended to ensure that early career researchers, those who have been ill and/or on maternity leave, etc., are not discriminated against by this process.	
2. Who is intended to benefit from the proposal and in what way?		All academic staff (experienced staff, early career researchers, etc.), who are eligible for a “T stream” allocation, and who wish to apply, should benefit from this proposal, as it should ensure a fair and transparent mechanism for providing protected time for research. This is because any “T stream” that is awarded will be allocated well before the start of the academic year, allowing Subject Group Leaders much more time to allocate teaching, and accommodate research time.	
3. What outcomes are wanted from this proposal?		Equality, transparency and inclusivity are wanted, and expected, from the completion of this process, which should result in high-quality outputs, in peer-reviewed journals, and an increase in funding applications. Both of these latter outcomes are necessary to ensure sustainability of research beyond Research Excellence Framework 2014.	

4. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes?	<b>Not following, or not understanding, the requirements for applying for a “T stream” allocation could impact on an individual’s allocation. However, detailed instructions have been provided to all academic staff. Sick leave, for instance, might also impact on an individual who is applying for an allocation. Thus, late applications, and appeals on decisions taken, will be considered.</b>		
5. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on minority ethnic groups? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	¥	N	Please explain: <b>The Faculty has a diverse workforce. However, the panel chosen to decide on bids for “T stream” is more diverse in terms of gender (three females and five males) than last year. Panel members were selected following an open “Expression of Interest” to all academic staff. The panel also comprises not only academics who will be applying for a “T stream” allocation but also non-research active staff such as Subject Group Leaders. There is also a wide spread of research interests represented by the panel.</b>
6. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact due to gender (including pregnancy and maternity)? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Y	N	Please explain: <b>The proposed process could have an impact on individuals who have been on maternity leave and/or have been away from work due to illness. This is because the rating of outputs (publications and grant applications) from last year’s allocation will be taken into consideration when allocating “T stream” this year. However, such mitigating circumstances will be taken into consideration by the panel.</b>
7. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact due to disability? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	¥	N	Please explain: <b>As alluded to above, staff who have been on extended sick leave could be at a disadvantage, perhaps because they have not achieved the proposed outputs from last year. However, such mitigating circumstances will be taken into consideration by the panel. Late applications for “T stream”, due to illness and/or disability, and late applications from new members of staff will also be considered.</b>
8. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to sexual orientation? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	¥	N	Please explain: <b>We have no evidence that this might be the case.</b>

9. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people due to their age? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Y	N	Please explain: <b>The process could, perhaps, have a negative impact on individuals on a part-time contract, early career researchers, and even non-research active staff. However, in the case of part-time staff, “T stream” will be allocated on a <i>pro rata</i> basis. Early career researchers will be fully considered by having representation of this group on the allocation panel. And, there is no bar to staff who have not previously been research-active from applying.</b>
10. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> 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?	≠	N	Please explain: <b>We have no evidence that this might be the case.</b>
11. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> have a positive or negative impact on people with dependants/caring responsibilities? What evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?	Y	N	Please explain: <b>It is possible that those with dependants and/or caring responsibilities could be disadvantaged because of “fitting in” their research time into heavy workloads. However, the whole point about the early allocation of “T stream” this year is to allow staff to have time for one-to-one meetings with their respective Subject Group Leader (well before the start of the next academic year), to ensure that their “T stream” can be accommodated in their workload, and fit within their working pattern.</b>
12. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> 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?	≠	N	<b>We have no evidence that this might be the case.</b>
13. Is it likely that the proposal <b>could</b> 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?	≠	N	<b>We have no evidence that this might be the case.</b>

<p>14. Describe how this proposal will help the University to meet its Public Sector Equality Duty obligations.</p>		<p><b>The proposed method of allocating “T stream” will help the University to meet its Public Sector Equality Duty obligations by providing an open, transparent and inclusive process for allocating protected research time to academics. The early allocation (April, as opposed to July/August, as has been the case in previous years) will also permit this time to be embedded in workloads well before the start of the new academic year.</b></p> <p><b>It should also be noted that, because of the proposed early allocation of “T stream”, staff will only have had 9 months in which to generate the proposed outputs from last year (rather than the normal 12 months). This will also be taken into consideration when allocating “T stream” this year.</b></p>
---	--	---