Equality analysis for the process of selecting outputs for submission

BU REF 2021 Code of Practice

Equality Analysis template

Screening	Please provide explanatory comments
1. What activity is being analysed?	BU REF 2021 Output Selection Process
2. Who is likely to be affected by the activity?	REF category A submitted staff (including former staff)
3. Who led the analysis?	Pengpeng Hatch, Research Outputs Adviser
4. Who contributed to the analysis?	Julie Northam, Head of RDS
5. What information has been used to inform the analysis?	Data from the final submission as at 31st March 2021 – submitted outputs with their attributed staff.
Analysis	**Please provide explanatory comments**
6. How does the activity promote good relations/ equality/inclusion in relation to:	
6.1 Age 6.2 Disability 6.3 Gender Reassignment 6.4 Marriage and civil partnership[1] 6.5 Pregnancy and maternity (including paternity) 6.6 Race (colour, ethnic or national background) 6.7 Religion or belief (including non-belief) 6.8 Sex (Female/Male) 6.9 Sexual orientation	All academic staff meeting the REF definition of 'Category A eligible' can be identified for submission to REF 2021, regardless of these protected characteristics. All Category A submitted staff were invited to nominate between 1 and 5 outputs for review. No expectation was made in regards to an individual's contribution to the output pool other than eligible staff having a minimum of 1 output. Where staff did not nominate outputs themselves, eligible outputs were nominated on their behalf. Outputs from former members of staff, including those who have since retired from academia, were included in the review pool for potential submission. No information regarding these protected characteristic was used in review of outputs or their selection for submission. The quality of the research was the primary characteristic for output submission. The quality score was determined by a robust process of peer review by the Internal Review Panels. The panels

---

[1] Marriage and civil partnership are protected under the legislation but only for the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination in employment.

were formed through an open and transparent recruitment process. No criteria relating to the protected characteristics was used when appointing members. Positive action statements were included during the internal recruitment of panel members to encourage applications from underrepresented groups.

Age
When forming the UOA Internal Review Panels, consideration was given to the academic career level of applicants (Professoriate/Mid-Career/Early Career) to ensure, where possible, that panels had representation from each level.

Staff circumstances pertaining to ECR status can be voluntarily and confidentially put forward for consideration to the REF Circumstances Board.

Disability
Upon request, nomination and review of outputs could be made in other formats.

Staff circumstances pertaining to disability, ill health, injury or mental health conditions could be voluntarily and confidentially put forward for consideration to the REF Circumstances Board.

Pregnancy and maternity (including paternity)
Staff circumstances pertaining to maternity or paternity leave could be voluntarily and confidentially put forward for consideration to the REF Circumstances Board.

Race (colour, ethnic or national background)
Staff were able to nominate outputs in languages other than English for review. Reasonable efforts were made to ensure there was appropriate assessment of these outputs including (where required) external specialist advisers to whom the work could have been referred.

Sex (Female/Male)
To promote good relations/equality/inclusion in relation to sex, UOA Leadership Teams were encouraged to have gender-balanced review panels and to consider gender balance when allocating reviewers to outputs.

	Staff who did not have any eligible research outputs or who had low scoring outputs were offered high quality support through our Writing Academy; 75% of attendees to date are female.
7. Does the activity have an actual or potential adverse impact in relation to?	
7.1 Age	**The BU data indicates there was little perceived impact on the selection of outputs in terms of age.** The submission data shows that staff identified as eligible for submission in the 20-29, 30-39 and 50-59 age categories had slightly fewer outputs selected for submission. Those in the 40-49 and 60 Plus age categories had a greater number of outputs selected, particularly those in the 40-49 age category. However, the variance is small in all instances.

Within the 7.1 Age cell:

Age Category	Variance
20-29	-0.08%
30-39	-1.96%
40-49	2.15%
50-59	-0.90%
60 Plus	0.79%

The output vs staff ratio indicates that for every staff member in the 40-49 age category, an average of 2.14 outputs was submitted, as opposed to only 1.67 in the 20-29 age category.

Age Category	Average*
20-29	1.67
30-39	1.83
40-49	2.14
50-59	1.94
60 Plus	2.12

*This is calculated based on the number of outputs divided by the number of staff in each category

There is a potential adverse impact on Early Career Researchers who are more likely to have less experience, fewer outputs, etcetera; Early Career Researchers are more likely to be younger in age than more established researchers (although this isn't always the case).

	In some UOAs, citation data may be used to inform peer-review. Citation data is likely to favour more established researchers (and therefore potentially older researchers) as they would have had more time to produce outputs and more time to build a track record of citations. In addition, a period of absence away from academia within the REF publication period may adversely affect an individual's ability to produce outputs which can be considered for submission. This potentially has an age component, for example, recent parents. These all have the potential for the age of the author to impact on the number of outputs selected for submission, with the possibility for fewer outputs to be attributed to individuals who are younger in age.
7.2 Disability	**The BU data indicates there was little perceived impact on the selection of outputs in terms of disability.** The submission data shows that staff in the 'Category A submitted' group were slightly less likely to have outputs selected for submission if they have a disclosed disability compared with those who did not have a disclosed disability. However, the variance is small in all instances. Staff with a disclosed disability comprised 5.8% of all submitted staff and their outputs comprised 4.47% of all outputs, i.e. there was a variance of -1.34%. <table><tr><td></td><td>Variance*</td></tr><tr><td>No declared disability</td><td>1.01%</td></tr><tr><td>Prefer not to say</td><td>0.33%</td></tr><tr><td>Declared disability</td><td>-1.34%</td></tr></table> *This was calculated by comparing the proportion of the total staff submitted in each group with the proportion of total outputs attributed to each group.
7.3 Gender Reassignment	There was no perceived impact on the selection of available outputs. This data was unavailable so it was not possible at this stage to see whether there

	were any patterns in terms of submission based on this protected characteristic. However, a period of absence away from academia within the REF publication period may have adversely affected an individual's ability to produce outputs which could be considered for submission.
7.4 Marriage and civil partnership[2]	There was no perceived impact on the selection of available outputs. This data is unavailable so it is not possible at this stage to see whether there are any patterns in terms of submission based on this protected characteristic.
7.5 Pregnancy and maternity (including paternity)	There was no perceived impact on the selection of available outputs. This data was unavailable so it was not possible at this stage to see whether there were any patterns in terms of submission based on this protected characteristic. However, a period of absence away from academia within the REF publication period may have adversely affected an individual's ability to produce outputs which could be considered for submission.
7.6 Race (colour, ethnic or national background)	**There was a potential adverse impact on staff publishing in languages other than English.** Within some UOAs, citation data may have been used to inform peer-review. The predominance of English-language publications in most academic fields meant that those publishing in non-English outlets might be disadvantaged in terms of citations. The BU data indicated there was little impact on the selection of available outputs in terms of race. On the whole, having a disclosed BAME background made no difference in terms of the proportion of outputs attributed to staff or in terms of the perceived quality of the outputs. All variances between staff submitted and outputs selected were small. Staff with a disclosed Chinese background were slightly more likely (1.81%) to have outputs selected for submission. Staff with a disclosed background of Other Asian or Asian British – Indian were slightly less likely (0.73% & 0.75%) to have outputs selected for submission.

---

[2] Please see footnote 1.

	Variance*
Arab	-0.33%
Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi	-0.08%
Asian or Asian British - Indian	-0.75%
Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	0.33%
Black or Black British - African	-0.59%
Black or Black British - Caribbean	0.00%
Chinese	1.81%
Information refused	0.41%
Mixed - White and Asian	-0.33%
Mixed - White and Black African	-0.08%
Mixed - White and Black Caribbean	-0.08%
Not known	0.33%
Other Asian background	-0.73%
Other Black background	-0.67%
Other ethnic background	0.33%
Other mixed background	-0.17%
Other White background	-0.33%
PREFER NOT TO SAY	-0.08%
White	0.31%

*This was calculated by comparing the proportion of the total staff submitted in each group with the proportion of total outputs attributed to each group.

7.7 Religion or belief (including non-belief)	No perceived impact, however, this data was unavailable so it was not possible at this stage to see whether there wee any patterns in terms of submission based on this protected characteristic.
7.8 Sex (Female/Male)	**There was a potential adverse impact on female members of staff.** The BU submission data indicated that women represented 46% of the REF submission and yet only 40% of the submitted outputs were attributed to female authors. Overall, women had fewer outputs selected for submission than men. This was the case is all but two units (UOA 15 & 32) where they had 0.25% and 1.58% more outputs selected respectively. In the other UOAs, there were three UOAs (20, 24 and 27) where women were only slightly less likely to have outputs selected for submission than men (all variances were less than 2%). However, the variance rose to over 9% in three UOAs - 4, 12 and 17 – and to over 13% in UOA 12. The table below shows the ratios for the average number of outputs attributed to men and women in

each of the UOAs. UOA 12 had the highest difference with nearly three times as many outputs attributed per man compared to per woman. There were two units where there is close balance between males and females with the difference between the female and male ratio being 0.02, and UOA 15 favouring females.

UOA	Ratio average outputs attributed to each man : woman
3	1.39 : 1
4	1.48 : 1
11	1.42 : 1
12	2.92 : 1
14	1.25 : 1
15	0.99 : 1
17	1.64 : 1
18	1.19 : 1
20	1.08 : 1
24	1.01 : 1
27	1.02 : 1
32	0.90 : 1
34	1.10 : 1
Overall	**1.27 : 1**

The data was disaggregated by job category rather than UOA (see the table below). This indicated that men were more likely to have outputs attributed to them than women in all job categories other than Deputy Head of Department, Researchers and Research Fellows, and Senior Specialists. The greatest variance was in the Head of Department category where nearly three times as many outputs were attributed per man compared to per woman.

Job Position	Ratio average outputs attributed to each man : woman	Variance*
Head of Department	2.62 : 1	-22.34%
Deputy Head of Department	0.86 : 1	3.7%
Deputy Deans	1.17 : 1	-3.75%

Associate Deans	n/a	0%
Professors	1.06 : 1	-1.14%
Associate Professors	1.22 : 1	-4.66%
Senior Principal Academic	n/a	0%
Principal Academics	1.14 : 1	-3.03%
Senior Lecturers	1.23 : 1	-5.17%
Lecturers	1.15 : 1	-3.55%
Researchers	0.97 : 1	0.77%
Research assistants	n/a	0%
Research Fellows	0.88 : 1	3.03%
Readers	n/a	0%
Senior Specialist	0.25 : 1	30%
Career breaks	n/a	0%
Mat/ Adop leave	n/a	0%
Former staff (not specified)	1.16 : 1	-3.43%
OVERALL	1.27 : 1	-5.9%

*This was calculated by comparing the proportion of the total staff submitted in each group with the proportion of total outputs attributed to each group.

In general, men publish more papers on average than women so are likely to be nominating a higher volume of outputs for review.

Within some units (3, 4, 11) citation data may be used to inform peer-review. It is widely evidenced that women are less likely to be cited, less likely to publish internationally and less likely to self-cite which may affect scores which have been informed by citation data.

8. Other

We also looked at the selection of outputs for staff on permanent/fixed term contracts and those on Full or Part-Time Contracts.

There was no significant adverse impact on staff on fixed term/permanent to have outputs selected with permanent staff being 1.34% more likely to have outputs submitted.

There was slightly more impact on staff on full/part-time contracts to have outputs selected with full-time staff being 2.52% more likely to have outputs submitted.

9. Comment on the good practice identified

Equality, diversity and inclusivity have been key drivers in the development of the process for selecting outputs for submission and for all stages of the development of our code of practice.

Specific areas of good practice in regards to the process of selecting outputs are:

- Support with publication
  - The Writing Academy provides high quality publications support and development for staff
- Nomination
  - Open nomination of outputs
  - No set expectation of staff contributions – staff can nominate between 1 and 5 outputs
  - A mechanism for nomination incorporated in instances where individuals do not nominate outputs themselves
- Review
  - Open and transparent recruitment processes for members of UOA Internal Review Panels
  - Consideration of the diversity and representativeness of key groups including UOA Internal Review Panels
  - Encouraging the consideration of diversity when allocating reviewers to outputs
  - Mandatory REF-focussed equality and diversity development for all those involved in reviewing and advising on outputs
- Selection
  - Open and transparent process for the submission and allocation of outputs
  - Mandatory REF-focussed equality and diversity development for all those involved in making decisions in terms of selecting outputs

10. Comment on the actions to mitigate actual or potential adverse impact

This equality analysis identifies three actions:
1. Further information is required about why in some UOAs there are fewer high scoring outputs linked to females than males to ascertain possible reasons for this and to see whether there is any bias in the process that could be mitigated.
2. A reminder of the limitations of citation data should be provided to all reviewers in UOAs which are using citation data to inform peer-review to mitigate against any potential adverse impacts on staff in relation to protected characteristics. This will be taken forward by the Research Output Adviser.

10. Decision/Feedback/Approval

10.1 What is the analysis outcome? (See Table 1 to assist here)	Please circle	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4

10.2 Have you consulted with ESG?	The draft BU REF 2021 Code of Practice was shared with ESG and approved by email.
10.3 When will the analysis be reported to ESG?	Summer 2021
10.4 Which Committee will approve the analysis?	REF Steering Group
10.5 Date of approval	July 2021
10.6 When and how will the analysis be reviewed?	N/A