



Bournemouth University
Equality Impact Assessment

Introduction

Inclusivity is extremely important to Bournemouth University (BU). When developing our strategic plan, BU2025, we positioned inclusivity at the heart, elevating it to one of our four institutional values. There are Board-approved key performance indicators (KPIs) for equality in terms of gender and ethnicity, sending a clear message to staff and students of our commitment to equality and diversity. We therefore welcomed the recommendation from the Research Excellence Framework Review for the REF to be more inclusive and the efforts made by the REF Team to develop a framework for REF2021 that strives for greater equality in staff inclusion rates.

BU's Equality & Diversity Committee (EDC) has responsibility for developing and embedding our strategic commitments to ensuring greater equality and inclusivity. The EDC reports to the University Leadership Team (ULT). Our REF Steering Group has responsibility for considering equality and diversity aspects of our REF submission, including the equality impact assessment (EIA) process. Membership of the REF Steering Group includes the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, chair of the EDC and chairs of the Athena Swan Steering Group and Self-Assessment Team (SAT). This ensured our REF preparations aligned to inclusivity as articulated in our BU2025 strategy, our broader institutional policies for equality and diversity, our action plan for Athena Swan, and our work towards the Race Equality Charter.

The EIA process was used throughout our preparations for the REF2021 to ensure that policies, processes and decisions were fair and did not discriminate inadvertently against any protected group of 'Category A eligible' staff. EIAs were discussed and approved by the REF Steering Group. The key findings and data were shared with the University Leadership Team and the University Research & Professional Practice Committee.

Background

Inclusivity and equality were key drivers at all stages of our REF preparations. Equality analysis was used to inform the modelling of processes and the testing of the models to identify preferred options for our REF2021 Code of Practice. Some of the possible options for identifying staff with significant responsibility for research, for example, were identified as potentially posing a barrier to 'Category A eligible' staff from a particular protected characteristic group and this resulted in these options being excluded from further consideration. All EIA data on the Code of Practice modelling was made openly available to staff as part of the feedback exercises.

BU's equality and diversity work for the REF was included in the University's dignity, diversity and equality action plan and Athena Swan action plan and was considered as part of the work towards the Race Equality Charter. All staff involved in advising and making decisions (in terms of identifying staff with significant responsibility for research, determining research independence, and selecting outputs) received mandatory REF-focussed equality and diversity training and development. The diversity of the membership of internal REF groups (such as the REF Steering Group, REF Committee, Staff Circumstances Board and REF Appeals Panel) was taken into consideration to ensure diverse and inclusive memberships. Diversity was also taken into consideration during the review process, for example, ensuring gender representative review teams for outputs and impact case studies. An EIA was conducted after each review exercise and scrutinised by

the REF Steering Group. Where the data indicated that staff with a protected characteristic were less likely to be included in the submission then this was investigated thoroughly, and appropriate actions to seek to mitigate the potential adverse impact were identified and progressed. This approach enabled us to ensure any equality gaps were reduced wherever possible prior to the final submission.

Scope

This EIA covers the application of the policies and processes set out in our REF2021 Code of Practice to determine 'Category A eligible' staff for inclusion in our submission to REF2021, i.e. which 'teaching & research' staff met our definition of having significant responsibility for research and which 'research only' staff met our definition of being independent researchers.

The protected characteristics considered included: gender/sex, race/ethnicity, disability and age¹. In addition, we included two further variables – contractual status¹ (established or fixed-term) and contractual working hours (full-time or part-time) – which we felt were important as research indicates these can be barriers to staff engaging actively in research. All our EIAs included all 'Category A eligible' staff and were based on data available at the time.

An EIA was undertaken on our draft Code of Practice in May 2019 and this was updated in September 2019. These EIAs were based on our modelling of whether the policies and processes outlined in our draft Code of Practice for identifying staff with significant responsibility for research and determining research independence would pose a barrier to 'Category A eligible' staff from a particular group. In addition, interim EIAs were undertaken in July 2020 (after our mock review exercise) and in September 2020 (after the staff census date). The final EIA was undertaken in after we submitted to the REF2021 exercise.

Analyses

The following tables summarises the findings of the interim EIAs and the final EIA.

Protected characteristic: Sex

Table 1a: Final EIA, May 2021 – 'Category A eligible' and submitted staff, based on gender/sex.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Gender/sex			
			Headcount men	Headcount women	% men submitted	% women submitted
Teaching & Research	Eligible	719	373	346	100%	100%
	Submitted	549	295	254	79.09%	73.41%
Research-only	Eligible	2	1	1	100%	100%
	Submitted	2	1	1	100%	100%
Both categories	Eligible	721	374	347	100%	100%
	Submitted	551	296	255	79.14%	73.49%

Table 1b: Interim EIA, September 2020 – 'Category A eligible' and potentially submitted staff, based on gender/sex.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Gender/sex			
			Headcount men	Headcount women	% men submitted	% women submitted
	Eligible	737	382	355	100%	100%

¹ Age and contractual status were added as variables following our EIA in May 2019.

Teaching & Research	Submitted	560	298	262	78.01%	73.80%
Research-only	Eligible	3	1	2	100%	100%
	Submitted	3	1	2	100.00%	100.00%
Both categories	Eligible	740	383	357	100%	100%
	Submitted	563	299	264	78.07%	73.95%

Table 1c: Interim EIA, July 2020 – ‘Category A eligible’ and potentially submitted staff, based on gender/sex.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Gender/sex			
			Headcount men	Headcount women	% men submitted	% women submitted
Teaching & Research	Eligible	718	369	349	100%	100%
	Submitted	542	291	251	78.86%	71.92%
Research-only	Eligible	22	10	12	100%	100%
	Submitted	4	2	2	20.00%	16.67%
Both categories	Eligible	740	379	361	100%	100%
	Submitted	546	293	253	77.31%	70.08%

Protected characteristic: Disability

Table 2a: Final EIA, May 2021 – ‘Category A eligible’ and submitted staff, based on disability.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Disability			
			Headcount disclosed disability	Headcount no disclosed disability	% submitted with disclosed disability	% submitted with no disclosed disability
Teaching & Research	Eligible	719	47	672	100%	100%
	Submitted	549	33	516	70.21%	76.79%
Research-only	Eligible	2	0	2	-	100%
	Submitted	2	0	2	-	100%
Both categories	Eligible	721	47	674	100%	100%
	Submitted	551	33	518	70.21%	76.85%

Table 2b: Interim EIA, July 2020 – ‘Category A eligible’ and potentially submitted staff, based on disability.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Disability			
			Headcount disclosed disability	Headcount no disclosed disability	% submitted with disclosed disability	% submitted with no disclosed disability
Teaching & Research	Eligible	718	47	671	100%	100%
	Submitted	542	31	511	65.96%	76.15%
Research-only	Eligible	22	1	21	100%	100%
	Submitted	4	0	4	-	19.05%
Both categories	Eligible	740	48	692	100%	100%
	Submitted	546	31	515	64.58%	74.42%

Table 2b: Interim EIA, September 2020 – ‘Category A eligible’ and potentially submitted staff, based on disability.

	Option		Disability			
--	--------	--	------------	--	--	--

Academic employment function		Category A headcount	Headcount disclosed disability	Headcount no disclosed disability	% submitted with disclosed disability	% submitted with no disclosed disability
Teaching & Research	Eligible	737	49	688	100%	100%
	Submitted	560	35	525	71.43%	76.31%
Research-only	Eligible	3	0	3	-	100%
	Submitted	3	0	3	-	100%
Both categories	Eligible	740	49	691	100%	100%
	Submitted	563	35	528	71.43%	76.41%

Protected characteristic: Ethnicity

Table 3a: Final EIA, May 2021 – ‘Category A eligible’ and submitted staff, based on race/ethnicity.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Race/ethnicity							
			Headcount White	Headcount Information refused / unknown	Headcount BAME	Headcount mixed race	% submitted White	% submitted Information refused / unknown	% submitted BAME	% submitted mixed race
Teaching & Research	Eligible	719	579	28	95	17	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	549	429	22	85	13	74.09%	79%	89.47%	76.47%
Research-only	Eligible	2	2	0	0	0	100%	-	-	-
	Submitted	2	2	0	0	0	100%	-	-	-
Both categories	Eligible	721	581	28	95	17	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	551	431	22	85	13	74.18%	79%	89.47%	76.47%

Table 3b: Interim EIA, September 2020 – ‘Category A eligible’ and submitted staff, based on race/ethnicity.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Race/ethnicity							
			Headcount White	Headcount Information refused / unknown	Headcount BAME	Headcount mixed race	% submitted White	% submitted Information refused / unknown	% submitted BAME	% submitted mixed race
Teaching & Research	Eligible	737	594	28	98	17	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	560	440	21	86	13	74.07%	75%	87.76%	76.47%
Research-only	Eligible	3	3	0	0	0	100%	-	-	-
	Submitted	3	3	0	0	0	100%	-	-	-
Both categories	Eligible	740	597	28	98	17	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	563	443	21	86	13	74.20%	75%	87.76%	76.47%

Table 3c: Interim EIA, July 2020 – ‘Category A eligible’ and submitted staff, based on race/ethnicity.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Race/ethnicity					
			Headcount White	Headcount Information refused / unknown	Headcount BAME	% submitted White	% submitted Information refused / unknown	% submitted BAME

Teaching & Research	Eligible	718	577	23	118	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	542	421	19	102	72.96%	82.61%	86.44%
Research-only	Eligible	22	22	0	0	100%	-	-
	Submitted	4	4	0	0	18.18%	-	-
Both categories	Eligible	740	599	23	118	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	546	425	19	102	70.95%	83%	86.44%

Additional variable: Contracted hours

Table 4a: Final EIA, May 2021 – ‘Category A eligible’ and submitted staff, based on contractual hours.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Contracted hours			
			Headcount full-time	Headcount part-time	% submitted full-time	% submitted part-time
Teaching & Research	Eligible	719	583	136	100%	100%
	Submitted	549	464	85	79.59%	62.5%
Research-only	Eligible	2	2	-	100%	-
	Submitted	2	2	-	100%	-
Both categories	Eligible	721	585	136	100%	100%
	Submitted	551	466	85	79.66%	62.5%

Table 4b: Interim EIA, September 2020 – ‘Category A eligible’ and submitted staff, based on contractual hours.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Contracted hours			
			Headcount full-time	Headcount part-time	% submitted full-time	% submitted part-time
Teaching & Research	Eligible	737	49	688	100%	100%
	Submitted	560	35	525	71.43%	76.31%
Research-only	Eligible	3	0	3	-	100%
	Submitted	3	0	3	-	100%
Both categories	Eligible	740	49	691	100%	100%
	Submitted	563	35	528	71.43%	76.41%

Table 4c: Interim EIA, July 2020 – ‘Category A eligible’ and submitted staff, based on contractual hours.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Contracted hours			
			Headcount full-time	Headcount part-time	% submitted full-time	% submitted part-time
Teaching & Research	Eligible	718	571	147	100%	100%
	Submitted	542	450	92	78.81%	62.59%
Research-only	Eligible	22	15	7	100%	100%
	Submitted	4	4	0	26.67%	-
Both categories	Eligible	740	586	154	100%	100%
	Submitted	546	454	92	77.47%	59.74%

Protected characteristic: Age

Table 5a: Final EIA, May 2021 – ‘Category A eligible’ and submitted staff, based on age.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Age									
			Headcount					% submitted				
			20-29 years	30-39 years	40-49 years	50-59 years	60+ years	20-29 years	30-39 years	40-49 years	50-59 years	60+ years
Teaching & Research	Eligible	719	9	145	227	227	111	77.78%	82.76%	78.85%	73.13%	69.37%
	Submitted	549	7	120	179	166	77	75.00%	82.67%	78.85%	73.13%	69.37%
Research-only	Eligible	2	0	1	0	1	0	-	100%	-	100%	-
	Submitted	2	0	1	0	1	0	-	100.00%	-	100.00%	-
Both categories	Eligible	721	9	146	227	228	111	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	551	7	121	179	167	77	77.78%	82.88%	78.85%	73.25%	69.37%

Table 5a: Interim EIA, September 2020 – ‘Category A eligible’ and submitted staff, based on age.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Age									
			Headcount					% submitted				
			20-29 years	30-39 years	40-49 years	50-59 years	60+ years	20-29 years	30-39 years	40-49 years	50-59 years	60+ years
Teaching & Research	Eligible	3	1	1	0	1	0	100%	100%	-	100%	-
	Submitted	3	1	1	0	1	0	100.00%	100.00%	-	100.00%	-
Research-only	Eligible	737	11	158	225	229	114	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	560	7	128	178	168	79	63.64%	81.01%	79.11%	73.36%	69.30%
Both categories	Eligible	740	12	159	225	230	114	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	563	8	129	178	169	79	66.67%	81.13%	79.11%	73.48%	69.30%

Table 5c: Interim EIA, July 2020 – ‘Category A eligible’ and submitted staff, based on age.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Age									
			Headcount					% submitted				
			20-29 years	30-39 years	40-49 years	50-59 years	60+ years	20-29 years	30-39 years	40-49 years	50-59 years	60+ years
Teaching & Research	Eligible	718	9	142	217	228	122	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	542	5	117	171	166	83	55.56%	82.39%	78.80%	72.81%	68.03%
Research-only	Eligible	22	12	6	3	1	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	-
	Submitted	4	0	2	1	1	0	-	33.33%	33.33%	100.00%	-
Both categories	Eligible	740	21	148	220	229	122	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	546	5	119	172	167	83	23.81%	80.41%	78.18%	72.93%	68.03%

Additional variable: Contractual status

Table 6a: Final EIA, May 2021 – ‘Category A eligible’ and submitted staff, based on contractual status.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Contractual status			
			Headcount		% submitted	
			Established	Fixed-term	Established	Fixed-term
Teaching & Research	Eligible	719	676	43	100%	100%
	Submitted	549	515	34	76.18%	79.07%
Research-only	Eligible	2	-	2	-	100%
	Submitted	2	-	2	-	100%
Both categories	Eligible	721	676	45	100%	100%
	Submitted	551	515	36	76.18%	80%

Table 6b: Interim EIA, September 2020 – ‘Category A eligible’ and submitted staff, based on contractual status.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Contractual status			
			Headcount		% submitted	
			Established	Fixed-term	Established	Fixed-term
Teaching & Research	Eligible	737	678	59	100%	100%
	Submitted	560	520	40	76.70%	67.80%
Research-only	Eligible	3	0	3	-	100%
	Submitted	3	0	3	-	100.00%
Both categories	Eligible	740	678	62	100%	100%
	Submitted	563	520	43	76.70%	69.35%

Table 6c: Interim EIA, July 2020 – ‘Category A eligible’ and submitted staff, based on contractual status.

Academic employment function	Option	Category A headcount	Contractual status					
			Headcount			% submitted		
			Established	Fixed-term	Unknown	Established	Fixed-term	Unknown
Teaching & Research	Eligible	718	640	51	27	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	542	482	41	19	75.31%	80.39%	70.37%
Research-only	Eligible	22	5	13	4	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	4	1	2	1	20.00%	15.38%	25.00%
Both categories	Eligible	740	645	64	31	100%	100%	100%
	Submitted	546	483	43	20	74.88%	67.19%	64.52%

Conclusions

The equality profile of the submission is much more representative of BU's academic community than the submission to REF2014. There were still some potential inequalities highlighted by the final EIA; however, gaps are narrower than the REF2014 submission, demonstrating a more inclusive approach to REF2021 and to engagement with research at BU. The current gaps relate to:

- Sex: Women were slightly less likely to be in our REF2021 submission than men. The gap closed between the first interim EIA when it was 7.23% and the final EIA when it was 5.65%. The gap has closed significantly since our submission to REF2014 where there was a 15% variance. Compared to REF2014, the number of men submitted to REF2021 increased by 174%, whilst the number of women submitted increased by 325%.
- Disability: Staff with a disclosed disability are slightly less likely to be submitted than those with no disclosed disability. The gap increased slightly between the first interim EIA when it was 4.98% and the final EIA when it was 6.64%. The final gap was similar to that observed in our submission to REF2014 where there was a 7% gap.
- Age: Our final EIA demonstrated that staff in the 50-59 and 60+ age categories were less likely to be submitted than younger staff. The first interim EIA indicated that staff in the 20-29 age category were also less likely to be submitted; however, the proportion increased by the final EIA from 23.81% to 77.78%. This is a different profile to REF2014 when staff aged between 46 and 65 were less likely to be submitted.
- Ethnicity: Throughout all the EIA exercises, staff with a disclosed Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) background were more likely to be submitted than staff with a disclosed white background, resulting in a 15.29% variance by the final EIA. This was a similar pattern to REF2014 where there was a 16% variance in the same direction.
- Contractual working hours: Part-time staff were less likely to be submitted than full-time staff. The gap closed slightly between the first interim EIA when it was 17.73% and the final EIA when it was 17.16%. This was not considered in the REF2014 equality analysis so a comparator cannot be given.
- Contract type: Interim EIAs indicated that fixed-term staff were less likely to be submitted than staff on established contracts; however, the final EIA indicated this was no longer the case with 80% of staff on fixed-term contracts being submitted compared to 76.18% of staff on established contracts.

The EIA process has been a useful mechanism for highlighting equality and diversity matters. We have used it to instigate and inform regular discussions about equality and diversity in research at the University Research and Professional Practice Committee (URPPC). We have also discussed the data and findings with the University Leadership Team. This has had two major benefits: first it has enabled us to raise the profile and importance of these matters and second it has resulted in a number of actions being taken forward to address the issues at both University and local level. For example, as a result of the URPPC discussions, all Faculties now have a gender and research action plan. As a result of the ULT discussions, the relevant Professional Services and Faculties are now working collaboratively to tackle potential procedural and structural barriers, such as through workload planning, recruitment, promotion, and succession planning, and linking this in to our existing work as part of Athena Swan, the Race Equality Charter and the HR Excellence in Research Award. This has enabled a more cohesive, broad, and sophisticated approach.

Action plan

We used the EIA process to inform our institutional action plan to prevent discrimination and advance equality. We are committed to the following actions:

1. On an ongoing basis review our recruitment documentation and media choices to ensure they are inclusive and free from bias e.g. revising the language in on our job adverts to ensure it is not gendered or pre-disposed to certain age groups.
2. Include wording on our commitment to inclusivity and diversity and flexible working arrangements in all our job advertisements to try and attract a diverse applicant pool.
3. Where our equality monitoring has shown that women and minority ethnic groups are currently under-represented within the university, we will state this within the advert and actively encourage applications from eligible candidates from these groups.
4. Support the development, progression, and promotion of women research leaders through female-only development sessions.
5. Promote and encourage use of Academic Study leave (paid leave for the purpose of developing, progressing and enhancing research performance) for all staff and prioritise for staff returning from long term family-related leave and ECRs.
6. Ensure equitable application of the Workload Planning for academic staff returning from maternity/adoption leave (should normally have an 80% teaching load in their first year following their return) to encourage and allow for a period of adjustment and focus on research.
7. Ensure a gender mix on funding panels and teams where decisions are made in relation to research funding, support, and supervision.
8. Expand staff groups (e.g. set up a carers group, BAME, etc) to encourage inclusivity, widen opportunity to provide feedback and share their lived experience including any barriers to research performance.
9. Review strategies to increase BAME applications for academic and research roles.
10. Monitor BAME staff research bid success rate by ethnicity and discipline.
11. Embed equality and diversity principles in all development programmes offered and coordinated by RDS, ensuring researchers understand how to integrate, implement and operationalise E & D considerations within their research.
12. As a result of 1-11, undertake regular monitoring and analysis of impact to inform further actions.