

Research Excellence Framework 2021

Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

Introduction

This report summarises the approach that has been taken to equality impact assessing the Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2021 processes within Keele University.

The findings from all EIAs undertaken have been reviewed and considered by the REF Strategy Steering Group (RSSG) to inform their decision making on:

- i. Identification of staff with a significant responsibility for research
- ii. Determining who is an independent researcher
- iii. The selection of outputs

The equality analysis documents that have been produced during the REF process are contained within the annexes to this report.

Background

Keele's approach to EIA has been to embed equality analysis and considerations throughout the development and implementation of REF 2021 processes, starting with an EIA on our draft [Code of Practice \(CoP\)](#) (Annex A). This EIA was written as the CoP was being drafted and consulted and set out the steps we would take to eliminate or reduce any adverse impacts identified.

Our CoP sets out in detail how it relates to our institutional policies that promote and support equality, diversity and inclusion and how we embedded the principles of transparency, consistency, accountability and inclusivity into the design and implementation of REF processes.

A key action was to ensure that all REF decision makers undertook REF specific unconscious bias training. This training was specifically designed to consider how unconscious bias could impact the REF decisions and covered the process being adopted to assess research quality, with a reminder of the Institution's commitment to the [responsible use of research metrics](#). During these training sessions, equality analysis findings from mock REF exercises on the identification of staff with significant responsibility for research or research independence were shared, to raise awareness of the impact of participants decision making and to demonstrate the importance that Keele places on inclusion.

Scope

Equality analysis has been undertaken in line with EDAP's recommendations, specifically on the following policies:

1. Determining staff with significant responsibility for research
2. Determining research independence
3. Output selection including processes used to assess research quality (e.g. metrics)

In addition, EIAs have been undertaken on the development of Keele's Code of Practice and on the mock REF exercises undertaken in 2019.

This document brings together the findings from the analyses and considers the combined impact of the 3 policies named above.

All data analysis has included the following protected characteristics: ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation and disability. In addition, where possible we have carried out analysis looking at the intersection of ethnicity and gender.

Most analysis has been carried out at the institutional level due to the low numbers of staff in the majority of UoAs; 12 UoAs have less than 20FTE.

Each EIA identifies groups who may be potentially affected by the REF processes. Keele's initial assessment of potential impact identified that some groups of staff may have circumstances that affect their ability to research productively through the period. This is likely to be linked to time away from work e.g. family related leave, sickness absence, secondments, career breaks, disability leave, caring responsibilities or gender reassignment. In addition, analysis from Keele's REF 2014 submission showed that while there had been a significant increase in the proportion of eligible female staff submitted (41% in RAE 2008 to 52% in REF 2014), at the institutional level, proportionally fewer female staff were submitted. All EIAs were carried out and considered within this context.

Analyses

The analysis for each EIA is contained within the following Annexes:

Annex A

Equality Analysis on Keele University's CoP, drafted in October 2018 and updated during the consultation period until the CoP was submitted to EDAP on 16 May 2019.

Annex B

Equality Analysis findings on the mock REF exercise, which were shared as part of the unconscious bias training for REF decision makers in June 2019.

Annex C

Updated Equality Analysis findings on mock REF exercise, which were shared with RSSG in August 2019

Annex D

Equality Analysis on UoA Staff Group recommendations for determining staff with significant responsibility for research or research independence.

There are 2 versions of this analysis. The first was produced and considered by RSSG in January 2020 and it was then updated and considered in November 2020, following staffing changes. The November 2020 document details the final analysis of Keele's REF submission.

This analysis examines the characteristics of staff with significant responsibility for research or research independence in comparison to the characteristics of eligible academic staff.

Analysis was carried out at the Institutional level and separately excluding staff from the Schools of Nursing and Midwifery (NaM) and Allied Health Professionals (AHP). These two schools are in the

early stages of developing their research strategy and focus on disciplines traditionally undertaken by women.

Annex E

Equality Analysis on UoA Output Group recommendations for output selection

This document examines the distribution of outputs by the characteristics of staff within the output pool. Analysis is presented by ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation and disability at the institutional level. Analysis has been undertaken at UoA level, but data is only presented where there are more than 5 members of staff within each group to ensure anonymity, in line with our usual equality reporting and analysis practices.

The analysis on the distribution of outputs is presented in three ways:

1. average (mean) number of outputs by group
2. the proportion of each group by number of outputs (1 to 5)
3. the proportion of each group with less than or more than 2.5 outputs

This analysis also considers the impact that personal circumstances might have had on the output pool.

Conclusions

The findings from the equality analysis on determining staff with significant responsibility for research were broadly in line with the analysis on the outcomes of our mock 'Ready for REF' exercise. Key findings were:

- Overall, 74.7% of Education and Research staff have significant responsibility for research an improvement on REF 2014 (58.3%).
- Analysis by ethnicity and sexual orientation, for the current populations, show no cause for concern. However, due to low overall representation, it remains important to monitor any changes in these groups.
- Analysis by disability, when areas with low research productivity are excluded (NaM and AHP), shows no cause for concern, and a small disparity when these areas are included.
- Analysis by gender shows a small disparity when NaM and AHP are excluded and a notable disparity when these are included.
- Intersectional analysis shows the likelihood of having significant responsibility for research from highest to lowest is in the order BAME women > non-BAME men > BAME men > non-BAME women.
- The low proportion of non-BAME women with significant responsibility is notable. However, this is largely explained by the high representation of non-BAME women in NaM and AHP

Whilst, following this analysis there are no concerns in the process for identifying significant responsibility for research on the grounds of ethnicity, sexual orientation and disability, the University remains committed to increasing overall representation of these groups, where they are under-represented, and ensuring all staff are supported to thrive, in-line with relevant equality action plans.

Particular barriers to research-activity remain in the Schools of NaM and AHP; these disproportionately affect women. These Schools are aware of the issues and have action plans in place within their School Athena Swan submissions to focus on building research capacity but also to

support staff who choose teaching and scholarship careers. Both schools currently hold a Bronze departmental Athena Swan award.

The limitation to the analysis is that the overall institutional picture may not be replicated within different UoA's. Equality analysis has not been possible at UoA level due to the low numbers of staff in the majority of UoA's, however this data will be made available to school EDI teams who will carry out gender analysis on REF eligibility. EDI leads will be provided with their relevant gender data by School, following the final REF submission, in order to develop actions as appropriate and feed into their departmental Athena Swan submissions.

Regarding determining research independence, overall, 19.2% of staff are recommended to have research independence out of the potentially eligible population (99 staff). There are small numbers of staff on 'Research Only' contracts and therefore it is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions when analysing protected characteristics with low levels of disclosure and/or representation. Gender is the only characteristic where meaningful conclusions can be drawn and analysis shows that a higher proportion of women are recommended to have research independence. 49.5% of the eligible population are female and 57.9% of those recommended to have research independence are female.

The analysis of output selection at the Institutional level identified some unevenness in the distribution of outputs by the characteristics of staff within the output pool however, the analysis by UoA shows no clear disadvantage by ethnicity or gender (the only protected characteristics able to be analysed). It is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions for the analysis by sexual orientation and disability due to the small numbers of staff in some of these groups.

Proportionally more BAME staff submit 1 output compared to non-BAME staff (+7%) and a higher proportion of non-BAME staff submitted more than 2.5 outputs (+7%). Equal proportions of BAME and non-BAME staff submitted personal circumstances, and analysis of that group shows that proportionally more BAME staff (+12%) submitted more than 2.5 outputs.

Proportionally more women submit 1 output compared to men (+10%) and a higher proportion of men submitted more than 2.5 outputs (+7%). A higher proportion of women submitted personal circumstances (60% of circumstances were submitted by women). Analysis of the group who submitted circumstances shows that even proportions submitted more than 2.5 outputs (26% of women and 25% of men).

It was anticipated in earlier EIAs that women are more likely to take longer periods of family related leave, work part time and undertake caring responsibilities, all of which have the potential to impact on research careers and a researcher's ability to produce outputs. When the data of individuals who chose to declare personal circumstances were excluded from the analysis, there is little change to the overall data. While the REF processes, through the individual circumstances process, were designed to take this into account, the data shows that proportionally there are fewer outputs attributed to women in the submission than men. Further investigation was undertaken to establish whether part time working has contributed to the lower average number of outputs for the female group, however, this still shows that men contribute more outputs to the pool than women, relative to their overall FTE. Possible reasons for this disparity could include;

1. not all women who have had circumstances which impacted on their research productivity declared these circumstances
2. the research quality of the male group being assessed as higher
3. a combination of 1 and 2

With regard to the declaration of circumstances, we are aware that not all ECR staff declared this status; 37 staff with significant responsibility for research declared an ECR status compared to 65 ECRs we identified in our 2019/20 HESA return and at least 6 women chose not to declare their period of maternity leave.

The process for scoring outputs was designed to reduce the chance of bias affecting scoring, with all outputs being reviewed by at least 2 reviewers, using the 12 point scoring system to enable greater granularity and to facilitate the selection of outputs. In addition, a third of all outputs were sent to external reviewers to benchmark internal scoring.

The process followed by the UoA Output Groups accords to Keele's Institutional Code of Practice, in which we as an institution sought to embrace the decoupling of staff and outputs as set out in the REF rules and to avoid reliance on metrics in the assessment of output quality.

The findings of this analysis will be shared with Research Committee and the relevant EDI groups who are due to commence work on new action plans in support of gender and race equality.

Action plan

Keele University has a long-standing commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion and these are core values which underpin our mission. We are proud of our commitment to advancing equality across all groups and have signed up to relevant equality charters to guide and drive forward the EDI agenda at Keele.

The equality analysis undertaken on our REF processes has not been undertaken in isolation and has shaped and informed our approach as we moved through the REF timeframe. The findings of the multiple analyses have led us to identify areas where we can improve and these will be taken forward by identified committees in line with our commitment to mainstream EDI into all that we do.

1. To increase the proportion of women with significant responsibility for research

REF equality analysis data will be made available to school EDI teams who will carry out gender analysis on REF eligibility. EDI leads will be provided with their relevant gender data by School, following the final REF submission, in order to develop actions as appropriate and feed into their departmental Athena Swan submissions.

Through the EDI Steering Group, and led by the Institutional Lead for Gender Equality, the review of our Athena Swan action plan will use the data from this analysis to assess the effectiveness of the actions to support women's research careers and inform future actions.

2. To bring the average number of outputs submitted by BAME and non-BAME staff in line

While it was encouraging to see that there is no disparity between BAME and non-BAME staff groups with significant responsibility for research, the data analysis on output selection will be shared with our Race Equality Charter (REC) Self-Assessment Team (SAT), to inform our next REC award submission. The REC SAT will consider appropriate actions to address the slight disparity in the average number of outputs submitted by BAME and non-BAME staff.

3. To undertake further analysis at school level on output data by gender

REF output data will be made available to our school and University EDI teams who will carry out further gender analysis which can be fed into departmental Athena Swan submissions and the Institutional Athena Swan submission.

4. To identify actions to enable research for disabled staff

EDI groups will be asked to consider actions to enable research for disabled staff and the recent relaunch of our Disabled Staff Network will be a useful forum to consult on any proposed actions.

5. Communicate the EIA findings

The findings of this analysis will be shared with Research Committee and the relevant EDI groups who are due to commence work on new action plans in support of gender and race equality.

Annexes

Annex A – EIA on Draft REF 2021 Code of Practice

Annex B – EIA on Mock REF exercise – used in unconscious bias training

Annex C – updated EIA on Mock REF exercise for RSSG

Annex D – EIA on UoA Staff Group recommendations (January 2020 and November 2020)

Annex E – EIA on UoA Output Group recommendations

Equality Analysis

Please use this form as working document and submit your final Equality Analysis [here](#)

Name of Policy	Draft REF 2021 Code of Practice
Purpose	<p>HEIs submitting to REF 2021 must produce a Code of Practice on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The fair and transparent identification of staff with a significant responsibility for research 2. Determining who is an independent researcher 3. The selection of outputs <p>In July 2018 draft guidelines on producing a code of practice were released and due to the timescales set by Research England, work commenced at Keele in late August to develop internal processes based on the draft guidelines. The final guidance from Research England was published in March 2019. Keele submitted the draft CoP to EDAP on 16 May 2019 ahead of the 7 June 2019 deadline.</p>
Person responsible for the policy	Professor David Amigoni, PVC Research and Enterprise
Person completing the EA	Nicola Ratcliffe, Head of HR (Strategy & Policy) and Ellie James, Head of Research Quality
Date of EA	October 2018 & ongoing
Faculty/Directorate	Vice Chancellors Office
School/Department	VCO
Has the policy previously been subject to EA?	No – this is a new Code of Practice
If so, what are the main changes since the EA?	n/a
Which Committee will formally approve this policy	UEC

1. Initial assessment of potential impact

The REF guidelines on developing codes of practice are intended to assist all HEIs to draw up a code which frames decision-making processes in relation to REF 2021 in the context of the principles of equality and diversity, and all relevant legislation.

The REF guidance has been used as a key point of reference in developing draft processes to ensure that the draft REF procedures do not discriminate unlawfully against, or otherwise have the effect of

harassing or victimising individuals because of age, disability, gender identity, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation or because they are pregnant or have recently given birth.

The REF guidance includes a template for codes of practice which has been used to develop Keele's code.

Some staff may have circumstances which have affected their ability to research productively throughout the period. This is likely to be linked to time away from work for example due to: maternity leave, parental leave, adoption leave, sickness absence, secondment, career break, disability, caring responsibilities or gender reassignment. REF have also identified that early career researchers will not have had the same amount of time for research. Keele supports the inclusion of a process to take into account such circumstances and has developed a process to consider circumstances and will submit for a reduction request for those which meet the REF criteria.

2. Relevant data

An EIA was undertaken on the University's REF 2014 submission. This was reviewed at University Research Committee on 11 February 2014 and 13 May 2014. The analysis showed that 58% of eligible staff (headcount) had been submitted, and there was a significant increase in the proportion of eligible female staff submitted: from 41% in RAE 2008 to 52% in REF 2014. The schools of Nursing & Midwifery and Health and Rehabilitation are at the beginning of developing a research culture within their respective schools and consequently very few staff in these schools were submitted to the REF. If staff from these schools are removed from the analysis, the same proportions of men and women (65.1%) were submitted to REF.

Data analysis will be undertaken as the consultation and development of the code continues, in particular following the Ready for REF meetings. The findings will then be used to inform the code.

Consultation will be undertaken with: UoA leads, Heads of School, RI Directors, UCU, Faculty EDI groups, open meetings for any member of staff to attend, Senate, Council.

The REF guidelines on codes of practice have been helpful to identify areas where steps could be taken to eliminate or reduce the potential for adverse impact; these are set out in section 3 of this EA.

3. Steps to eliminate or reduce any adverse impact

As suggested in the guidance, it has been identified in the code where we will undertake data analysis for equality impact, e.g. following the Ready for REF meetings.

As suggested in the guidance, EDI training, including unconscious bias, tailored to REF will be developed/sourced and provided to all members of the panels/committees.

Consideration of the gender balance of panels/committees has been identified and the option to co-opt additional members to ensure there is female representation has been written into the code.

The processes suggested are University wide, seeking to reduce local variations which could lead to inconsistent implementation and decision making.

It is proposed that the processes for (1) the fair and transparent identification of staff with a significant responsibility for research and (2) determining who is an independent researcher are the same, with the aim of ensuring consistent treatment.

The proposals seek to minimise variation in the application of the criteria for identifying staff with significant responsibility for research across Units of Assessment, and where there may be variations it will be a requirement to justify them based on variations in employment practices at Unit of Assessment level.

Communication of the code has been considered and will be detailed within the code to ensure that the processes are transparent.

It has been identified that the final code will be made available in accessible formats and publicised, including to those who are absent from work.

The process for scoring outputs internally will be undertaken by at least 2 reviewers using a 12 point scoring system to enable greater granularity and facilitate selection of outputs. It is important that at least 2 people score to reduce the chance of bias affecting scoring. 1/3 of outputs will also be sent to an external reviewer to benchmark internal scoring.

4. Potential for positive impact

As part of the consultation ran by REF the University supported the facility to take into account staff circumstances which may have affected their ability to research productively throughout the period. The proposed process for disclosing and considering individual circumstances within the University has been developed to try to maintain confidentiality and all circumstances will be submitted to a single University group who will review circumstances against the REF criteria (documented in the Guidance on Submissions) and will apply these consistently. Eligible cases will then be put forward to the REF/EDAP panel and those which are approved will be communicated to the UoA lead, without identifying individuals, apart from where there is approval to remove the minimum of one output requirement. The members of the REF Individual Circumstances panel will review the distribution of outputs across staff within the UoA to make checks to ensure that the reductions in outputs have been broadly applied and will report this to the RSSG.

5. Decision

- **No major change**
- ~~**Adjust the policy**~~
- ~~**Continue the policy**~~
- ~~**Stop and remove policy**~~

Please explain:

This analysis has been undertaken on the draft code and is subject to further consultation and review. It will be updated as required.

6. Submission

Name of the person who reviewed this EA (note: this person should be a member of the committee specified above) Professor David Amigoni

Date submitted: 16 May 2019

7. Monitoring and review

Date for the next review: Ongoing as part of the consultation process

Explain the monitoring and review process: There will be data analysis following the Ready for REF meetings.

Person responsible for the policy review: Professor David Amigoni

Keele’s Equality Analysis Data - SRFR

	% Green		% Green
BAME	73.7%	LGBTI	82.4%
Non-BAME	65.5%	Not LGBTI	64.7%
Refused (ethnicity)	85.7%	Refused (Sexual Orientation)	70.0%
Declared disability	53.1%		
No disability	68.1%	Male	77.5%
Refused (disability)	84.6%	Female	55.8%

% Green (All staff) = 67.5%



SRFR (excluding N&M and SHAR)

	% Green		% Green
BAME	74.5%	LGBTI	82.4%
Non-BAME	73.4%	Not LGBTI	73.1%
Refused (ethnicity)	94.7%	Refused (Sexual Orientation)	75.8%
Declared disability	64.0%		
No disability	74.9%	Male	78.5%
Refused (disability)	84.6%	Female	68.9%

% Green (All staff) = 74.6%



Research Independence

	% Green		% Green
BAME	15.8%	LGBTI	0%
Non-BAME	24.1%	Not LGBTI	20.5%
Refused (ethnicity)	0%	Refused (Sexual Orientation)	27.7%
Declared disability	11.1%		
No disability	23.3%	Male	15.4%
Refused (disability)	0%	Female	28%

% Green (All staff) = 21.6%



Equality Analysis on the outcomes from the Ready for REF meetings

In April and May 2019, Research Operations coordinated a mock exercise, to identify staff who are likely to have Significant Responsibility for Research or Research Independence. The EDI Training for REF decision makers, which ran during the summer, shared the initial findings of an equality analysis on the outcomes from these ‘Ready for REF’ meetings which was carried out in May 19.

The analysis has now been updated to reflect staff departures under the recent voluntary severance scheme and the outcomes from the translation process.

1. Significant Responsibility for Research

The proportion of eligible staff rated as ‘Green’ (i.e. likely to have significant responsibility for research) has increased to 70.8% (from 67.5%). Analysis by protected characteristic is set out below, with the variance from the previously reported data in brackets.

	% Green		% Green
BAME	76.5% (+2.8%)	LGB	86.7% (+4.3%)
Non-BAME	69.2% (+3.7%)	Not LGB	67.1% (-2.4%)
Refused (Ethnicity)	81.8% (-3.9%)	Refused (Sexual Orientation)	74.7% (+4.7%)
Declared disability	60.7% (+7.6%)		
No disability	71.2% (+3.1%)	Male	79.3% (+1.8%)
Refused (disability)	81.8% (-2.8%)	Female	60.4% (+4.6%)

Excluding Schools of Nursing & Midwifery and Allied Health Professionals, the proportion of eligible staff rated as ‘Green’ increases to 78% (from 74.6%).

	% Green		% Green
BAME	77.6% (+3.1%)	LGB	86.7% (+4.3%)
Non-BAME	77.3% (+3.9%)	Not LGB	77.0% (+3.9%)
Refused (Ethnicity)	90.0% (-4.7%)	Refused (Sexual Orientation)	78.5% (+2.7%)
Declared disability	72.7% (+8.7%)		
No disability	78.2% (+3.3%)	Male	80.8% (+2.3%)
Refused (disability)	81.8% (-2.8%)	Female	73.8% (+4.9%)

2. Research Independence

The proportion of Research Only staff rated as ‘Green’ (i.e. likely to be independent researchers) has decreased slightly to 20.5% (from 21.6%).

	% Green		% Green
BAME	16.7% (+0.9%)	LGB	0 (-)
Non-BAME	22.1% (-2.0%)	Not LGB	17.4% (-3.1%)
Refused (Ethnicity)	0 (-)	Refused (Sexual Orientation)	35.3% (+7.6%)
Declared disability	11.1% (-)		

No disability	22.1% (-1.2%)	Male	15.9% (+0.5%)
Refused (disability)	0 (-)	Female	25.0% (-3.0%)

Annex D – EIA on UoA Staff Group recommendations (January 2020 and November 2020)

Equality Analysis on the outcomes of the UoA Staff Group Meetings – January 2020

This equality analysis examines the recommendations from the 17 UoA Staff Groups which are presented to RSSG for approval.

Overall, 71.3% of Education and Research staff are recommended to have Significant Responsibility for Research (SRFR) and 17.2% of research only staff are recommended to have research independence. This varies by UoA, with 4 units submitting 100% of staff and 13 units submitting between 37-97% of staff. Equality Analysis has not been possible at UoA level due to the low numbers of staff in the majority of UoAs; 12 UoAs have less than 20FTE.

1. Process for identifying Significant Responsibility for Research

Analysis has been undertaken by ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation and disability. In addition, RSSG are presented with analysis looking at the intersection of ethnicity and gender. Overall the findings of the analysis are broadly in line with the equality analysis presented to RSSG in August 2019, on the outcomes of the 'Ready for REF' exercise undertaken in May 2019.

Ethnicity

Row Labels	BAME	Non-BAME	Unknown	Grand Total
SRFR	77.0%	69.1%	87.5%	71.3%
No SRFR	23.0%	30.9%	12.5%	28.7%

14.4% of eligible staff are BAME

15.5% of those identified as having SRFR are BAME

The proportion of BAME staff recommended to have SRFR is higher than the overall proportion of BAME staff in the eligible population. In the last REF, the submission rate for BAME staff was 51.4% and for non-BAME staff was 58.1%. Our Race Equality Action plan details an action to reduce the gap in the submission rate for REF 2021 and eliminate it for the next REF. Subject to RSSG approving the UoA recommendations, there will be no gap in submission rates for BAME staff. There is a higher BAME population at Keele University in 2020 compared to 2014. However, BAME staff representation is still low in comparison to all benchmarks and the University has set ambitious targets to increase BAME representation at all levels. Continued monitoring will be important as the BAME staff population increases.

Gender

	Female	Male	Grand Total
Row Labels			
SRFR	61.7%	79.5%	71.3%
No SRFR	38.3%	20.5%	28.7%

46.1% of eligible staff are female

40% of those identified as having SRFR are female

The proportion of women recommended to have SRFR is lower than the population total. There is a significant gap between the proportion of men and women recommended to have SRFR (17.8%) though this has reduced slightly compared the analysis on the Ready for REF meetings (from 18.9%).

In 2014, 52.0% of eligible women and 63.4% of men were submitted. There are significant increases in the proportion of both genders, though notably there is a larger increase in the proportion of men. Further analysis is detailed below excluding the staff from the Schools of Nursing & Midwifery (NaM) and Allied Health Professionals (AHP).

Sexual Orientation

	LGB	Not LGB	Unknown	Grand Total
Row Labels				
SRFR	89.47%	68.02%	74.21%	71.29%
No SRFR	10.53%	31.98%	25.79%	28.71%

4.5% of eligible staff identify as LGB

5.6% of those identified as having SRFR identify as LGB

This is the first year we have been able to report on sexual orientation, though the analysis should be considered in the context of low disclosure rates and a high proportion of refused data (37.4% of the population). The data analysis shows a higher proportion of staff with a LGB identity being recommended as having significant responsibility for research in comparison to non-LGB and unknown orientations.

Disability

	No	Not Known	Yes	Grand Total
Row Labels				
SRFR	71.4%	84.6%	63.0%	71.3%
No SRFR	28.6%	15.4%	37.0%	28.7%

6.4% of eligible staff have declared a disability

5.6% of those identified as having SRFR have declared a disability

The proportion of staff who have declared a disability being recommended to have SRFR is lower than the eligible population however, the number of staff declaring a disability is low and the data should be considered within this context. In REF 2014, 40% of disabled staff were submitted compared to 56.9% of staff who did not declare a disability. Should RSSG approve the recommendations there will be a significant increase in the proportion of staff declaring a disability being submitted.

Intersectional Analysis – Gender and Ethnicity (Note: unknown Ethnicity is not shown separately, but is included in the total)

	Female		Male		Grand Total
Row Labels	BAME	Non-BAME	BAME	Non-BAME	
SRFR	82.1%	57.2%	72.7%	79.6%	71.3%
No SRFR	17.9%	42.8%	27.3%	20.4%	28.7%

6.6% of eligible staff are BAME females

7.6% of those identified as having SRFR are BAME females

7.8% of eligible staff are BAME males

7.9% of those identified as having SRFR are BAME males

This is the first year this analysis has been provided. Non-BAME women are the group with the lowest proportion of staff recommended as having SRFR. This reinforces the analysis above, that SRFR by gender has the largest gap. BAME women are the group with the largest proportion of staff being put forward as having SRFR, but they are also (just) the smallest group.

Analysis Excluding Staff from the Schools of Nursing & Midwifery and Allied Health Professionals

Further analysis has been undertaken, excluding staff from the Schools of NaM and AHP. These 2 schools are in the early stages of developing their research strategy and focus on disciplines traditionally undertaken by women.

Overall 78.6% of eligible staff are recommended to have SRFR.

Ethnicity

	BAME	Non-BAME	Unknown	Grand Total
Row Labels				
SRFR	79.7%	77.5%	90.9%	78.6%
No SRFR	20.3%	22.5%	9.1%	21.4%

15.6% of eligible staff are BAME

15.8% of those identified as having SRFR are BAME

This analysis sees broad increases in the proportion of staff in all groups being recommended as having SRFR. There is no significant change to the findings of the above analysis.

Gender

	Female	Male	Grand Total
Row Labels			
SRFR	74.8%	81.4%	78.6%
No SRFR	25.2%	18.6%	21.4%

42.0% of eligible staff are female

40.0% of those identified as having SRFR are female

The exclusion of staff from the Schools of NaM and AHP has had an impact on the analysis by gender. The gender profile of the proportion of the eligible population reduces to 42% female, and is in line with the gender profile of the population recommended as having SRFR, 40% female.

Looking at the female population, 74.8% are recommended to have significant responsibility for research, an increase of 13.1% compared to the data including the Schools of NaM and AHP. The Male population has increased slightly, by 1.9% to 81.4%.

Supporting the development of women's research careers in the Schools of NaM and AHP as the research strategy in each school develops is a priority action. This is an area which is identified in both Schools Athena SWAN submissions and action plans.

Sexual Orientation

	LGB	Not LGB	Unknown	Grand Total
Row Labels				
SRFR	89.47%	77.57%	78.77%	78.63%
No SRFR	10.53%	22.43%	21.23%	21.37%

5.0% of eligible staff identify as LGB
 5.7% of those identified as having SRFR identify as LGB

This analysis sees slight changes in the proportion of staff in all groups being recommended as having SRFR. There is no significant change to the findings of the above analysis.

Disability

	No	Not Known	Yes	Grand Total
Row Labels				
SRFR	78.6%	83.3%	76.2%	78.6%
No SRFR	21.4%	16.7%	23.8%	21.4%

5.5% of eligible staff have declared a disability
 5.4% of those identified as having SRFR have declared a disability

The exclusion of the staff from the Schools of NaM and AHP has increased the proportion of staff who have declared a disability being recommended to have SRFR to be nearly in line with the overall population. However, as stated earlier, the number of staff declaring a disability in the overall population is low and the data should be considered within this context.

Intersectional Analysis – Gender and Ethnicity

	Female		Male		Grand Total
Row Labels	BAME	Non-BAME	BAME	Non-BAME	
SRFR	85.2%	71.8%	75.0%	81.6%	78.6%
No SRFR	14.8%	28.2%	25.0%	18.4%	21.4%

7.1% of eligible staff are BAME females
 7.7% of those identified as having SRFR are BAME females
 8.4% of eligible staff are BAME males
 8.1% of those identified as having SRFR are BAME males

The analysis shows increases in the proportion of staff being recommended as having SRFR across all groups, with a significant increase of 14.6% in the proportion of non-BAME women. This is in line with the findings by gender.

Summary of Findings

- Overall 71.3% of eligible staff have SRFR an improvement on REF2014 (where 58.3% of eligible staff were submitted).
- Analysis by ethnicity and sexual orientation, for the current populations, show no cause for concern. However, due to low overall representation, it remains important to monitor any changes in these groups.
- Analysis by disability, when areas with low research productivity are excluded (SNaM and AHP), shows no cause for concern, and a small disparity when these areas are included.
- Analysis by gender shows a small disparity when SNaM and AHP are excluded and a notable disparity when these are included.
- Intersectional analysis shows the likelihood of having SRFR from highest to lowest is in the order BAME women > non-BAME men > BAME men > non-BAME women.
- The low proportion of non-BAME women with SRFR is notable. However, this is largely explained by the high representation of non-BAME women in SNaM and AHP

Whilst, following this analysis there no concerns in the process for identifying SRFR on the grounds of ethnicity, sexual orientation and disability, the University remains committed to increasing overall representation of these groups, where they are under-represented, and ensuring all staff are supported to thrive, in-line with relevant action plans.

Particular barriers to research-activity remain in the Schools of NaM and AHP fields; these disproportionately affect women. These Schools are aware of the issues and have action plans in place within their School Athena SWAN submissions to focus on building research capacity but also to support staff who choose teaching and scholarship careers.

The limitation to the analysis, is that the overall institutional picture may not be replicated within different UoA's. School EDI teams carry out gender analysis for REF eligibility and EDI leads will be provided with their relevant gender data by School, following the final REF submission, in order to develop actions as appropriate.

2. Process for identifying Research Independence

There are small numbers of staff on 'Research Only' contracts and therefore it is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions when analysing protected characteristics with low levels of disclosure and/or representation. Gender is the only characteristic where meaningful conclusions can be drawn.

Overall, 17.2% of staff are recommended to have research independence out of the potentially eligible population (93 staff). The below table summarises the equality analysis findings.

	% Recommended as having Research Independence		% Recommended as having Research Independence
BAME	10%	LGB	0
Non-BAME	19.7%	Not LGB	11.0%
Refused (Ethnicity)	0	Refused (Sexual Orientation)	53.3%
Declared disability	14.3%		
No disability	17.9%	Male	13.6%
Refused (disability)	0	Female	20.4%

A higher proportion of women are recommended to have research independence. 52.3% of the eligible population are female and 62.5% of those recommended to have research independence are female.

Equality Analysis on the outcomes of the Unit of Assessment (UoA) Staff Group Meetings – November 2020

This equality analysis examines the final recommendations from the UoA Staff Groups which are presented to REF Strategy Steering Group (RSSG) for approval. The analysis has been carried out on the outcomes of Keele’s process for determining significant responsibility for research and research independence on the REF census date, 31 July 2020. This analysis will be submitted to Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP) in line with Research England requirements.

RSSG considered an equality analysis in January 2020, which reviewed the outcomes of the UoA Staff Group meetings at that date, since then, there have been some staff changes, mainly new starters, and these are included in this final analysis.

Overall, 74.7% of Education and Research staff¹ are recommended to have Significant Responsibility for Research (SRFR) and 19.2% of research only staff are recommended to have research independence. This varies by UoA, with 11 units submitting 100% of staff and 13 units submitting between 45-90% of staff. Equality Analysis has not been possible at UoA level due to the low numbers of staff in the majority of UoAs; 12 UoAs have less than 20FTE.

3. Process for identifying Significant Responsibility for Research

Analysis has been undertaken by ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation and disability. In addition, RSSG are presented with analysis looking at the intersection of ethnicity and gender.

The findings in this analysis, replicate the trends identified in the analysis presented to RSSG in January 2020 and both are broadly in line with the equality analysis presented to RSSG in August 2019, on the outcomes of the ‘Ready for REF’ exercise undertaken in May 2019.

Ethnicity

For data analysis purposes, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) staff have been aggregated.

Row Labels	BAME	Non-BAME	Unknown	Grand Total
SRFR	83.8%	72.2%	84.6%	74.5%
No SRFR	16.2%	27.8%	15.4%	25.5%

15.3% of eligible staff are BAME

17.2% of those identified as having SRFR are BAME

The proportion of BAME staff recommended to have SRFR is higher than the overall proportion of BAME staff in the eligible population. In the last REF, the submission rate for BAME staff was 51.4%

¹ Analysis is based on headcount

and for non-BAME staff was 58.1%. Our Race Equality Action plan details an action to reduce the gap in the submission rate for REF 2021 and eliminate it for the next REF. Subject to RSSG approving the UoA recommendations, there will be no gap in submission rates for BAME staff. There is a higher BAME population at Keele University in 2020 compared to 2014. However, BAME staff representation is still low in comparison to all benchmarks and the University has set ambitious targets to increase BAME representation at all levels. Continued monitoring will be important as the BAME staff population increases.

The University recognises that BAME staff are not a homogenous group and further analysis has been undertaken on the group of BAME staff who have been determined not to have significant responsibility for research. While we do not report the data due to the small numbers of staff in this group, we note that the ethnic profile is in line with the ethnic profile of the whole Teaching and Research BAME staff group and therefore have not identified any areas of concern.

Gender

	Female	Male	Grand Total
Row Labels			
SRFR	65.2%	82.7%	74.7%
No SRFR	34.8%	17.3%	25.3%

44.7% of eligible staff are female

39.1% of those identified as having SRFR are female

The proportion of women recommended to have SRFR is lower than the population total. There is a significant gap between the proportion of men and women recommended to have SRFR (17.5%) though this has reduced slightly compared to both the analysis on the Ready for REF meetings (from 18.9%) and the initial analysis in January (from 17.8%).

In 2014, 52.0% of eligible women and 63.4% of men were submitted. There are significant increases in the proportion of both genders, though notably there is a larger increase in the proportion of men. Further analysis is detailed below excluding the staff from the Schools of Nursing & Midwifery (NaM) and Allied Health Professionals (AHP).

Sexual Orientation

	LGB	Not LGB	Unknown	Grand Total
Row Labels				
SRFR	90.0%	71.9%	77.5%	74.7%
No SRFR	10.0%	28.1%	22.5%	25.3%

4.5% of eligible staff identify as LGB

5.4% of those identified as having SRFR identify as LGB

This is the first year we have been able to report on sexual orientation, though the analysis should be considered in the context of low disclosure rates and a high proportion of refused data (36.1% of the population). The data analysis shows a higher proportion of staff with an LGB sexual orientation being recommended as having significant responsibility for research in comparison to non-LGB and unknown orientations.

Disability

	No	Not Known	Yes	Grand Total
Row Labels				
SRFR	74.8%	85.7%	71.9%	74.7%
No SRFR	25.2%	14.3%	28.1%	25.3%

7.2% of eligible staff have declared a disability

7.0% of those identified as having SRFR have declared a disability

The proportion of staff who have declared a disability being recommended to have SRFR is slightly lower than the eligible population however, the number of staff declaring a disability is low and the data should be considered within this context. In REF 2014, 40% of disabled staff were submitted compared to 56.9% of staff who did not declare a disability. Should RSSG approve the recommendations there will be a significant increase in the proportion of staff declaring a disability being submitted.

Intersectional Analysis – Gender and Ethnicity (Note: unknown Ethnicity is not shown separately, but is included in the total)

	Female		Male		Grand Total
Row Labels	BAME	Non-BAME	BAME	Non-BAME	
SRFR	89.7%	60.6%	79.5%	82.0%	74.7%
No SRFR	10.3%	39.4%	20.5%	18.0%	25.3%

6.5% of eligible staff are BAME females

7.9% of those identified as having SRFR are BAME females

8.8% of eligible staff are BAME males

9.4% of those identified as having SRFR are BAME males

This is the first year this analysis has been provided. Non-BAME women are the group with the lowest proportion of staff recommended as having SRFR. This reinforces the analysis above, that SRFR by gender has the largest gap. BAME women are the group with the largest proportion of staff being put forward as having SRFR, but they are also (just) the smallest group.

Analysis Excluding Staff from the Schools of Nursing & Midwifery and Allied Health Professionals

Further analysis has been undertaken, excluding staff from the Schools of NaM and AHP. These 2 schools are in the early stages of developing their research strategy and focus on disciplines traditionally undertaken by women.

Overall, 82.1% of eligible staff are recommended to have SRFR.

Ethnicity

	BAME	Non-BAME	Unknown	Grand Total
Row Labels				
SRFR	86.4%	80.8%	91.3%	82.3%
No SRFR	13.6%	19.2%	8.7%	17.7%

16.7% of eligible staff are BAME

17.5% of those identified as having SRFR are BAME

This analysis sees broad increases in the proportion of staff in all groups being recommended as having SRFR. There is no significant change to the findings of the above analysis.

Gender

	Female	Male	Grand Total
Row Labels			
SRFR	78.9%	85.0%	82.3%
No SRFR	21.1%	15.0%	17.7%

40.1% of eligible staff are female

39.0% of those identified as having SRFR are female

The exclusion of staff from the Schools of NaM and AHP has had an impact on the analysis by gender. The gender profile of the proportion of the eligible population reduces to 40% female, and is in line with the gender profile of the population recommended as having SRFR, 39% female.

Looking at the female population, 78.9% are recommended to have significant responsibility for research, an increase of 13.7% compared to the data including the Schools of NaM and AHP. This figure has increased by 0.5% compared to the analysis undertaken in January 2020.

The proportion of the Male population recommended to have significant responsibility for research has increased slightly, by 2.3% to 85.0%.

Supporting the development of women’s research careers in the Schools of NaM and AHP as the research strategy in each school develops is a priority action. This is an area which is identified in both Schools Athena SWAN submissions and action plans.

Sexual Orientation

Row Labels	LGB	Not LGB	Unknown	Grand Total
SRFR	90.0%	82.0%	81.8%	82.3%
No SRFR	10.0%	18.0%	18.2%	17.7%

5.0% of eligible staff identify as LGB

5.5% of those identified as having SRFR identify as LGB

This analysis sees slight changes in the proportion of staff in all groups being recommended as having SRFR. There is no significant change to the findings of the above analysis.

Disability

Row Labels	No	Not Known	Yes	Grand Total
SRFR	82.1%	85.7%	84.6%	82.3%
No SRFR	17.9%	14.3%	15.4%	17.7%

6.6% of eligible staff have declared a disability

6.7% of those identified as having SRFR have declared a disability

The exclusion of the staff from the Schools of NaM and AHP has increased the proportion of staff who have declared a disability being recommended to have SRFR to be 84.6%. However, as stated

earlier, the number of staff declaring a disability in the overall population is low and the data should be considered within this context.

Intersectional Analysis – Gender and Ethnicity

	Female		Male		Grand Total
Row Labels	BAME	Non-BAME	BAME	Non-BAME	
SRFR	92.9%	75.4%	81.6%	84.5%	82.3%
No SRFR	7.1%	24.6%	18.4%	15.5%	17.7%

7.1% of eligible staff are BAME females

8.0% of those identified as having SRFR are BAME females

9.6% of eligible staff are BAME males

9.5% of those identified as having SRFR are BAME males

The analysis shows increases in the proportion of staff being recommended as having SRFR across all groups, with a significant increase of 14.8% in the proportion of non-BAME women. This is in line with the findings by gender.

Summary of Findings

- Overall 74.7% of eligible staff have SRFR an improvement on REF2014 (where 58.3% of eligible staff were submitted).
- Analysis by ethnicity and sexual orientation, for the current populations, show no cause for concern. However, due to low overall representation, it remains important to monitor any changes in these groups.
- Analysis by disability, when areas with low research productivity are excluded (SNaM and AHP), shows no cause for concern, and a small disparity when these areas are included.
- Analysis by gender shows a small disparity when SNaM and AHP are excluded and a notable disparity when these are included.
- Intersectional analysis shows the likelihood of having SRFR from highest to lowest is in the order BAME women > non-BAME men > BAME men > non-BAME women.
- The low proportion of non-BAME women with SRFR is notable. However, this is largely explained by the high representation of non-BAME women in SNaM and AHP

Whilst, following this analysis there no concerns in the process for identifying SRFR on the grounds of ethnicity, sexual orientation and disability, the University remains committed to increasing overall representation of these groups, where they are under-represented, and ensuring all staff are supported to thrive, in-line with relevant action plans.

Particular barriers to research-activity remain in the Schools of NaM and AHP fields; these disproportionately affect women. These Schools are aware of the issues and have action plans in place within their School Athena SWAN submissions to focus on building research capacity but also to support staff who choose teaching and scholarship careers.

The findings in this analysis (November 2020), replicates the overall trends identified in the analysis presented to RSSG in January 2020.

The limitation to the analysis, is that the overall institutional picture may not be replicated within different UoA's. As stated earlier, equality analysis has not been possible at UoA level due to the low numbers of staff in the majority of UoA's, however this data will be made available to school EDI teams who will carry out gender analysis on REF eligibility. EDI leads will be provided with their relevant gender data by School, following the final REF submission, in order to develop actions as appropriate and feed into their departmental Athena SWAN submissions.

4. Process for identifying Research Independence

There are small numbers of staff on 'Research Only' contracts and therefore it is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions when analysing protected characteristics with low levels of disclosure and/or representation. Gender is the only characteristic where meaningful conclusions can be drawn.

Overall, 19.2% of staff are recommended to have research independence out of the potentially eligible population (99 staff). The below table summarises the equality analysis findings.

	% Recommended as having Research Independence		% Recommended as having Research Independence
BAME	9.1%	LGB	0
Non-BAME	22.7%	Not LGB	12.2%
Refused (Ethnicity)	0	Refused (Sexual Orientation)	45.5%
Declared disability	16.7%		
No disability	19.6%	Male	16.0%
Refused (disability)	0	Female	22.5%

A higher proportion of women are recommended to have research independence. 49.5% of the eligible population are female and 57.9% of those recommended to have research independence are female.

Annex E – EIA on UoA Output Group recommendations

Equality Analysis on the outcomes of the Unit of Assessment (UoA) Output Group Meetings – March 2021

Introduction

This equality analysis examines the final recommendations from the UoA Output Groups which are presented to the REF Strategy Steering Group (RSSG) for approval. The analysis has been carried out on the output selection process which was discharged in line with the processes set out in our Institutional REF Code of Practice. This analysis will be submitted to Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP) in line with Research England requirements.

In line with EDAP requirements, we have previously carried out an equality analysis on our processes to assess research quality (e.g. metrics) and this was considered as part of the design and drafting of our internal processes and set out in our Code of Practice.

Equality Analysis Process

This document examines the distribution of outputs by the characteristics of staff within the output pool.

Analysis has been undertaken by: ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation and disability.

Analysis is presented for all characteristics at the institutional level. Analysis has been undertaken at UoA level, but data is only presented where there are more than 5 members of staff within each group to ensure anonymity. This is in line with our usual equality reporting and analysis practices.

Analysis on the distribution of outputs is presented in three ways:

4. average (mean) number of outputs by group
5. the proportion of each group by number of outputs (1 to 5)
6. the proportion of each group with less than or more than 2.5 outputs

The output pool includes outputs from staff who are no longer employed by Keele University and we have used our historical staff data records to include data on their protected characteristics within the analysis.

1) Institutional Analysis

a) Ethnicity

Table 1a - Mean number of outputs by staff group

Row Labels	Outputs	Headcount
BAME	1.8	66
Non-BAME	2.0	310
Grand Total	1.9	376

Table 2a – Proportion of staff group by number of outputs:

Row Labels	1	2	3	4	5
BAME	56%	24%	9%	8%	3%
Non-BAME	49%	24%	14%	7%	6%
Grand Total	50%	24%	13%	7%	6%

Table 3a – Proportion of staff group with less/more than 2.5 outputs

Row Labels	Less than 2.5	More than 2.5
BAME	80%	20%
Non-BAME	73%	27%
Grand Total	74%	26%

Table 2a shows that proportionally (+7%) more BAME staff submit 1 output compared to non-BAME staff. A higher proportion of non-BAME staff (+7%) submit more than 2.5 outputs (table 3a) and the mean number of outputs is higher for the non-BAME staff group (2) in comparison to BAME staff (1.8).

Equal proportions of BAME and non-BAME staff have submitted personal circumstances. The expected contribution to the output pool for any member of staff with declared personal circumstances is 1 output. Analysis of the groups who declared personal circumstances shows that 36% of BAME staff and 24% of non-BAME staff submitted more than 2.5 outputs and the mean number of outputs is marginally higher for the BAME staff group (2) compared to non-BAME staff (1.9).

When we exclude the data of individuals who chose to declare personal circumstances, there are very marginal changes to the profiles set out in the above tables.

Action: this data analysis will be shared with the University’s Race Equality Charter (REC) Self-Assessment Team, to inform our next REC award submission (due in February 2022). Actions will be considered to bring the average number of outputs submitted by BAME and non-BAME staff in line.

b) Gender

Table 1a – Mean number of outputs by staff group

Row Labels	Outputs	Headcount
Female	1.8	163
Male	2.1	240
Grand Total	2.0	403

Table 2b – Proportion of staff group by number of outputs:

Row Labels	1	2	3	4	5
Female	56%	21%	11%	7%	4%
Male	46%	25%	14%	8%	8%
Grand Total	50%	24%	13%	7%	6%

Table 3b – Proportion of staff group with less/more than 2.5 outputs

Row Labels	Less than 2.5	More than 2.5
Female	78%	22%
Male	71%	29%
Grand Total	74%	26%

Proportionally, more women submit 1 output (+10%) in comparison to men. There is a 7% difference (in favour of men) in the proportion of men and women submitting over 2.5 outputs and the mean number of outputs is higher for men (2.1) in comparison to women (1.8).

A higher proportion and number of women chose to declare personal circumstances, and therefore their expected contribution to the output pool was 1. Analysis of the group who declared personal circumstances, shows that 26% of women and 25% of men submitted more than 2.5 outputs.

When the data of individuals who chose to declare personal circumstances is excluded from the analysis, there is little change to the overall data – the mean number of outputs remains at 1.8 and 2.1 for women and men respectively and the proportion of each group submitting more than 2.5 outputs widens slightly to be 9% (+2%) in favour of men.

It is recognised that women are more likely to take longer periods of family related leave, work part time and undertake caring responsibilities, all of which have the potential to impact on research careers and a researcher’s ability to produce outputs. While the REF processes, through the individual circumstances process, were designed to take this into account, our data still shows that proportionally there are fewer outputs attributed to women in the submission than men. Further investigation has been undertaken to establish whether part time working has contributed to the lower average number of outputs for the female group, however, this still shows that men contribute more outputs to the pool than women relative to their overall FTE.

Action: REF data will be made available to our school and University EDI teams who will carry out further gender analysis on REF related areas which can be fed into departmental Athena Swan submissions and our Institutional Athena Swan submission which is due in November 2022.

c) Sexual Orientation

Table 1c – Mean number of outputs by staff group

Row Labels	Outputs	Headcount
LGB	2.2	19
Non-LGB	1.9	231
Grand Total	2.0	250

Table 2c – Proportion of staff group by number of outputs:

Row Labels	1	2	3	4	5
LGB	53%	5%	16%	21%	5%
Non-LGB	49%	26%	12%	7%	6%
Grand Total	50%	24%	12%	8%	6%

Table 3c – Proportion of staff group with less/more than 2.5 outputs

Row Labels	Less than 2.5	More than 2.5
LGB	58%	42%
Non-LGB	75%	25%
Grand Total	74%	26%

The data shows that a similar proportion (given the small numbers of LGB staff) submit 1 output, a significantly higher proportion of staff with an LGB sexual orientation submit more than 2.5 outputs (42% compared to 25%).

While analysis should be considered in the context of low disclosure rates (4.7% of the population declared an LGB sexual orientation) and a high proportion of refused sexual orientation data, there appears to be no disadvantage to those who have declared and LGB orientation, so no specific action is proposed.

d) Disability

Table 1d – Mean number of outputs by staff group

Row Labels	Outputs	Headcount
No	2.0	358
Yes	1.5	27
Grand Total	1.9	385

Table 2d – Proportion of staff group by number of outputs:

Row Labels	1	2	3	4	5
No	49%	24%	13%	8%	6%
Yes	63%	26%	7%	4%	0%
Grand Total	50%	24%	13%	7%	5%

Table 3d – Proportion of staff group with less/more than 2.5 outputs

Row Labels	Less than 2.5	More than 2.5
No	73%	27%
Yes	89%	11%
Grand Total	74%	26%

A significantly higher proportion of staff with a declared disability (63%) are submitting one output in comparison to those who do not declare a disability (49%). A higher proportion of staff who do not declare a disability (+16%) submit more than 2.5 outputs (Table 3d).

This analysis should be considered in the context of the number of staff declaring a disability being low (6.7% of the population). While the number of staff is small, it is recognised that some disabilities would impact on the volume of publications a researcher is able to produce, this analysis shows the greatest differential between groups.

Action: our EDI groups will be asked to consider actions to enable research for disabled staff and the recent relaunch of our Disabled Staff Network will be a useful forum to consult on any proposed actions.

2. UoA level analysis

Unit level analysis has been undertaken but data is only presented where there are more than 5 members of staff within each group to ensure anonymity. This is in line with our usual equality reporting and analysis practices.

a. Ethnicity

There are 5 UoA's where there are more than 5 staff within both groups to present analysis of the distribution of outputs by ethnicity. Analysis in this section is focused on the proportion of each staff submitting more than 2.5 outputs to the pool.

Table 2a - % difference between the proportion of BAME and non-BAME staff submitting more than 2.5 outputs (+ is in favour of BAME and highlighted yellow)

UoA	3	12	17	18	20
% difference	4%	-18%	25%	-13%	9%

The analysis shows a high degree of variation across these UoA's. This is because in some UoA's there are small numbers of staff, particularly BAME staff and the analysis should be considered within that context. The largest number of staff with a declared BAME ethnicity is 10.

b. Gender

There are 12 UoA's where there are more than 5 staff within both groups to present analysis of the distribution of outputs by gender. Analysis is focused on the proportion of each gender submitting more than 2.5 outputs to the pool.

Table 2b - % difference between the proportion of Female and Male staff submitting more than 2.5 outputs (+ is in favour of women and highlighted yellow)

UoA	2	3	4	5	12	14
% difference	20%	-10%	18%	8%	0.5%	-11%
UoA	17	18	19	20	27	28
% difference	6%	-14%	23%	-9%	-24%	-25%

Out of 12 UoAs, half show a higher proportion of women submitting more than 2.5 outputs, but there are considerable variations across the UoA's and no discernible pattern has been identified in the Faculty/disciplinary profiles of the UoAs.

Summary

The analysis has identified some unevenness in the distribution of outputs by the characteristics of staff within the output pool, but the analysis by UoA shows no clear disadvantage by ethnicity or gender. It is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions for the analysis by sexual orientation and disability due to the small numbers of staff in some of these groups.

The process followed by the UoA Output Groups accords to Keele's Institutional Code of Practice, in which we as an institution sought to embrace the decoupling of staff and outputs as set out in the REF rules and to avoid an overreliance on metrics in the assessment of output quality.

The findings of this analysis will be shared with Research Committee and the relevant EDI groups who are due to commence work on new action plans in support of gender and race equality.