

## **Royal Holloway, University of London**

### **REF2014 Equality Impact Assessment - submission**

The REF Individual Staff Circumstances Panel assessed the final data for staff submitted in the REF2014 exercise, to satisfy itself and the REF Steering Group that there were no areas of concern in regards to any protected characteristics throughout the REF process.

The Panel was presented with an overall total for staff eligible to be submitted in the REF and the total that were actually submitted. The numbers were broken down by gender, ethnicity, age group and disability. Details on the number of Early Career Researchers and part-time staff (worked part-time at some point during the REF period) were also provided.

For the purposes of the Impact Assessment, and for consistency, the 10 members of staff who were not assigned to a UoA were included to provide the full picture for the overall numbers.

#### **Overall submitted headline data (percentages of staff submitted in the final submission)**

- 76.89% of staff eligible for the REF were submitted
- 74.29% of female eligible staff were submitted compared to 78.19% of male eligible staff
- 61.29% of eligible BME staff were submitted compared to 79.55% of eligible white staff
- 55.56% of eligible staff who have declared a disability were submitted compared with 77.18% of eligible staff not declaring a disability
- 85.53% of Early Career Researchers were submitted
- 71.43% of staff who had been part-time during the REF period were submitted

#### **Gender**

The Panel felt that the overall difference of -3.90% for eligible staff submitted was acceptable and did not need further investigation as this was within the 5% tolerance rate.

Data was also provided to the Panel broken down by UoA as with all previous Impact Assessments. The Panel as before agreed that any UoA with a + or - % of greater than 5% (in line with other equality monitoring statistics) should be investigated. After investigation by UoA the Panel was satisfied that although 12 UoAs (less than in previous Impact Assessments) fell into the investigation thresholds that as the numbers within each UoA were so small that they were happy that there was no gender bias in the selection criteria for the REF exercise.

#### **Ethnicity**

There was a relatively large % difference in eligible BME staff being submitted compared with eligible white staff and this had been the case in all previous Impact Assessments. The Panel, as before, acknowledged that the numbers of BME staff were small compared to the number of white staff (445 to 62) and therefore any form of statistical analysis was difficult, but the Panel felt that it would be inappropriate not to investigate this issue further by UoA as on the surface it looks like BME staff are not achieving the quality thresholds unlike their white counterparts. Outside the REF process, the College was committed to reviewing recruitment procedures in relation to the ethnicity to try and identify actions which might have a positive effect on the number of BME staff appointed.

The Panel again investigated by UoA but were satisfied that the small numbers of BME staff skew the % differences and that there was no inherent bias in the selection of staff.

## **Disability**

The number of staff declaring a disability is still very low throughout the College, around 2.5%.

Of the 528 staff eligible to be included in the REF only 9 have declared a disability. Therefore any analysis of this data is very difficult. Although the HR department had recently undertaken an exercise to ask all staff to update their EO details this had not improved the disability data.

## **Age**

The Panel considered that with age it was difficult to have one common methodology to pick up any issues. The information provided again supported that HEFCE's tariffs for reductions in outputs for ECRs were having an impact on the number of ECRs, who tended to be younger members of staff, being submitted. Actual numbers and %s of ECR's are given below.

There was a drop off in staff submitted in the age group 45-54 (from 80.53% for staff aged 35-44 to 71.69% for staff aged between 45-54) and to a slightly lesser extent for staff in age group 55-64 (72.04%) indicating a mid to late career dip; however this dip was less pronounced than had been in other iterations of the data. The Panel had already recommended that the College should investigate this to see if there was a reason for this happening.

## **Part-time staff**

The number of staff, who had worked part-time during the REF period and had been submitted, was 71.43% which was less than the overall submitted % of 76.89%. The Panel did acknowledge that part-time status was not a permanent status but agreed that in future exercises the part-time numbers should be measured against gender and disability to see if there was any support that could be provided to ensure the part-time submitted % moves in-line with full-time staff.

## **Early Career Researchers**

85.53% of ECRs were submitted which was higher than the overall submission percentage. However, the Panel felt that this was to be expected as staff had been recruited for their strong publications and the HEFCE tariffs had a positive impact on staff being submitted. However, as detailed above the College would consider why the %s of staff submitted drop off in the age groups 45-54 and 55-64.

In summary the Panel were satisfied that there was no evidence of inherent bias in the selection process and as a Panel, were happy with the submission data. The overall data is included below, however, in-line with other similar exercises, the College is not publishing the breakdown by UoAs, as the numbers are so small and it would be possible to identify individuals. However these UoA breakdowns have been provided to the REF Steering Group and the Panels carrying out the Impact Assessments at each of the 4 Impact Assessments exercises undertaken.

## **Individual Staff Circumstances Panel**

28 November 2013

<b>Total staff eligible</b>	<b>528</b>	
<b>Total submitted staff</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>76.89%</b>

**Eligible - Gender**

Female	175	33.14%
Male	353	66.86%
Total	528	100.00%

**Submitted**

Female	130	32.02%
Male	276	67.98%
Total	406	100.00%

% Females eligible submitted	74.29%
% Males eligible submitted	78.19%

**Eligible - Ethnicity**

White	445	84.28%
BME	62	11.74%
Prefer not to say	21	3.98%
Total	528	100.00%

**Submitted**

White	354	87.19%
BME	38	9.36%
Prefer not to say	14	3.45%
Total	406	100.00%

% white ethnicity eligible submitted	79.55%
% BME ethnicity eligible submitted	61.29%
% Prefer not to say eligible submitted	66.67%

**Eligible -Disability**

Yes	9	1.70%
No	517	97.92%
Prefer not to say	2	0.38%
Total	528	100.00%

**Submitted**

Yes	5	1.23%
No	399	98.28%
Prefer not to say	2	0.49%
Total	406	100.00%

% Declared disability eligible submitted	55.56%
% Not declared a disability eligible submitted	77.18%
% Prefer not to say eligible submitted	100.00%

**Eligible - Age Group**

Under 35	59
35 - 44	190
45 - 54	166
55 - 64	93
65 +	20
Total	528

**Submitted**

Under 35	50
35 - 44	153
45 - 54	119
55 - 64	67
65+	17
Total	406

% under 35 eligible submitted	84.75%
% 35 - 44 eligible submitted	80.53%
% 45 - 54 eligible submitted	71.69%
% 55 - 64 eligible submitted	72.04%
% 65+ eligible submitted	85.00%

**Early Career Researchers**

ECR eligible	76
ECR eligible submitted	65
% ECR eligible submitted	85.53%

**Part-time sometime during the REF period**

Part-time eligible	84
Part-time submitted	60
%Part-time eligible submitted	71.43%