

# **UWE Code of Practice on the Selection of Staff for the Research Excellence Framework 2014**

**Version 6, November 2012**

## **Introduction**

1. It is a requirement of the REF2014 that the University establishes a Code of Practice for the Selection of Staff which operates within the context of all relevant equality legislation as well as the University's own equality and diversity policy. This Code of Practice should be read in conjunction with UWE's REF Strategy statement (Annex A).

## **The purpose of the code**

2. The University is committed to the principle that the selection of staff for the REF should be on the basis of demonstrable research excellence in the context of the REF and of UWE's REF Strategy, and that the process of selection is carried out in a fair and transparent manner. This Code outlines the process by which that selection will take place. The University's aim is to ensure that the optimum number of eligible staff are included in UWE's REF submission taking into account the published procedures and criteria of the REF2014, the University's REF Strategy and its broader research strategy, as outlined in Annex A.

## **Research Excellence**

3. In making recommendations and decisions on which staff to submit, research 'excellence' will be interpreted according to the definitions and criteria set out by the Funding Councils and by the relevant REF panels and sub-panels, and taking into account the University's strategy for its submission to any particular Unit of Assessment or to the REF as a whole. Research excellence in this context may take into account both published outputs and other contributions made by staff in the form of research impact, research income, research student supervision and other relevant performance measures. In considering published outputs, the process will take account of the REF rules and guidance on jointly-authored work in assessing individual contributions.

## **Principles**

4. In line with REF Guidance, the Code of Practice seeks to demonstrate fairness to staff by addressing the following principles:
  - a. Transparency
  - b. Consistency
  - c. Accountability
  - d. Inclusivity

## Implementation of Principles

5. The implementation of this Code takes account of these principles in the following ways;

### a. Transparency

- The Code is easily accessible and publicised to all academic staff across the institution, including on the University web pages, and visible externally (<http://rbi.uwe.ac.uk/internet/Research/ref.asp>) and through the weekly e-Newsletter to all staff,
- All eligible staff will receive a letter, bringing their attention to the selection process and including a copy of this Code of Practice. This will be sent to home addresses to ensure it is drawn to the attention of those absent from work.
- The Code is actively disseminated and explained through relevant meetings of committees and groups involved in the selection of staff for the REF, including the REF Strategy Group, Unit of Assessment Leaders, Faculty REF groups and Faculty Executives
- The Code is actively disseminated and explained to other relevant groups such as the Trade Unions, Staff Networks and Faculty Research & Knowledge Exchange Committees

### b. Consistency

- The Code of Practice sets out the principles to be applied to all aspects/stages of the process at all levels within the institution where decisions will be made, including how individual staff circumstances will be taken into account.

### c. Accountability

- The Code identifies who will be involved in the selection process and identifies what training those staff will have undertaken.
- The Code describes the operating criteria and terms of reference for individuals and groups or committees concerned with staff selection.

### d. Inclusivity:

- The process of selection covered by the Code seeks to identify all eligible staff who have produced excellent research for submission to the REF.

## The decision-making process and those involved

6. Ultimately, the decision on which staff are to be submitted to the REF rests with the Vice-Chancellor in his role as chief operating officer.
7. The Vice-Chancellor will be informed in this decision by the Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group (REFSG), chaired by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) which, in turn, will receive recommendations from Executive Deans (see Annex B for membership and terms of reference of the REFSG).

8. In making their recommendations, Executive Deans will be informed by their Associate Dean (Research & Knowledge Exchange) in liaison with formally appointed Unit of Assessment Leaders (see Annex C for the role description of Unit of Assessment Leaders).

### **Key roles**

9. The DVC (Academic), as Chair of the REFSG, is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the University's REF strategy, including the application of this Code with respect to the selection of staff for the REF. The DVC (Academic) is also tasked with reporting to the Vice Chancellor's Executive Group and to the University Research and Knowledge Exchange Executive on the process of preparation for REF 2014, including the emerging equality profile of the submission and the outcome of equality impact assessments.
10. Staff recommended for selection to the REF will be proposed by Executive Deans via an iterative process of draft submissions compiled by Unit of Assessment Leaders under the leadership of the Associate Deans (R&KE). Executive Deans are tasked with ensuring that the process for the selection of staff for consideration by the REFSG is undertaken in a transparent manner and in line with the principles of this Code of Practice. This should include taking account of individual circumstances as described in this Code.
11. Where external assessors contribute to the selection process, they will be fully briefed on the need to take account of this Code of Practice and be provided with a copy before undertaking their assessment. External assessors should not decide which staff are to be submitted to the REF nor should they be given any information relating to individual staff circumstances.

### **Equality Training**

12. All staff with specific responsibilities in the process of selection will undertake training on equality and diversity which has been tailored to the REF process. This will include Unit of Assessment Leaders, Associate Deans (R&KE), Head of R&D:RBI (the REF Manager), Executive Deans, DVC (Academic) and VC. Details of this training are provided in Annex D.

### **Timetable for selection of staff**

13. The process of selection outlined in paragraphs 6 to 8 above comprises an iterative process of draft submissions led by Unit of Assessment Leaders reporting to their Associate Dean (R&KE) under the auspices of the REFSG. The timetable for these draft submissions and decision-making points is described in Annex H.

### **Equality impact assessment**

14. An equality impact assessment (EIA) will be carried out on the policy and procedures for selecting staff for the REF outlined in this Code. This will be undertaken under the auspices of the REFSG and will include an analysis to determine whether the staff selection policy for the REF may have a differential impact on particular protected groups.

15. The EIA will be reviewed by the REFSG at key stages of the selection process, up to and including the final submission process, to ensure that any necessary changes to prevent discrimination or promote equality are taken prior to the submission deadline.
16. The EIA will be undertaken by the REFSG, with support from the University's Equality & Diversity Unit, and will be informed by an analysis of data on staff who are eligible for selection in respect of all the protected characteristics for which data are available. The analysis will cover all eligible staff and will, where feasible, involve consultation with eligible staff from protected groups.
17. The final version of the REF EIA will be published on the web after the submission has been made, including the outcomes of any actions taken to prevent discrimination or advance equality.

### **Individual staff circumstances and their disclosure**

18. The University will follow the Funding Councils guidance on how REF panels will deal with individual circumstances that have constrained an individual's ability to produce four outputs or work productively throughout the assessment period - see paragraphs 63 to 91 of REF02.2012 *Panel criteria and working methods* (these are summarised in Annex G).
19. In considering staff for inclusion in the REF, all staff involved in the process should be aware of, and adhere to, the guidance on individual circumstances.
20. The approach to the treatment of individual circumstances will be consistent with the range of circumstances and procedures set out in the guidance and will be consistent across all units of assessment.
21. All eligible staff will be asked to complete a form disclosing their individual circumstances should they wish these to be considered (see Annex I). These will be considered by the REFSG in determining whether to recommend staff for inclusion. Further advice on this may be sought from the Director of Human Resources if required.
22. Members of REFSG handling individual staff circumstances will observe confidentiality and information will be stored securely. Information provided on the form may be shared externally for the purposes of evidencing any reduction in the number of research outputs.
23. Staff may declare individual circumstances at any time but will need to do so in particular through the REF rehearsal processes when Unit of Assessment Leaders are compiling draft submissions in accordance with the timetable noted in Annex H, to ensure these are taken full account of in the process of selection.
24. Such circumstances may include a desire **not** to be included in the REF even though the person is eligible and meets the quality threshold for inclusion. However the University, through the Vice Chancellor, has the final say on which staff are submitted.

### Feedback and appeals

25. Feedback will be given to staff at each formal stage of the selection process, (see timetable at Annex H).
26. All staff who are to be included in REF2014 will be notified by 30 April 2013. Any eligible staff who have put themselves forward but who are not considered suitable for inclusion in REF2014 will also have this confirmed by 30 April 2013 and feedback provided.
27. From 1 May 2013, the REF Appeal procedure will be available for staff to use (see Annex F). The deadline for appeals to be lodged, to enable sufficient time for an appeal to be considered and any outcomes implemented, will be 31 July 2013.

### Late decisions

28. The inclusion of some staff may be dependent upon the publication of one or more key outputs in 2013. Where this cannot be confirmed by 31 March 2013, **and for this reason only**, such staff may be designated as 'provisionally' included subject to confirmation of that output being publically available in 2013 and therefore eligible for inclusion in the final submission

### Late arrivals

29. Any staff joining the institution between 1 May and 31 October 2013 will be invited to put themselves forward for consideration in the REF and will be considered as soon as possible by the relevant UoA Leader and Associate Dean (R&KE). As a result they will either be recommended for inclusion to the REFSG (for onward recommendation to the Vice Chancellor) or given feedback regarding their exclusion. In this instance, the appeals process will be still be open to them provided an appeal is lodged by 31 October 2013.

### Further information and Guidance

**UWE REF Manager** – Richard Bond [richard.bond@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:richard.bond@uwe.ac.uk) ext 82257

**UWE REF Administrator** – Alison Vaughton [alison.vaughton@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:alison.vaughton@uwe.ac.uk) ext 82872

## **ANNEXES**

Annex A	UWE Strategy for the Research Excellence Framework
Annex B	Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group Membership and Terms of Reference
Annex C	Role of Unit of Assessment Leaders
Annex D	Equality & Diversity Training
Annex E	REF Review Form
Annex F	Appeals Procedure
Annex G	Guidance on individual staff circumstances
Annex H	Timetable for the selection of staff for REF2014
Annex I	Individual Circumstances Disclosure Form

## **ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS**

	Equality Analysis Form and data
--	---------------------------------

## **Annex A**

### **UWE STRATEGY FOR THE RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK**

#### **Research at UWE**

The University made a major step towards achieving its research vision to 'conduct world-class research in clearly identified areas' through a successful engagement with RAE 2008. A national process of stringent peer review rated more than a third (37%) of the research submitted by UWE as either world-leading or internationally excellent in terms of its originality, significance and rigour. This was equivalent to the work of some 120 staff.

The RAE results highlighted the significant presence of world-leading research in biomedical sciences, art and design and in communication, cultural and media studies. They also showed high levels of international excellence across a range of subjects including computer science, engineering, linguistics, accountancy and finance, town and country planning, plant science, history, nursing & midwifery and architecture and built environment. As a result, the University was one of the biggest winners following the financial outcome of RAE2008, increasing its research funding from HEFCE by 122%, one of the largest increases in the country.

In parallel with the RAE2008 assessment, the Research Strategy Implementation Group undertook a review of the research portfolio of the University in order to identify areas of strength, vitality and potential as well as areas where further review may be required. The overall outcomes of the research review, alongside the RAE outcomes, provided an evidence base to inform broad faculty planning and investment decisions, including the allocation of QR and the establishment of a Strategic Research Development Fund aimed at supporting areas of excellence, early career researchers and research studentships.

Areas of excellence identified by the review and supported through the SRDF comprised:

- Biomedical and biosensing sciences
- Arts and digital media
- Sustainable transport and planning
- Intelligent computing and robotics
- Health and well-being research in appearance, long term conditions and children

The challenge we face now is to ensure that we can build on this excellence and on the outcome from RAE2008 in a climate where resources are increasingly tight, where we face more intensive competition than ever for research grants from all sources, where a Government policy of research concentration has been introduced alongside increased selectivity and where the ability to invest in research from 'core' university funds is increasingly constrained.

## **Approach to the Research Excellence Framework**

One of the key aims of the University's Research Strategy is "to maintain the momentum that has made UWE one of the leading post-92 universities for research." Building on RAE2008, it also seeks to "deliver excellence in selected research areas, creating critical volume and ensuring sustainability." Key to ensuring sustainability in areas of excellence is to engage successfully with the Research Excellence Framework, to maximise the reputational and financial benefits to the University and to implement a process for the selection of staff that is rigorous, transparent and fair.

The University's research reputation rests largely on the quality of research output, but the REF, like the RAE, will also be a crucial mediator for reputation and, regardless of the direct financial consequences for UWE, its outcome will influence prospects for research partnerships, income generation, student recruitment, curriculum development and knowledge exchange beyond the REF.

As with the RAE, in developing an optimal strategy, careful account has to be taken of balancing the size of a submission (in terms of the number of staff selected) with the quality profile that may emerge. The working assumption for UWE's approach to the REF is that the quality profile, especially whether there is a significant presence at the higher end of the scale, will matter most for reputation. While the size of submissions may be important as a means of demonstrating critical mass or sheer size of activity in some areas, the mean grade average (or some equivalent) is most likely to drive league tables.

Given the Government's policy of both research selectivity and research concentration, it is inevitable that QR funding will continue to be skewed towards the higher levels of the quality profile following the REF (4\*/3\*). There is likely to be little advantage in including work at the lower levels (2\*/1\*).

Our strategy will reflect this assumption. The threshold for entry to many or most units of assessments will be raised by comparison with 2008, to maximise the chances of a higher mean grade average. How this translates into specific strategies will vary from unit to unit, in response to disciplinary differences, variable panel criteria and the significance, or not, of critical mass. But in broad terms the University will seek to exclude work likely to be considered 'unclassified' or 1\* and to consider carefully the volume of work included that is likely to be considered 2\*. Broadly speaking, staff eligible for submission are likely to have at least one output that has the prospect of being rated at 3\*.

In addition to an assessment of individual contributions, the REFSG will also consider the viability of submissions that appear to present a less than optimal overall profile even though it may include a number of individuals with profiles that meet the expected quality threshold. Wherever possible such individuals will be considered for inclusion in alternate submissions. However, on occasion, it may be the case that such individuals are not included where the interests of the University, with respect to the objectives of its REF strategy, are considered to militate against a submission to a particular unit of assessment.



Overall our strategy will therefore emphasise research excellence and enhancing reputation as the main drivers in shaping UWE's submission. Selection will be based on research quality, as defined by the REF criteria, mainly of research outputs but including also performance indicators such as evidence of impact, the quality of the research environment, research income and the completion of research degrees.

UWE's REF submission will pay particular attention to equality of opportunity. All staff will have the opportunity to put themselves forward for consideration and the process of selection will be closely informed by a Code of Practice. This will emphasize that the quality of research, in the context of the REF process and UWE's REF strategy, is the principal selection criterion. An Equality Impact Assessment of the strategy will be undertaken prior to its implementation through the REF selection process.

UWE's selective strategy for the REF however should be seen in the light of the maintenance of a broader University research strategy, one in which we continue to value and reward a wide range of research and knowledge exchange activity. This includes a commitment to the longer-term development of research capability by supporting new and emerging researchers in priority areas who will become crucial to our research strategy beyond the first REF exercise.

### **The decision making process**

Staff will be selected for the REF through an iterative process involving a number of rehearsals starting in 2010. These will be headed up by Unit of Assessment Leaders reporting to the relevant Associate Dean (Research & Knowledge Exchange). Feedback will be given to all staff under consideration for the REF on whether they are 'probable', 'possible' or 'unlikely' to be included at the various stages of this process.

Ultimately, the final decision on who, and where, the University submits to the REF will rest with the Vice Chancellor. In the process of making preparations for the REF, the VC will be informed by the Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group, chaired by the DVC (Academic), and including the four Associate Deans (Research and knowledge Exchange) and the Head of R&D, RBI. This group will receive recommendations from Executive Deans on which work (and therefore which staff) should be submitted through the iterative process noted above.

Confidential assessment by academic colleagues inside and outside the university will also inform the selection process.

Professor Paul Gough  
DVC (Academic)  
Chair, Research Excellence Framework Group

Revised March 2012

## **Annex B**

### **RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK STRATEGY GROUP**

#### **Membership**

Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) (Chair) - Professor Paul Gough

Pro Vice Chancellor (Research and Business Engagement)/Associate Dean (R&KE), Business and Law - Professor Martin Boddy

Associate Dean (R&KE), Health and Life Sciences - Professor Robin Means

Associate Dean (R&KE), Arts, Creative Industries and Education - Professor Gay Attwood

Associate Dean (R&KE), Environment and Technology - Professor Glenn Lyons

REF Manager, Head of R&D, Research, Business and Innovation - Richard Bond

Alison Vaughton, REF Administrator, Research, Business and Innovation (Secretary)

#### **Terms of Reference:**

Working within and seeking to implement the UWE Research Strategy, the Group will:

- advise the Vice Chancellor's Executive on the University's policy and strategy in relation to REF2014, and on the work and staff to be included in the REF;
- oversee the dissemination and implementation of the University's REF strategy, including the application of the Code of Practice for the Selection of Staff;
- oversee the development of REF submissions and consider recommendations from Unit of Assessment leaders and Faculty Executives on the work and staff to be included in the REF;
- feed back to Unit of Assessment leaders and Faculty Executives on the development of REF submissions as a result of internal and external assessment and published REF guidance and criteria
- advise Research, Business and Innovation, and other services as appropriate, on the preparation and administration of the REF submission
- make regular reports to the Vice Chancellors Executive, Academic Board and the Research and Knowledge Exchange Executive on the process of preparation for REF2014.
- to pursue the UWE Research Strategy, and allocate and monitor the University's QR research funds, including the Strategic Research Development Fund, and other research investments

## **Annex C**

### **UNIT OF ASSESSMENT LEADERS**

Unit of Assessment leaders are appointed by the Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group (REFSG) on the recommendation of the relevant Associate Dean (R&KE).

#### **Role of Unit of Assessment Leader**

To make recommendations to the Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group (REFSG) via the Associate Dean (Research & Knowledge Exchange) on the shape and content of draft submissions for a designated Unit of Assessment in accordance with the University's REF Strategy and its Code of Practice on the Selection of Staff to the Research Excellence Framework, including;

- responsibility for the preparation of draft submissions
- monitoring the development of official REF guidance and panel criteria in relation to the relevant Unit of Assessment
- making proposals for the inclusion of staff, taking into account the University's Code of Practice
- drafting or compiling the narrative sections of submissions
- acquiring and editing relevant information from staff on their research activities and publications
- overseeing the compilation of relevant research data (with Research Administration, Research, Business and Innovation)
- in liaison with the Associate Dean (Research & Knowledge Exchange), providing feedback to staff regarding their inclusion or exclusion
- receiving and responding to feedback on draft submissions from REFSG, including any commissioned external evaluations
- liaising with other faculties, in relation to staff who may be eligible for inclusion in the relevant Unit of Assessment
- gathering intelligence on the REF from colleagues and from the wider academic community in relation to the relevant Unit of Assessment

## **Annex D**

### **EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY TRAINING**

#### **Draft programme**

1. Introductions, scene setting & housekeeping – **Andrew** (5mins)
2. What is the Research Excellence Framework 2014 and future timeline – **Richard** (5mins)
3. Equality law and the implications for the REF 2014 – **Andrew** (10mins)
  - Legislation
  - Protected characteristics
  - Lessons learned from RAE 2008
4. Exercise 1 – understanding types of discrimination – **Andrew** (15mins)
5. Developing and implementing UWE REF 2014 Code of Practice - **Richard** (10mins)
  - Confidentiality
  - Decision making roles
  - Process for managing clearly defined/complex circumstances
6. Exercise 2 – Identifying clearly defined and complex circumstances - **Andrew** (10mins)
7. Exercise 3 – calculating clearly defined circumstances and outputs – **Andrew** (15mins)
8. Exercise 4 – Case studies REF Scenarios **Andrew** (20mins)
9. Exercise 5 – Managing complex circumstances **Richard** (20mins)
10. Closing remarks and future training/information needs **Richard** (5mins)

#### **Required resources:**

- Draft code of practice
- UWE Equality Policy
- Exercise handouts
- Research strategy

## **Annex E**

### **RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK REVIEW FORM**

#### **An invitation to staff - Research Excellence Framework Mid-term Review**

Staff are invited to put themselves forward for consideration in the University's Research Excellence Framework Mid-term Review 2010. This Review is a university wide initiative designed to assess progress towards the first Research Excellence Framework exercise which is likely to take place sometime between 2012 and 2014.

Individuals will be considered at faculty level for inclusion in one or more Units of Assessments where Review submissions are being compiled. This process will be led by the relevant Associate Dean (Research, Enterprise and Public Engagement) with the support of designated UoA Leaders (names to be confirmed).

To be considered for inclusion in this Review, please download and complete the **REF Review form** and return it to RBI by **30 September 2010**.

Many thanks.

Professor Paul Gough  
PVC (Research, Enterprise and Public Engagement)  
Chair, Research Strategy Implementation Group

June 2010

# REF Review 2010

## 1. Personal Details

Name:	
Grade:	
Faculty:	
Department:	
Email:	
Fraction (if part time)	
UoA in 2008 (if submitted)	
Have you joined the university since RAE2008? (ie Since 31 <sup>st</sup> October 2007) Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	

## 2. Research Outputs

You are invited to list up to a maximum of 6 research outputs that you would like considered for the REF Review. These should all have been published since January 2008. Please make sure that your publications have been uploaded onto the UWE Research Repository <http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk>. This will generate a unique **ID Code** that we will use to identify your publication. If you require help uploading your publications onto the repository email [eprints@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@uwe.ac.uk) or contact Library Services or your Faculty Research Office.

Contact	Faculty/ Service	Email	Telephone
Anna Lawson	Library Services	<a href="mailto:Anna.Lawson@uwe.ac.uk">Anna.Lawson@uwe.ac.uk</a>	86438
Viv Calway	CAHE – Humanities & Education	<a href="mailto:Vivien.Calway@uwe.ac.uk">Vivien.Calway@uwe.ac.uk</a>	84223
Patrick Lansley	CAHE – Creative Arts	<a href="mailto:Patrick.Lansley@uwe.ac.uk">Patrick.Lansley@uwe.ac.uk</a>	84834
Helen Frisby	FBL	<a href="mailto:Helen.Frisby@uwe.ac.uk">Helen.Frisby@uwe.ac.uk</a>	83429
Jane Newton	FET	<a href="mailto:Jane.Newton@uwe.ac.uk">Jane.Newton@uwe.ac.uk</a>	83102
Caroline Foyle	HLS	<a href="mailto:Caroline.Foyle@uwe.ac.uk">Caroline.Foyle@uwe.ac.uk</a>	81167
Ruth Quinn	RBI	<a href="mailto:Ruth.Quinn@uwe.ac.uk">Ruth.Quinn@uwe.ac.uk</a>	82947

We are aware that staff in some faculties have recently provided this data to their Faculty Research Office for inclusion in a Faculty database. If so, check with your FRO to see if the data has now been, or will shortly be, transferred onto the UWE Research Repository.

- **Self evaluation** – you are invited to provide a short (200 word maximum) self evaluation of each output in terms of the significance, originality and rigour of the underlying research. This should include evidence where possible such as reference to favourable citations, demonstrable impact on other researchers or users, the peer review standards of the journal etc.
- **Your contribution** - please indicate whether you are sole author, and if not, your approximate % contribution to the output.
- **UWE Co authors** - please name any current UWE staff who are co authors of this item.

**Please rank your outputs in the order which you feel they best represent the quality of your research (highest first).**

**Output 1 (highest ranked output)**

Title:	
UWE Repository ID Code:	
Your contribution:	
UWE Co authors:	

Self evaluation (up to 200 words)
-----------------------------------

**Output 2**

Title:	
UWE Repository ID Code:	
Your contribution:	
UWE Co authors:	

Self evaluation (up to 200 words)
-----------------------------------

**Output 3**

Title:	
UWE Repository ID Code:	
Your contribution:	

UWE Co authors:	

Self evaluation (up to 200 words)

**Output 4**

Title:	
UWE Repository ID Code:	
Your contribution:	
UWE Co authors:	

Self evaluation (up to 200 words)



**Output 5**

Title:	
UWE Repository ID Code:	
Your contribution:	
UWE Co authors:	

Self evaluation (up to 200 words)
-----------------------------------

**Output 6**

Title:	
UWE Repository ID Code:	
Your contribution:	
UWE Co authors:	

Self evaluation (up to 200 words)
-----------------------------------

### 3. Research Outputs – Forthcoming

You are invited to list up to 3 *forthcoming* publications, or other research outputs. For each output please indicate:

- **Type of output** – Please see Annex 1 attached for a list
- **Status of forthcoming output** – Please indicate at what stage in the publication process the output is at, eg planned, submitted for publication, being revised for resubmission, resubmitted, confirmed for publication/in press (please give journal title or publisher if known).
- **Date(s)** – when it will be publicly available, if known. In most cases month and year is sufficient.
- **Your contribution** – Are you sole author and if not what was your approximate % contribution (if known)?
- **UWE Co-authors** – please name any current UWE staff who are, or may be, co-authors.

#### ***Forthcoming Output 1***

Type of output	
Status of output	
Date(s) publically available	
Your contribution	
UWE Co-authors	

#### ***Forthcoming Output 2***

Type of output	
Status of output	
Date(s) publically available	
Your contribution	
UWE Co-authors	

#### ***Forthcoming Output 3***

Type of output	
Status of output	
Date(s) publically available	
Your contribution	
UWE Co-authors	

## 4. Esteem Indicators

Please list up to 6 *indicators of esteem* for the period January 2008 to July 2010. Examples of esteem might include:

- Membership of Research Council Peer Review College
- Honours and prizes
- Visiting fellowships/appointments and residencies
- MPhil/PhD external examinations
- Key-note addresses to major conferences
- Chairing major conferences sessions
- Editorial positions
- Major commissions or works held in public collections
- Invitations to join prestigious bodies
- Advice to public bodies or consultancies in business/industry/public bodies

For each esteem indicator please provide:

- **Date(s)** – please give the year, and, if possible, the month. If the esteem indicator was for a limited period of time (e.g. editor of a special edition) please give start and end dates.
- **Brief description** – give the main details of the esteem indicator e.g. *Appointed to editorial board of ...*

Esteem Indicator 1 (up to 50 words)
Esteem Indicator 2 (up to 50 words)
Esteem Indicator 3 (up to 50 words)
Esteem Indicator 4 (up to 50 words)
Esteem Indicator 5 (up to 50 words)
Esteem Indicator 6 (up to 50 words)

**Thank you for taking the time to complete this form. Completed forms should be e-mailed to [Ruth.quinn@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:Ruth.quinn@uwe.ac.uk) by the 30<sup>th</sup> September 2010.**

## **Annex 1: Type of research output (source: RAE2008)**

Outputs may include, but are not limited to (in no particular order):

Books (note whether authored or edited);  
Chapters in books;  
Journal articles;  
Conference contributions;  
Report for body  
Other such as:  
Curatorship and conservation;  
Digital and broadcast media;  
Performances and other types of live presentation;  
Artefacts, designs and exhibitions;  
Films, videos and other types of media presentation;

## **ANNEX F**

### **RESEARCH EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK 2014 – APPEALS PROCEDURE**

#### **Scope of Process**

The appeals process documented here relates to a discrete procedure pertaining solely to REF2014 - appeals can only be made on grounds relevant to the selection of staff for the REF.

#### **Process of Appeal**

An individual who wishes to have their recommendation for selection for the REF reviewed must write to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Resources, Planning and Infrastructure) clearly stating the reasons for requesting a review.

Following a request to review a recommendation, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Resources, Planning and Infrastructure) will convene a University REF Appeals Panel to be chaired by an Independent Member drawn from the Board of Governors and comprise also one or more members of the Vice-Chancellors Executive<sup>1</sup> (excluding the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and the Executive Dean of the Faculty to which the appellant belongs), and a representative of Human Resources. The panel should take into account any need to protect confidentiality.

It is expected that most matters will be considered by written representation, although an appeal can be heard in person if preferred by the individual. Should the University REF Appeals Panel need to meet an individual, the individual may be accompanied by a work colleague or trade union representative.

The University REF Appeals Panel may uphold an appeal, in which case the relevant Associate Dean (R&KE) will be directed to amend the original recommendation, or may dismiss an appeal, in which case the original recommendation will stand.

There will be no further right of appeal under this REF Appeals Process against the decision taken by the University REF Appeals Panel.

#### **Unresolved Appeals**

For any matters not resolved by the REF Appeals Process, the University's Grievance Procedure is available.

#### **Grounds of Appeal**

---

<sup>1</sup> The Vice-Chancellors Executive comprises the Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellors, Pro Vice-Chancellors/Executive Deans and Directors of Professional Services.

Appeals can be made on any grounds relevant to the REF process with respect to the selection of staff.

## ANNEX G

### GUIDANCE ON INDIVIDUAL STAFF CIRCUMSTANCES

This Summary is based on guidance provided in more detail in:

**Panel criteria and working methods (REF01.2012), Part 1, paragraphs 63-91**

<http://www.ref.ac.uk/subguide/>

#### Introduction

HEIs are allowed to list four outputs against any researcher, irrespective of their circumstances or the length of time they have had to conduct research. However individuals may be returned with fewer than four outputs without penalty in the assessment, where their circumstances have significantly constrained their ability to produce four outputs.

Where an individual is submitted with fewer than four outputs and their research has **not** considered to have been constrained by acceptable circumstances, any 'missing' outputs will be graded as 'Unclassified'.

#### Types of Circumstances

Staff may be returned with fewer than four outputs without penalty in the assessment, if one or more of the following circumstances significantly constrained their ability to produce four outputs. Such circumstances are classified as **Clearly Defined** or **Complex**. Where a combination of clearly defined and more complex circumstances is apparent, these should be returned as 'complex'.

#### Clearly Defined Circumstances:

- Qualifying as an Early Career Researcher (see below for definition)
- Absence from work due to working part-time, secondments or career breaks
- Maternity, paternity or adoption leave
- Other circumstances that apply in UoAs 1- 6 as defined in the Guidance (see paragraphs 86 – 87 in REF01.2012).

For clearly defined circumstances, there are tariffs to determine the number of outputs that may be reduced without penalty in the assessment, depending on the duration of the circumstance (or combination thereof).

For ECRs the number of outputs that may be reduced without penalty is:

<b>Date at which the individual first met the definition of an ECR</b>	<b>Number of outputs may be <i>reduced</i> without penalty by up to:</b>
On or before 31 July 2009	0
Between 1 August 2009 and 31 July 2010	1
Between 1 August 2010 and 31 July 2010	2
On or after 1 August 2011	3

For those who have been absent from work due to working part-time, secondments or career breaks, the number of outputs that may be reduced without penalty is:

<b>Total months absent between 1 January 2008 and 31 October 2013:</b>	<b>Number of outputs may be <i>reduced</i> without penalty by up to:</b>
0 – 11.99	0
12 – 27.99	1
28 – 45.99	2
46 or more	3

### **Maternity, paternity or adoption leave**

Staff may reduce the number of outputs by one for each discrete period of statutory maternity or adoption leave taken during the period 1 January 2008 to 31 October 2013, and for each period of additional paternity or adoption leave lasting for four months or more taken during this period (see paragraphs 75 – 81 for more information).

**Note that clearly defined circumstances can be cumulative. If an individual is both an ECR and has another clearly defined circumstance, a single calculation of the total absence should be made.**

### **Early career researchers**

Early career researchers are defined as members of staff who meet the criteria to be selected as Category A or C staff, **and** who started their careers as independent researchers on or after 1 August 2009.

For the purposes of the REF, an individual is deemed to have started their career as an independent researcher from the point at which they held a contract of employment of 0.2 FTE or greater, which included a primary employment function of undertaking 'research' or 'teaching and research' (with any HEI or other organisation), **and** who undertook independent research, leading or acting as principal investigator or equivalent on a research grant or significant piece of research work.

Further guidance on the definition of an ECR is given in paragraphs 85 to 87 of the **Assessment framework and guidance on submissions (REF02.2011)** at:

<http://www.ref.ac.uk/subguide/>

### **Complex Circumstances**

These are circumstances that are more complex and require a judgement about the appropriate number of outputs that can be reduced without penalty.

- Disability (as defined by the Equality Act 2010 – see REF02.2011 referenced above)
- Ill health or injury.
- Mental health conditions.
- Pregnancy or maternity, in addition to a clearly defined period of maternity leave.
- Childcare or other caring responsibilities.
- Gender reassignment.

- Other circumstances relating to protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation).

As far as is practicable, the impact of these circumstances on an individual's ability to work productively throughout the assessment period should be equated to the impact of clearly defined absences, and the number of outputs reduced in line with the table above for clearly defined circumstances.

For complex circumstances, the University's REF Strategy Group, advised by the REF Manager, will make a judgement on the appropriate reduction in the number of outputs submitted, based on Funding Council and Equality Challenge Unit guidance.

### **Submission requirements for individual circumstances**

For each member of staff returned with fewer than four outputs, submissions must include the following information (in REF1b):

#### **Staff with clearly defined circumstances** (maximum 200 words):

For ECRs, the date at which the individual became an ECR must be stated along with brief details of their research career history, specifically identifying the point at which they became an independent researcher, and the number of outputs returned.

For staff with other clearly defined circumstances, details must be provided of the nature of the circumstances, their timing and duration, a calculation of the total absence over the period 1 Jan 2008 to 31 Oct 2013, and the number of outputs returned.

#### **Staff with complex circumstances** (maximum 300 words):

The nature and timing of the circumstances must be described and their effect on the individual's contracted working hours or ability to fulfil their contracted working hours explained. Any other effects on the individual's ability to work productively should be explained and a calculation provided for the reduction in outputs and the number of outputs returned.

Following submission, the REF Equality & Diversity Advisory Panel (not the Main Panels or Sub-panels) will consider these cases and make a judgement as to whether the number of outputs included is appropriate.

### **Verifiability and Confidentiality**

The information returned in REF1b for any type of circumstances must be based on verifiable evidence. Information submitted in form REF1b will be kept confidential to the REF team and the panel members (for clearly defined circumstances) and the EDAP and main panel chairs (for complex circumstances).

March 2012



## Annex H

### TIMETABLE FOR THE SELECTION OF STAFF TO REF2014

Staff recommended for selection to the REF will be proposed by the Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group via an iterative process of draft submissions compiled by Unit of Assessment Leaders under the leadership of the Associate Deans (R&KE) reporting to Executive Deans.

#### 2010/11 REF Review

The 2010/11 REF Review invited all eligible staff in the university to put themselves forward for consideration in the REF.

June 2010	Invitation sent to all staff to submit a REF Review form (Annex G).
30 Sept 2010	Deadline for submission of forms.
October - December 2010	Forms considered by Unit of Assessment Leaders
14 January 2011	Deadline for recommendations by Unit of Assessment Leaders to Associate Deans (R&KE) on staff categorisation as 'probable', 'possible' or 'unlikely' for inclusion in the REF.
25 January 2011	Consideration of recommendations by REFSG
February – March 2011	Feedback by Unit of Assessment Leaders and/or Associate Deans (R&KE) to all staff who had submitted REF Review forms, including a clear indication of the category that individual staff were considered to be in.

The 2010/11 REF Review therefore comprised an initial assessment of staff 'readiness' for the REF, fully recognising that there was still a significant amount of time to go before the REF census date, that no firm decisions had been made at that point, that a Code of Practice had yet to be finalised and that further opportunities and iterations would take place to enable all eligible staff to be properly considered.

An initial equality analysis of the staff included in the 2010/11 REF Review, compared to that of the University's RAE2008 submission, was undertaken by the Research Strategy Equality Impact Assessment Group

#### 2011/12 REF Rehearsal

A more detailed REF submission took place in 2011/12. All staff were given a further opportunity to be considered at this point, with those not being included in the submission being categorised as 'unlikely'.

3 February 2012	Deadline for draft submissions to be made to the REF Strategy Group, including an indication of staff as 'probable' or 'possible' (guided by a draft Code of Practice)
31 May 2012	All staff provided with feedback on their current status with respect to the REF
31 June 2012	Equality impact assessment of the REF rehearsal undertaken, amendments made to the Code of Practice and signed off by REFSG for submission to the Funding Councils.

As with the REF Review, the 2011/12 REF Rehearsal constituted a further iteration in the process of selecting staff but did not conclude with final decisions but rather a clearer view of which staff are likely to be recommended for inclusion in 2013.

### 2012/13 Final REF Rehearsal

Following confirmation of UWE's Code of Practice, taking account of any feedback from the Funding Councils, all staff not considered 'probable' or 'possible' for inclusion after the 2011/12 REF Rehearsal will be given a final opportunity to put themselves forward for consideration for inclusion in the REF2014.

1 December 2012	Final invitation to all staff to be re-considered for inclusion in the REF, including any declarations of individual circumstances
31 January 2013.	Deadline for consideration of any 'unlikely' staff wishing to be re-considered
28 February 2013	Deadline for final REF rehearsal submissions, including firm recommendations on the staff to be included, and in accordance with the confirmed version of the Code of Practice, to be submitted to REFSG via Executive Deans
31 March 2013	Final recommendations made by the REFSG to the Vice-Chancellor
30 April 2013	Deadline for all staff who are to be included in REF2014 to be notified. Deadline for feedback to any eligible staff who have put themselves forward but who are not considered suitable for inclusion.

#### Note

*It is anticipated that the inclusion of a some staff may be dependent upon the publication of one or more key outputs in 2013. Where this cannot be confirmed by 31 March 2013, **and for this reason only**, such staff may be designated as 'provisionally' included subject to confirmation of that output being publically available in 2013 and therefore eligible for inclusion in the final submission.*

## Appeals process

From 1 May 2013	REF Appeal procedure available (see Annex F).
31 July 2013	Deadline for appeals to be lodged
30 September 2013	Deadline for appeal outcomes to be confirmed

## Summary of Timetable for Selection of Staff

### 2010/11 REF Review

2010

June Invitation issued to all eligible staff to be considered for REF2014

September 30 Deadline for receipt of responses

### 2011

January 14 Deadline for submission of information on which staff considered to be 'probable', 'possible' or 'unlikely' at this stage

January 25 Consideration by REFSG

February 28 Deadline for feedback to staff on current REF status

### 2011/12 REF Rehearsal

### 2012

February 3 Deadline for draft submissions and information on 'probable' and 'possible' staff to be submitted to REFSG

May 31 Deadline for feedback to staff on current REF status

### 2012/13 Final REF Rehearsal

December 1 Final invitation to all staff for consideration/declaration of individual circumstances  
**2013**

January 31 Deadline for staff to be re-considered in relation to inclusion the REF2014

February 28 Deadline for final rehearsal submissions to be submitted to REFSG

March 31 Decision point for Vice Chancellor on staff to be included

April 30 Deadline for feedback to staff on REF status

## Appeals process

May 1 Appeals process open

July 31 Deadline for appeals to be lodged

September 30 Deadline for appeal outcomes to be confirmed

## Submission

October 31 Census date for staff eligible for selection

November 29 Closing date for submissions

## Annex I

### INDIVIDUAL CIRCUMSTANCES DISCLOSURE FORM

To: All members of staff eligible for return in REF 2014

From: [insert]

**Subject: REF 2014, consideration of individual staff circumstances**

---

The University of the West of England is committed to ensuring that decisions about selecting staff for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) are made in a fair, transparent and consistent manner. Information on how eligible staff will be selected for submission to the REF can be found in the University's Code of Practice which can be found at [insert web address].

To ensure that REF processes are fair, the University is collecting data on individual circumstances from all staff eligible for submission. The data will be used to identify which staff are eligible for submission with fewer than four outputs. Summary level data collected may also inform the University's monitoring of staff selection procedures at the institutional level.

In determining whether eligible staff may be submitted to the REF with fewer than four research outputs, the University's Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group will take the following circumstances into consideration:

- Early career researcher (started career as an independent researcher on or after 1 August 2009)
- Part time employment
- Career break or secondment outside of the higher education sector in which the individual did not undertake academic research
- Maternity leave, statutory adoption leave, and additional paternity leave (taken by partners of new mothers or co-adopters)
- Disability (including conditions such as cancer and chronic fatigue)
- Ill health or injury
- Mental health conditions
- Constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, breastfeeding, adoption, paternity or childcare **in addition to** periods of maternity, statutory adoption or additional paternity leave taken. This could include for example, pregnancy related illness and health and safety restrictions in laboratory and field work.
- Other caring responsibilities (including caring for an elderly or disabled relative)
- Gender reassignment

If your research output has been affected by other circumstances, not including teaching and administration that are not listed above, please detail them on this form as they may be considered.

**In determining the number of outputs staff are required to submit, the institution will observe the definitions of individual staff circumstances provided in the published REF 'Panel criteria and working methods' (January 2012) available at [www.ref.ac.uk](http://www.ref.ac.uk) under 'Publications'.**

### **What action do I need to take?**

If you are eligible for REF submission you are encouraged to complete the attached form. If further information is required about any circumstances disclosed, you will be contacted by Richard Bond, Head of R&D in RBI, who is the University's REF Manager.

### **Who will see the information that I provide?**

Within the institution, the information that you provide will be seen by the University's Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group, who may take advice from the Director of Human resources if required.

Members of the University's Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group handling individual staff circumstances will observe confidentiality and information will be stored securely.

Information provided on the form may be shared externally for the purposes of evidencing any reduction in the number of research outputs:

- For **circumstances with a clearly defined reduction in outputs**, information will be seen by the relevant REF sub-panel, the REF panel secretariat and the UK funding bodies' REF team. This will be information about early career researcher status, part-time working, career breaks or secondments, and periods of maternity, additional paternity or adoption leave taken.
- For **more complex circumstances**, information will be seen only by the REF Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel, the REF Main Panel Chairs and the UK funding bodies' REF team. This will be information to explain the impact on your research of circumstances such as disability, ill health, injury, mental health conditions, gender reassignment, caring responsibilities or constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, breastfeeding, adoption and paternity (in addition to the period of leave taken). This information will **not** be seen by the REF sub-panel.

All REF panel members, chairs and secretaries are bound by confidentiality requirements, and acceptance of the confidentiality requirements is a condition of their appointment to the role. No information relating to identifiable individuals' circumstances will be published by the funding bodies REF Team. All data collected, stored and processed by the UK funding bodies REF Team will be handled in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

The REF Assessment Framework and Guidance on Submissions <http://www.ref.ac.uk/subguide/> requires all higher education institutions participating in the REF to ensure appropriate confidentiality in handling individual staff circumstances.

University of the West of England, Bristol

**What if my circumstances change?**

The University recognises that staff circumstances may change between 1 January 2008 and 31 October 2013. If your circumstances change you can download a copy of the attached form at <http://rbi.uwe.ac.uk/internet/Research/ref.asp> .

**Individual staff circumstances disclosure form**

<b>Name</b>	
<b>Department</b>	
<b>Unit of Assessment</b>	

**Section one:**

**Please select one of the following:**

- I have no individual circumstances that I wish to be taken into consideration for the purposes of the Research Excellence Framework (REF).
  
- I have individual circumstances that I wish to make known but I am not seeking a reduction in outputs. (Please complete sections two and three)
  
- In completing this form I am seeking a reduction in research outputs. (Please complete sections two and three)

**Section two:**

**Please select as appropriate:**

- I would like to be contacted by a member of human resources staff to discuss my circumstances and requirements and/or the support provided by UWE. My contact details for this purpose are:

<b>Email</b>	
<b>Telephone</b>	
<b>Preferred method of communication</b>	

- I do **not** wish to be contacted by a member of human resources staff

**Section three**

I wish to make the University aware of the following circumstances which have had an impact on my ability to produce four outputs or work productively between 1 January 2008 and 31 October 2013:

Please provide information required on relevant circumstance/s and continue onto a separate sheet of paper if necessary:

Circumstance	Information required
<b>Early career researcher (started career as an independent researcher on or after 1 August 2009)</b>	<i>Date on which you became an early career researcher</i>
<b>Information</b>	
<b>Part time employee</b>	<i>FTE and duration in months</i>
<b>Information</b>	
<b>Career break or secondment outside of the higher education sector</b>	<i>Dates and duration in months</i>
<b>Information</b>	
<b>Maternity leave, statutory adoption leave, or additional paternity leave (taken by partners of new mothers or co-adopters)</b>	<i>For each period of leave state which type of leave was taken and the dates and duration in months</i>
<b>Information</b>	
<b>Disability (including conditions such as cancer and chronic fatigue)</b>	<i>Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months</i>
<b>Information</b>	
<b>Mental health condition</b>	<i>Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months</i>
<b>Information</b>	



<b>Ill health or injury</b>	<i>Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months</i>
<b>Information</b>	
<b>Constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, breastfeeding, paternity, adoption or childcare <i>in addition to</i> the period of maternity, adoption or additional paternity leave taken.</b>	<i>Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months</i>
<b>Information</b>	
<b>Other caring responsibilities (including caring for an elderly or disabled relative)</b>	<i>Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months</i>
<b>Information</b>	
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	<i>Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months</i>
<b>Information</b>	
<b>Other exceptional and relevant reasons, not including teaching or administrative work</b>	<i>Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months</i>
<b>Information</b>	

Please select as appropriate:

I confirm that the information provided is a true and accurate description of my circumstances.

I recognise that the information provided will be used for REF purposes and will be seen by the Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group.

I realise that it may be necessary to share information with the UK funding bodies' REF team, who may make the information available to REF panel chairs, members and secretaries and/or the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel. Where permission is not provided, UWE will be limited in the action it can take.

Signature: ..... Date: .....  
(Staff member)

**For official use only**

Following consideration of the personal circumstances described above, the Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group:

- Will progress the staff member's inclusion in the REF submission with [insert number] of research outputs. Rationale for the proposed number of outputs:  
*e.g. this decision is based on the tariffs outlined in the panel criteria.*
  
- Requires further information of the circumstances described as follows:  
*e.g. please provide information from your occupational health assessment on the effectiveness of reasonable adjustments provided.*
  
- Does not feel that the staff member meets the criteria outlined within the REF 'Panel criteria and working methods' for submitting fewer than four research outputs. The reason(s) for this decision are:  
e.g. circumstances detailed are not recognised within the assessment framework and guidance on submissions.

If [insert name of staff member] wishes to appeal against the decision of the [insert name of the committee or individuals] they will need to do so by [insert date] and details of the appeals process can be found at [insert web address].

Signature: ..... Date: .....  
*(Chair, Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group)*

Signature: ..... Date: .....  
*(REF Manager)*

## Equality analysis form

1. Name of the activity (strategy, policy or practice etc)

Code of Practice for the Selection of Staff for the Research Excellence Framework (REF)

2. What is the aim of the activity (objective or purpose)?

The Code aims to ensure that the selection of staff for the REF is on the basis of demonstrable research excellence in the context of the REF and of UWE's REF Strategy, and that the process of selection is carried out in a fair and transparent manner.

3. If amending a current activity, what changes are proposed?

N/a

4. Who is responsible for developing and delivering the activity?

The development and implementation of the Code was overseen by the Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group (REFSG), chaired by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) with support by the University's designated REF Manager (currently the Head of R&D in RBI). The selection process was undertaken through an iterative process of draft REF submissions and recommendations, led by Unit of Assessment leaders reporting to an Associate Dean (R&KE), under the auspices of the REFSG.

5. What measures will be used to assess whether the activity is successful?

The final measure of success will be the outcome of the REF2014 exercise, which will be known in December 2014. This will be measured in terms of the quality profiles for individual submissions and for the university as a whole (and their impact on league tables and other secondary reputational impacts), and by the resulting QR funds to the University.

In terms of inclusivity, another positive indicator was the absence of appeals made on grounds of inequality in the REF selection process.

6. Does the activity have a potentially adverse impact on equality groups, in terms of employment issues and/or service delivery for students and/or staff? In the table below, please give evidence to support your yes or no answers. If the answer is not known, indicate how you will source evidence.

**Meeting the public sector equality duty**

Please also use the table below to demonstrate whether the activity has the potential to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations. Please use the 'no' column to highlight your responses.

*There were no obvious adverse impacts on these groups but the selection process has been monitored in relation to the equality profile of selected staff in comparison with that of the eligible population (see data attached) and actions taken as necessary, and will be further considered as part of the post-REF review. The Code of Practice contained clear guidance on the circumstances that need to be taken into account that may have adversely impacted on staff research productivity, and a clear process to enable this to be implemented.*

	Yes	No	Not known
Women, men, trans people			
Black and minority ethnic groups			
Disabled people			
Younger or older people			
People of different religion and beliefs			
Lesbian, gay, bisexual people			
Marriage and civil partnership			
Pregnancy and maternity			

7. Please give evidence of how you have engaged equality groups in the equality analysis process. Is further engagement required?

All staff were invited to put themselves forward for consideration at the outset of the REF process in 2011. This was further encouraged through an on-going iterative process of submission development. A further formal opportunity was made available to all eligible staff in December 2012 via letters to their home addresses, including the opportunity to

present information about any circumstances that may have impacted on their research productivity during the assessment period and which should be taken into account in the selection process. Opportunities for consideration have been reinforced at Faculty level, led by Associate Deans (R&KE) and by Unit of Assessment leaders.

A university-wide consultation process for the draft Code of Practice was undertaken during May 2012, including consultation with the unions and a meeting with staff networks.

8. What action can be taken to mitigate any potential negative impacts or address different needs? Please comment and then complete an action plan (see appendix 1).

By ensuring the selection process was carried out fairly and transparently, in line with the Code of Practice. The Code itself was required to be vetted and approved by HEFCE. To implement the Code, an initial equality briefing was undertaken by the E&D Unit and RBI for all staff involved in the selection process (ostensibly UoA leaders and Associate Deans, R&KE). A further compulsory event was held in autumn 2012 for the same group which explored REF selection issues in more detail prior to the decision making process, using materials provided by the Equality Challenge Unit.

9. Please indicate the level of equality relevance:

High

Medium

Low

10. Equality analysis completed by:

Name	Richard Bond (on behalf of the REFSG)
Post title	Head of Research Administration (and REF Manager)
Faculty / service	RBI
Date	Updated 9 January 2014

**Please return this form to the Equality and Diversity Unit for feedback and publication.**

# Equality analysis - action plan

Name of activity: Code of Practice for the Selection of Staff for the Research Excellence Framework (REF)

Plan completed by: Richard Bond (for the REFSG)

Service / faculty: RBI

Issues	Actions required	Responsible Person	Resources required	Target date	Success Indicators	What progress has been made?
<b>Information/data required</b>	Equality profiles of staff considered probable or possible for inclusion in the REF, compared to those for all eligible staff, at two rehearsal stages and final submission	Richard Bond (RBI), with Lesley Donnithorne (HR)	RBI/HR time	April 2012, May 2013 and November 2013	Data provided, analysed and considered by REFSG	Data at target dates has been provided and analysed, and presented to REFSG as basis for on-going monitoring of equality profile of REF submission. (data and analysis attached)
<b>Consultation</b>	UWE-wide consultation during May 2012, including staff networks meeting and unions.	Richard Bond (RBI) with Andrew Mclean (E&DUnit)	RBI/HR time	May 2012	Engagement with and positive reaction to Code	Consultation completed
<b>Monitoring and review arrangements</b>	REFSG to continue to monitor equality profile of REF submission as selection process develops.	REFSG with support of RBI	REFSG/RBI/HR Time.	On-going until final submission in Nov 2013	No apparent bias in REF selection process in relation to equality groups	See analysis attached. No apparent issues in relation to ethnicity, disability and age but some concern over smaller proportion of women finally submitted than men. To be considered further by REFSG.

**University of the West of England, Bristol**

<b>Publication</b>	EIA (and equality data) to be published on the E&D and REF websites	E&D unit (for E&D website) and RBI (for REF website)	RBI time	May 2012 (and updated on an on-going basis until submission in Nov 2013)	Web presence implemented and up-dated regularly.	CoP and EIA (including data and analysis) published on web during the process and at the conclusion.
<b>Other actions</b>	Equality and Diversity training (in the context of the REF) to be provided for all staff involved in the selection process.		RBI/HR/REF SG/ UoA leader time	Autumn 2012	Full attendance and positive feedback from event(s)	Initial briefings held for all UoA leaders, spring 2012. Further follow-up training provided in 2013 in line with CoP requirement..

Please return form to the Equality and Diversity Unit



## **University of the West of England, Bristol**

### **Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group**

**January 2014**

#### **Equality Analysis of REF2014 Submission**

Data attached, provided by HR, shows numbers of staff (headcount) by gender, ethnicity, disability and age for all staff eligible as Category A staff in the REF (All) and for all staff submitted to REF2014 (REF).

Some of the key observations are as follows.

#### **Totals**

27% (318) of all eligible staff were submitted to REF 2014.

#### **Gender**

41% of all staff submitted were female and 59% were male.

32% of male staff eligible for the REF were submitted compared to 22% of eligible female staff.

#### **Ethnicity**

10% of all staff submitted were BME (black minority ethnic), 87% were white and 3% unknown. 9% of all eligible staff were BME.

31% of eligible BME staff were submitted compared to 27% of eligible white staff.

#### **Disability**

21% of eligible staff who declare themselves as disabled were submitted compared to 27% of eligible staff who do not declare themselves to be disabled (but note that 40% of all eligible staff are 'undeclared' with regard to disability).

#### **Age**

The age range with the lowest proportion of staff submitted to REF2014 were the under 30s (2% of staff submitted, representing 18% of eligible staff in that age range).

The age range with the highest proportion of staff submitted to REF2014 were the 40-49 year olds (38% of staff submitted, representing 31% of eligible staff in that age range).

#### **Comparison with REF rehearsal (April 2012)**

Some differences are noted in the population of staff in the final REF submission compared to the initial selection of 'probable and possible' staff. In particular:

- a) 46% of staff identified as 'probable or possible' in the rehearsal were female; 41% of staff selected for REF2014 were female.

## **University of the West of England, Bristol**

- b) 28% of staff identified as 'probable or possible' in the rehearsal were under 40,;22% of staff selected for REF2014 were under 40

This suggests that there was a higher proportion of both female and younger staff who were considered as 'probable or possible' but who were not then submitted. Given the application of a quality threshold this may not be surprising for younger staff but a more detailed analysis is required to throw light on whether it raises equality issues that need further consideration.

Richard Bond, January 2014

## **University of the West of England, Bristol**

### **Research Excellence Framework Strategy Group**

**2 May 2012**

#### **Equality Analysis of REF Rehearsal 2011/12**

Data attached, provided by HR, shows numbers of staff (headcount) by gender, ethnicity, disability and age for a) all staff eligible as category A staff in the REF and b) all staff declared as either 'probable' or 'possible' in the REF rehearsal 2011/12.

Some of the key observations are as follows.

#### **Totals**

32% (372) of all eligible staff are currently considered to be probable/possible for REF 2014.

#### **Gender**

36% of male staff eligible for the REF are currently considered probable/possible compared to 29% of eligible female staff.

#### **Ethnicity**

39% of eligible BME (black minority ethnic) staff are currently considered probable/possible compared to 32% of eligible white staff.

#### **Disability**

27% of eligible staff who declare themselves as disabled are currently considered probable/possible compared to 32% of eligible staff who do not declare themselves to be disabled (but note that 40% of all eligible staff are 'undeclared' with regard to disability).

#### **Age**

The age range with the lowest proportion of staff currently considered probable/possible are the under 30s (6% of eligible staff).

The age range with the highest proportion of staff currently considered probable/possible are the 30-39 year olds (45% of eligible staff).

The age range with the most eligible staff are the 50-59 year olds (393) whereas the age range with the most probable/possible staff are the 40-49 year olds (131).

There are 4 staff over 70 who obviously haven't been retained because of their research profile!

Richard Bond, April 2012

**TABLE 1**

**EQUALITY ANALYSIS - APRIL 2012**

GENDER ANALYSIS

Gender	All	REF	% selected for REF	% of all selected staff
Female	586	170	29	46
Male	567	202	36	54
Grand Total	1153	372	32	100

ETHNICITY ANALYSIS

Ethnicity	All	REF	% selected for REF	% of all selected staff
BME	85	33	39	9
White	1027	329	32	88
Not known	41	10	24	3
Grand Total	1153	372	32	100

DISABLED STATUS ANALYSIS

Disabled status	All	REF	% selected for REF	% of all selected staff
Yes	44	12	27	3
No	644	207	32	56
No/Not known	465	153	33	41
Grand Total	1153	372	32	100

AGE ANALYSIS

Age band	All	REF	% selected for REF	% of all selected staff
20-29	35	2	6	1
30-39	237	101	43	27
40-49	366	131	36	35
50-59	393	106	27	28
60-69	116	30	26	8
70+	6	2	33	1
Grand Total	1153	372	32	100

TABLE 2

EQUALITY ANALYSIS - NOV 2013

GENDER ANALYSIS

	All	REF	% selected for REF		% of all selected staff
Female	586	130	22		41
Male	591	188	32		59
Grand Total	1177	318	27		100

ETHNICITY ANALYSIS

	All	REF			
BME	100	31	31		10
White	1028	278	27		87
Not Known	49	9	18		3
Grand Total	1177	318	27		100

DISABLED ANALYSIS

	All	REF			
Yes	38	8	21		3
No	725	198	27		62
No/Not Known	414	112	27		35
Grand Total	1177	318	27		100

AGE ANALYSIS

	All	REF			
20-29	39	7	18		2
30-39	221	65	29		20
40-49	390	121	31		38
50-59	412	92	22		29
60-69	112	32	29		10
70+	3	1	33		0
Grand Total	1177	318	27		100