REF2021: CODE OF PRACTICE

Part 1: Introduction

Purpose and Scope

1. Oxford Brookes University values the contribution of all staff, whether this is through teaching, research, knowledge exchange or administration. Engagement in the Research Excellence Framework (REF) represents one aspect of the contribution that staff may make.

2. This Code of Practice (Code) has been developed specifically to support the University's approach to REF2021; and in particular to ensure that the University adheres to the principles of Transparency, Consistency, Accountability and Inclusivity.

3. The Code explains how Oxford Brookes will select staff and outputs for submission to the REF in line with our policies and practices to promote equality, diversity and inclusion, as well as the equitable treatment of fixed-term and part-time staff, and the development of early career researchers (ECRs).

4. It explains our approach to equality impact assessments (EIA), which will be carried out at all key stages of the exercise.

5. The Code will be widely disseminated and made available on the university website. Information on these processes will be communicated to all staff including those who are absent (for example on sabbatical, sick leave or maternity leave).

Principles

6. This Code of Practice seeks to ensure fairness to staff by addressing the following principles:

    - Transparency: all processes for identifying staff with significant responsibility for research, determining research independence, and selecting outputs for inclusion in the REF submissions are transparent.

    - Consistency: our policies in relation to the processes covered by the Code are consistent across the University and uniformly implemented.

    - Accountability: responsibilities are clearly defined and the individuals/bodies involved in (i) identifying staff with significant responsibility for research; (ii) determining research independence; and (iii) selecting outputs for REF submissions are identified by name or role.

    - Inclusivity: processes are in place to foster an inclusive environment that enables us to identify all staff who have significant responsibility for research, all staff who are independent researchers, and the excellent research produced by all staff.

7. Oxford Brookes is committed to the advancement of equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI). It seeks, through all its policies and actions, to be a genuinely inclusive organisation, and draws on good practice throughout the higher education sector and beyond with a view to integrating the principles of equal treatment and the promotion of diversity into all aspects of

the University's day-to-day life.

8. The University has embedded the principles of the Equality Act 2010 in its HR policies and practices which:

- ensure that no unlawful discrimination occurs in the conduct of the University's work;
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a Protected Characteristic[1] as well as all other members of the university community;
- foster positive relations between people who share the 'protected characteristics' and those who do not.

9. Beyond compliance, Oxford Brookes demonstrates its commitment to EDI through its engagement with Athena SWAN, Aurora, the HE Race Equality Charter, Stonewall, and Disability Confident. In 2016, Oxford Brookes was one of the first universities to gain an Athena SWAN award under the revised charter. The Faculty of Health and Life Sciences achieved a departmental Athena SWAN silver award in 2015, which was renewed in October 2018 and the Faculty of Technology, Design and Environment achieved a departmental Athena SWAN bronze award in 2017. The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences and the Oxford Brookes Business School have established Athena SWAN self-assessment teams in preparation for submissions in 2019/2020.

10. Our equalities work[2] is overseen by the EDI Advisory Group which is chaired by the Vice-Chancellor (VC).

11. Oxford Brookes supports contract research staff through its commitment to the Concordat as demonstrated by our achieving and then ongoing retention of the HR Excellence in Research Award. This support is reflected in our HR policies and practice, including:

- redeployment and the provision of bridging finance (through the Central Research Fund) for colleagues on fixed-term contracts;
- a dedicated post of Director of Researcher Development (Professor Susan Brooks);
- 'Your First Three Years' programme (a centrally-run programme providing induction and training for early-career researchers and those new to Brookes);
- access to university research funds and support, for example, Research Excellence Awards, Research Collaboration Travel Awards, Impact Awards, Research Fellowships, Research Studentships;
- university-wide Research Mentoring Scheme;
- faculty mentoring and support; and
- Faculty Research Support Funds, Staff Development Funds and other opportunities.

12. Fixed-term and part-time colleagues have equal access to our policies and services, as reflected in our HR policies and practice. Oxford Brookes is committed to enabling all colleagues to achieve a good work-life balance and we have a suite of policies to support flexible working.

13. The University's workload planning (WLP) framework is the well-established method by which dedicated research time is planned and allocated to academic staff. This will be used to inform our approach to the identification of staff who make a significant contribution to research.

---

[1] Age, disability, ethnicity (including race, colour and nationality), gender, gender reassignment, marriage or civil partnership, pregnancy or maternity, religion and belief, sexual orientation.
[2] Our dedicated EDI web pages provided more information about these activities, https://www.brookes.ac.uk/staff/human-resources/equality-diversity-and-inclusion/.

14. Equality impact assessments are being conducted at key stages of the REF exercise using an agreed methodology in relation to the protected characteristics (see Appendix 3), i.e. selecting staff for the REF; designation of research independence; final selection of outputs.

Determining Eligible Staff

15. The REF Team at Research England requires Oxford Brookes to submit to REF2021 all the eligible staff it employs who have a significant responsibility for research. In exceptional circumstances, we can request, in advance, to except a very small unit from being returned (see below).

16. Oxford Brookes staff eligible for submission are those:

    - employed on a contract of 0.2 FTE or greater;
    - on the payroll on the census date (31 July 2020);
    - with a primary employment function to undertake either 'research-only' or 'teaching and research', where staff on a 'research-only' contract meet the definition of independent researcher; and
    - with a substantive research connection to the University.

17. Where the bullet points above in para 16 do not cover 100% of staff, we have also to explain how we identify staff who have a significant responsibility for research. This Code explains how Oxford Brookes is selecting staff and outputs for submission in those Units of Assessments (UoA).

Data

18. The REF process requires specific information about the individuals returned to the Research England REF Team. This includes data about staff and outputs returned, research income, research student completions, impact case studies, as well as information about the research environment of the University and the UoA. Data on staff, students, outputs and income will be derived from central data sources such as the Human Resources staff database, Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) annual returns and Converis (the University's Research Information System). Only data required by the REF Team will be collected and only shared with appropriate personnel who have a specific responsibility for managing REF-related data. A privacy notice will be in place to explain what data is being provided to the REF Team and staff who are being returned will be advised of what data is being shared.

Actions since REF2014

19. Since REF2014, and in addition to its usual review processes, the University has conducted a number of reviews of research activity:

    - Semester 1 2016/17: Faculties were asked to review output data, income, student completions and progress on impact. This was a 'light-touch' review which considered all the data at a high level and assessed where future investment should be placed and how colleagues could best be supported in their research trajectories. The review was chaired by the Pro Vice Chancellor, Research and Global Partnerships (PVC RGP) and included the Research Support Director, the University's Research Impact Officer and the relevant Faculty Associate Deans, Research and Knowledge Exchange (ADRKE); Research Leads and Research Managers.

- Semester 1 2017/18: Faculties were asked to review at a strategic level progress towards REF2021 and to test the hypothesis that workload planning (WLP) allocations could be used as an accurate description of those staff 'making a significant contribution to research'. These strategic meetings were chaired by the PVC RGP and included the Research Support Director, the University's Research Impact Officer and the relevant faculty Head of Department/School, ADRKE; Research Leads and Research Managers.

- Semester 2 2017/18: Faculties were asked to prepare for a full REF audit. This included the setting up of UoA Internal Review Panels, with internal readers and using external readers to verify and validate assessments of quality. Internal Review Panels used the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment and/or the Leiden Manifesto for Research Metrics to inform their assessment processes.

- Semester 2 2017/2018: Each Faculty then had a formal review meeting covering every UoA, with the meeting chaired by the PVC RGP. These meetings included the relevant ADRKE, Research Lead and UoA Coordinator and Research Manager. After these meetings, Faculties gave feedback to staff at either a general or specific level on the overall performance of the UoA. In September-October 2018, there was a further catch-up Audit meeting to see how actions arising from the main 2018 audit had been followed up.

20. Part of the 2017 and 2018 Audit processes were also to test the suitability of the use of existing research WLP categories A, B and C as markers for 'significant responsibility for research'. It was agreed that these existing markers were suitable as accurately reflecting the work staff were undertaking and that, for staff on teaching and research contracts, these three categories would be used. Category A equates to 640 hours or 0.4 FTE; B to 480 hours or 0.3 FTE and C to 320 hours or 0.2 FTE. All these categories are allocated *pro-rata* for part-time staff. The full description of what hours comprise for WLP purposes are articulated in the tariff documentation agreed and circulated each year by the University's Workload Planning Group.

21. Faculties have informal processes where staff can query their WLP allocations. A process to appeal allocations with regard to eligibility for the REF is described below, paras 60-64.

Part 2: Identifying Staff with Significant Responsibility for Research

Policies and Procedures (REF 2019/03 Guidance on codes of practice para 40)

Workload Planning Process

22. The University has decided to use its well-established and formal institutional WLP framework as the method for identifying staff with significant responsibility for research. The WLP applies to all academic staff and covers teaching, research and related activity within a notional 1600-hour year (*pro rata* for part-time staff). The fundamentals of the WLP process have been in place for a number of years and staff are familiar with the process. (Appendix 1).

23. The 2017 and 2018 Audits confirmed that the existing A, B and C research WLP categories (see para 20) accurately reflected staff that had significant responsibility for research, and that, for staff on teaching and research contracts, these three categories should be used as markers for 'significant responsibility for research'.

24. The University has agreed to return all staff with a research allocation of Category A, B, or C (ie 320 hours or more *pro rata*) on the census date (31-07-2020) (WLP tariffs attached as Appendix 2).

25. All staff on a research-only contract (i.e. 100% of FTE devoted to research and/or a workload deemed to be considered 100% research) will be returned, providing they also meet the definition of an independent researcher (See below section 3, para 71-73).

26. Early career, research-active academics may be allocated additional time within the WLP framework to establish their research, i.e. more than the normal maximum allocation, in recognition of their developmental needs. They will be returned where they meet the definition of an independent researcher.

27. Staff with a job title which has a clear expectation of research activity (e.g. Research Fellow, Reader, Professor[3], etc.) will be returned. Senior staff (e.g. PVCs, PVC/Deans) who, in addition to their leadership role, are research active and have an agreed WLP of 320 hours or more for research will be returned.

28. The WLP Review Group reviews the WLP tariffs annually and changes are agreed by the Vice-Chancellor's Group (VCG) and publicised before the start of the next academic year. The WLP Review Group is chaired by a PVC/Dean and includes the Associate Dean Strategy and Development (ADSD) from each faculty, representatives from the University and College Union (UCU) and members of HR.

29. Formal responsibility for the application of the WLP framework within each faculty rests with the PVC Dean, although operational decisions are taken by the Head of Department/School. The latter is advised on making research allocations in their area by the relevant faculty ADRKE and School/Department Research Lead.

30. Each faculty has a WLP Group, which meets at the start of each WLP cycle to determine how the central university WLP tariffs will be applied within the faculty to ensure consistency.

31. Workload allocation is undertaken from May onwards in preparation for the next academic year, alongside the annual Performance and Development Review (PDR) and a review of Individual Personal Research Plans. The Personal Research Plan process collects data on objectives and reports on activities undertaken in the context of the individual's career stage and research activity level, i.e. those on Category C hours are not expected to have the same quantity of activity/outputs as those on Category A hours.

32. WLPs are determined within the agreed priorities for each faculty with regard to research, student number forecasts and teaching needs, enhancement of the student experience, etc. Allocations for research time are agreed with each individual and may vary depending on the expectations of and by the researcher, grant capture, outputs and personal circumstances.

33. Suggested research WLP allocations are agreed by the relevant Head of Department/School, with input and advice from the ADRKE and Research Lead. Decisions on allocations are then fed back, with the opportunity to discuss research plans in the staff member's PDR. Staff who wish to question their research allocation are able to discuss this informally with the relevant Research Lead and then ADRKE. Allocations are confirmed or amended as a result of this process. If staff wish to appeal formally, then this is accommodated via the WLP formal process, outlined below in paras 60-64 and in the schematic in Appendix 1.

---

[3] Professors on the research pathway

34. In accordance with the University's commitment to EDI, and our Athena SWAN action plan, faculties are expected to exercise appropriate discretion in applying these tariffs to support colleagues returning from a break for family/caring responsibilities or other long-term absence, e.g. those on a research trajectory returning from maternity leave, and to ensure an appropriate work-life balance for all staff. Such support is not prescribed but is tailored to individual needs and research aspirations. As a result of the Code consultation process, we will ensure that line managers are provided with improved guidance on the application of WLP tariffs and other support following return to work from breaks for family/caring responsibilities or other long term absence.

Development of processes

35. The draft Code was developed by a Code of Practice Working Group (CoPWG) established by the PVC RGP. Drafts of the Code were considered by the group and the ADRKE/PVC RGP. A draft for consultation was sent to the University Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee (RKEC) in December 2018. After this meeting, an amended version was sent to Faculty RKEC for consultation with staff in their Faculty. In addition, the CoPWG sent drafts of the Code to a wide range of stakeholders across the University, for consultation.

36. The document was also drawn to the attention of staff in the University's e-newsletter 'On Stream'. Staff were asked to comment on content or processes to the Research Support Director who collated all feedback and reported back to the CoPWG. A final draft incorporating feedback was considered and agreed by the University RKEC and VCG (which includes the VC, Pro VC RGP and all PVC Deans) in May 2019 and then forwarded to the VC for formal agreement. The version sent to the REF Team in June 2019 was loaded on the University's internal website and the agreed version on both the internal and external websites. Communication to staff will point out the reduction in output options, disclosure of circumstances and appeals processes in particular.

37. Circulation timetable:

July - October 2018	Code of Practice Working Group finalising first draft
November 2018	REF Steering Group review first draft and suggest amendments
4 December 2018	Draft Code of Practice formally considered by University's senior Research Committee, the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee
December 2018	Code of Practice amended in light of comments at Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee
December onwards	Amended Code of Practice sent to: The Race Equality Steering Group (17-12-2018) and Race Equality Action Group (24-01-2019); Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Group (07-3-2019); Athena Swan Steering Group (16-01-2019); Workload Planning Group (05-02-2019); REF Steering Group meeting (19-02-2019); the relevant Unions, via the Joint Staff Committee meetings that HR and the unions

	have (raised in several discussions December 2018 - Jan 2019 e.g. 14-01-2019) and Faculty Research and Knowledge Exchange Committees for cascading to academic staff Article in On Stream, particularly highlighting sections on output selection, disclosure of circumstances and appeals process (December 2018) and amended Draft after final guidance released (February 2019). The Draft Code of Practice was updated as soon as final REF guidance was released. The amended version was circulated as part of the consultation process.
February - March 2019	Consideration of Code of Practice
April 2019	Amendment of Code in relation to comments raised. All committees who received the Draft for consideration endorsed the Code and confirmed this in their minutes. Faculty RKEC Chairs wrote to confirm that they had circulated the Code widely and confirmed their support for the Code at the end of the consultation period.
20 May 2019	Submission of final draft to Vice-Chancellor's Group (VCG), attended by VC, PV-C RGP, PVC Deans and HR Director.
21 May 2019	Submission of final draft to University Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee
End May 2019	Code of Practice amended in light of comments from VCG and RKEC and sent to VC for final agreement
Before 6 June 2019	Code of Practice sent to REF Team. Final draft on University internal pages
Later 2019	Once Code finalised and agreed, it will be put on University internal and external pages. Agreed version sent to University and Faculty RKECs and Faculty WLP Groups and University web-newsletter On Stream. After formal WLP process completed, all staff will be contacted to explain how to access the Code and state whether they are currently selected for return or not. This will also alert staff to the formal process for appealing WLP allocations and research independence and the disclosure of staff circumstances procedure.

Staff, committees and training (REF 2019/03 Guidance on codes of practice paras 44-48)

38. In order to ensure a full understanding of the REF context, the University implemented a training programme to explain REF requirements and the relationship to WLP allocations. This training was led by Professor Simonetta Manfredi (Professor in Equality and Diversity

Management) and supported by Professor Lucy Vickers (Professor of Equality Law), both members of the REF Steering Group.

39. The training was divided into two parts:

i) Training relating to the allocation of research WLP and how this relates to a REF return and;

ii) Training on determining who is an independent researcher and on the selection of outputs.

40. Both programmes work on a 'Train-the-Trainer' approach, as a way to spread knowledge and responsibility through the University and provide local expertise in each Faculty, and was monitored centrally.

41. The training relating to WLP covered:

- Understanding WLP implications for REF;
- Setting the context for the training: highlighting key equality legal provisions (i.e. protected characteristics and public sector equality duty) and equality issues (e.g. indirect discrimination, unconscious bias).
  - Taking into account equality considerations when making decisions about WLP to include guiding principles to: identify staff who should be allocated research hours; exercise discretion where appropriate (e.g. ECR); support colleagues with caring responsibilities, disability and other equality related issues:
- Equality monitoring of WLP;
- Short case studies to consider application of guiding principles in WLP to give 'due regard' to equality in practice.

42. The training in relation to determining research independence and selection of outputs will ensure that the REF rules are clearly understood and the principles to be used to allocate outputs and confirm independence are taken in the context of equality and diversity.

43. Both programmes will adopt a 'Train-the-Trainer' approach, as a way to spread knowledge and responsibility through the University and provide local expertise in each faculty.

44. Those required to attend the training are: the PVC RGP; and from each of the four faculties: PVC/Deans, ADRKEs, Associate Deans Student Experience and the designated trainer for each faculty, identified by that faculty as most appropriate to undertake this activity. [This took place on 18 February 2019].

45. The designated trainer is responsible for training Heads of Department/School, Research Leads and UoA Coordinators (where these were different from Research Leads) in their faculty. Where other staff are involved in allocating workload plans for research (e.g. Programme Leads in some cases), they will also be required to undertake the training.

46. The training relating to determining research independence and selection of outputs will take place in June-September 2019. This training is to be given to the PVC RGP, ADRKEs, Research Managers and the designated trainer for each of the four faculties. The initial training event is currently scheduled to take place on 21 June 2019.

47. The designated trainer is responsible for training Research Leads and UoA Coordinators (where these were different from Research Leads) in their faculty. If other staff are involved in selecting outputs for the final submission, they are also required to undertake the training.

Research independence will be agreed by the relevant ADRKE with advice from the Research Support Director.

48. In addition, the University has rolled out a mandatory minimising unconscious bias training programme, which all senior staff will have undertaken by the end of Semester 1 2019-20 and with an intention that most other staff groupings will undertake thereafter.

Roles and Responsibilities for Key Decisions

49. The **Vice Chancellor** has formal institutional responsibility for the REF submission.

50. The **Pro Vice Chancellor, Research and Global Partnerships** has delegated authority from the Vice-Chancellor for managing the institutional preparations for and submission to the REF. The PVC RGP will take the final decision on the submission in consultation with the Faculty ADRKE.

51. The **REF Steering Group**, chaired by the PCV RGP, consists of the ADRKEs, the Research Support Director, the Research Impact Manager and other staff co-opted as required to make preparations for the REF. It will appoint working groups to carry out specific tasks, e.g. developing the Environment Template and the Impact Case Studies. The group reports regularly to the University's RKEC.

52. The **University's Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee** oversees all research activity across the University and reports to the Academic Board.

53. **Pro Vice-Chancellor/Deans of Faculty** delegate their faculty responsibility for research to the relevant Faculty ADRKE

54. **Faculty ADRKEs** manage all research processes within their faculty on a day-to-day basis. With regard to the REF, the ADRKEs are responsible for ensuring that:

- when a REF audit takes place all relevant staff have the opportunity to submit outputs for consideration by the Faculty UoA Internal Review Panel;
- following reviews, the outcomes are communicated to members of staff appropriately; and
- making final recommendations to the PVC RGP for the ultimate REF return.

55. **Research Leads** work closely with the ADRKE. Each department/school has a Research Lead to ensure the appropriate representation of the discipline within the management of research in the faculty. Research Leads are responsible for ensuring, in conjunction with the relevant ADRKE, that all research-active staff in their department/school has the opportunity to submit outputs for consideration by the REF audit. They will assist in the review of outputs and are responsible for providing individual feedback to staff when the audit is completed.

56. **Unit of Assessment Coordinators** may be appointed where a department/school covers more than one UoA, or where a UoA covers more than one department/school. They work to support the Research Leads, and with the ADRKEs.

57. **Heads of Department/School** have delegated responsibility for allocating WLP from their Faculty PVC/Deans. They work closely with the Research Leads to review WLP research allocations for academic colleagues.

58. **Internal Review Panels** are reviewing outputs and advising/determining which should be submitted for each UoA. The objective is to develop a portfolio of outputs which best

represents the excellent research undertaken within the context of the 'output' pool. Panel membership has been determined primarily according to experience in peer review including reading and assessing a wide range of outputs and types, but diversity of panel membership is also being considered wherever possible. All outputs are read internally and given a rating according to that review, moderated by external review as described in the next paragraph.

59. **External assessment** provides another tier of evidence for the internal peer review process. External assessment is being used to judge outputs where the decisions on rating outputs are not clear-cut, as well as to provide independent validation of the internal assessment. External assessors have been selected and agreed within the UoA by the Research Leads/UoA Coordinators and appointments have been confirmed by the PVC RGP. They have only been asked to comment on the star rating of outputs (not the individual) and will not be given any information relating to individual staff circumstances.

Appeals (REF 2019/03 Guidance on codes of practice paras 75-78)

Formal Process for appealing individual WLPs

60. For the purposes of determining WLP research allocations for those with significant responsibility for research and hence submission to REF2021, the following modification to our normal grievance procedure will apply (as outlined in the schematic in Appendix 1).

61. Staff who wish to question their research allocation should discuss this informally with their Research Lead and/or ADRKE with a view to reaching agreement on the appropriate allocation.

62. If agreement cannot be reached, the staff member should set out their concerns in writing to the Head of Department who will convene a meeting with the staff member and the relevant ADRKE within 10 working days to discuss their concerns. The decision of the review will be confirmed in writing to the staff member within 5 working days of the meeting.

63. If the staff member is not satisfied with the outcome, they may raise an appeal in writing to the PVC RGP within 10 working days of the decision in para 62 above. The PVC RGP will convene an appeal panel including ADRKE from two other faculties; a representative from the University's Workload Planning Group (from a different faculty to the appellant) and a representative from the Union. The appeal panel will normally arrange an appeal meeting within 10 working days and will communicate its decision in writing within 5 working days. The decision of the appeal panel will be final.

64. The formal appeals process adopted in preparation for REF2021 does not affect existing processes within faculties whereby staff can comment on and challenge their WLP allocations more generally (i.e. for non-research activities) as part of the usual process of allocating WLP hours ie staff have the opportunity to raise issues or concerns about their WLP allocation with their line manager and/or Head of Department/School.

REF and Small Units of Assessment

65. The REF rules permit an exception for submission for small UoA, i.e. units where the combined FTE of staff employed with significant responsibility for research in the unit is lower than 5 FTE and where the research focus of these staff (REF 2019/01 Guidance on submissions paragraphs 69-70):

- falls within the scope of one UoA;
- is clearly academically distinct from other submitting units in the institution; and

- the environment for supporting research and enabling impact of each proposed submitted unit is clearly separate and distinct, from other submitting units in the institution

66. The REF Steering Group will consider whether to request an exemption for certain units if:
   - The research is in the scope of a UoA in which Oxford Brookes has not previously submitted, and has not been an area of investment and growth for the university; or
   - Where a previous REF submission has been made to the UoA, there has since been a change in the staff profile in the research area in Oxford Brookes.

67. If such an exemption is accepted, the personal records of the affected staff will be updated to note that the decision was taken on strategic grounds and not as a reflection of their individual or collective contribution/profile.

Equality Impact Assessment (REF 2019/03 Guidance on codes of practice paras 59-72)

68. The Equality Impact Assessment for REF2014 showed that:

   - staff who might previously have been excluded for having insufficient outputs had been included once the quantity of outputs with which they could be returned had been reduced under the 'individual circumstances' rules;
   - proportionately fewer BME staff were returned (4%) as compared with the relevant pool (8%);
   - BME staff were proportionately more likely to be returned (60%) compared with non-BME staff (45%);
   - Female staff were less likely to be returned - 26% of female staff compared with 39% of male staff;
   - Both full and part-time male staff were more likely to be included despite more female employees and more women on part-time contracts;
   - Male staff constituted a greater proportion of Early Career Researchers (60%) compared to female staff (40%).

69. The University has sought to address these imbalances through its work on Athena SWAN work and the Race Equality Charter.

70. Equality impact assessments for REF2021 will be carried out and reviewed by the REF Steering Group at key stages.

   - Early autumn of 2018: selection of staff using WLP data for the academic year 2017-2018. REF Steering Group reviewed EIA on 2017-2018 WLP data;
   - April/May 2019 review of WLP data for 2018-2019 to give an early view of the likely shape of the REF return and any emerging equality issues (see appendix 3). High level review at University, Faculty, Departmental level and UoA level where this is appropriate (size of return may mean it is not helpful to assess at this level); review of staff in decision-making positions; initial review of research independence;
   - Autumn 2019: review of the WLP data for 2019-2020 to assess if there are any significant changes. Review at University, Faculty, Department and at UoA, where this is appropriate (size of return may mean it is not helpful to assess at this level);
   - Autumn 2019-Spring 2020: Review of WLP data for 2019-20 i.e. those staff being returned; against the relevant population for establishing independence and allocations of outputs. It is expected that the EIA relating to outputs will be on an ongoing basis once started;
   - Autumn 2020: Final review based on the return made to REF2021 for selection of staff,

independence and output allocation.

Part 3: Determining Research Independence

Policies and Procedures (REF 2019/03 Guidance on codes of practice para 40)

71. Staff on teaching and research contracts are independent researchers by virtue of the nature of their contract with the University.

72. A member of staff on a research-only contract will be deemed to be an independent researcher unless they are:

    (i) working 100% of their contracted time at the University on a research project led by another; or

    (ii) working some of their contracted time at the University on a research project led by another.

    These independent, research-only staff are usually given the job description of Research Fellows.

    In the case of para 72 (ii) above, the researcher will be deemed to be eligible to be returned to REF2021 as an independent researcher if they meet one or more of the following (refer to REF 2019/01 Guidance on submissions document paras 128-134):

    ● leading or acting as principal investigator or equivalent on an externally-funded research project;
    ● holding an independently-won, competitively-awarded fellowship where research independence is a requirement;
    ● leading a research group or a substantial work package;

    In addition, Main Panels C and D will also consider that the following attributes may generally indicate research independence in their disciplines (refer to REF 2019/02 Panel criteria and working methods para 189):

    • Being named as a Co-I on an externally funded research grant/award;
    • Having significant input into the design, conduct and interpretation of the research.

73. The relevant Research Lead will discuss the case of any individuals whose independence is not clear with the relevant ADRKE. Where further investigation is required, the ADRKE will raise this with the Research Support Director and a review of relevant documentation will be undertaken (grant applications/awards details, contract details, etc.).

Staff, Committees and Training (REF 2019/03 Guidance on codes of practice paras 44-48)

As above at paras 38-48.

Appeals

74. The appeal process against decision on independence will be conducted in the same form as for the selection of staff, with the only difference being the removal of the representative from the University's Workload Planning Group.

Equality Impact Assessment (REF 2019/03 Guidance on codes of practice paras 59-72)

As above at paras 68-70.

Part 4: Selection of Outputs

Policies and Procedures (REF 2019/03 Guidance on codes of practice para 40)

75. The decoupling of staff and outputs in REF2021 provides UoAs with increased flexibility to develop a portfolio of outputs that best represents the excellent research undertaken, within the context of the 'output pool' (FTE x 2.5 less any reductions that apply).

76. REF2021 requires a minimum of one output to be allocated to each eligible member of staff and a maximum of five. No individual is permitted to have more than five outputs attributed to them, although they may be co-authors on other outputs attributable to other individuals

77. There are many reasons why an excellent researcher may have fewer or more outputs attributable to them in the assessment period and, therefore, the University does not expect that all submitted staff will be returned with the same number of outputs.

78. In terms of career progression and future allocation of resources, the University will not take into account the number of outputs returned that were attributable to any individual. It will simply take account of their being returned to REF2021.

79. Paragraphs 54 – 59 and 75-90 explain how outputs will be provided for assessment and then assessed.

80. As acknowledged by the REF Team, it is accepted that those who work part-time or who have caring responsibilities, or periods of ill health, or family-related leave, or career breaks for personal reasons, or who are ECRs, during the assessment period might contribute fewer outputs than others. The impact of each circumstance on the ability of an individual to generate excellent outputs is unique and, therefore, the University will not be prescriptive in assigning numbers of outputs expected from any individual. Rather, the UoA team will select the best portfolio of outputs that best represents the excellent research from those available to make up the UoA output pool.

81. For example, most UoAs have critical mass, a sustainable research environment and a balanced staff base, such that the absence of staff for reasons of maternity/paternity/career break/ill health, etc. is not disadvantageous to their development. In such cases, the individual's output/progression expectations will be adapted through their Personal Research Plans and discussions concerning their WLP allocation. In these instances, the University will ensure that output quality and quantity are balanced overall and those who have had time away for whatever reason are not only not disadvantaged but are supported in a way appropriate to their individual circumstances.

82. As the decoupling of staff from outputs allows for much greater flexibility in developing a portfolio of outputs, it is expected that most UoAs will have an output pool of sufficient size to meet the REF requirements. However, some UoAs may have been disproportionately affected by individual staff circumstances to the extent that the size of the output pool is adversely affected. To ensure a fair and consistent approach to such staff circumstances across UoAs, the University will ask all eligible staff, on a voluntary basis, to declare if they feel that individual circumstances (as defined in REF 2019/01 Guidance on submissions paras 160-161) have adversely affected their ability to produce outputs. Once the University has received these declarations, it will assess them in the context of the output pool for the relevant UoA and apply to the REF Team for output reductions where appropriate.

83. The University will ask colleagues to declare voluntarily in October/November 2019 whether they have circumstances which they feel have affected their ability to produce outputs so that applications to the REF Team can be made well before the March 2020 deadline. The University will ask for colleagues to make this disclosure via a disclosure of circumstances form. This form will ask for minimal information at this stage and where further corroborating information relating to the voluntary declaration can be gained from HR (e.g. period of sick leave, maternity/paternity dates; ECR dates etc), and the output pool of the relevant UoA has been particularly affected by staff circumstances so that the UoA wishes to consider reduction requests, the individual need not provide further information. If the nature of the disclosure needs to be pursued in more detail, this will be done only if necessary and with advice and guidance from the HR directorate.

84. A further exercise will be run, following the same process, to pick up all those who are eligible to be returned, but who became eligible (either because they joined the University or for another reason) after the March 2020 deadline but before the census date.

85. The disclosure of circumstances form will be returned to the Research Support Director and recorded securely. The Research Support Director will summarise these data by UoA and a summary of the circumstances (which will also be checked against HR records for confirmation of dates etc as referred to in para 83 above). The PVC RGP, ADRKEs and the Head of HR will meet regularly through 2019-2020 to review any cases submitted for inclusion with individual circumstances to ensure they meet the REF guidance and to review the request in the context of the relevant UoAs' output pool. This review will not need to receive details of the individual or their circumstances but will receive a summary to enable them to make the assessment. It is expected that in most cases, the UoA output pool will be more than sufficient to accommodate individual circumstances but that in some, particularly smaller, UoAs this may not be the case. Decisions will recorded by the Research Support Director and communicated to the staff member. In due course, where agreed, the REF Team will be asked to consider the output reduction. Disclosure of individual circumstances will be kept as confidential as possible and any disclosure will only be in the context of obtaining sufficient information from HR to confirm dates of absence, for example, or for providing the REF Team with sufficient information to comply with their requirements for requesting output reductions.

86. The REF Team acknowledge that there might be exceptional circumstances in which an excellent researcher is not able to produce any outputs in the assessment period. Examples include, but are not limited to, prolonged periods of ill health (more than 46 months) or two or more periods of family-related leave. Where this is the case, the University may apply to reduce the minimum to 0 on the grounds of exceptional staff circumstances (see paragraph 96). In such cases where the REF Team has agreed, the person requirement will be reduced to 0 and the output pool reduced by one. Staff will be asked if they wish to declare circumstances which could lead to the removal of the minimum of one output via the same process as the reduction of outputs described in paragraphs 83-84 above.

87. When considering output reductions to 0 outputs, we are required to ensure that the proposed reduction to 0 outputs would not result in a smaller total output requirement than the number of Category A submitted staff in the unit for whom a minimum of one output is required.

88. Once the final size of the output pool is determined, each UoA will select a portfolio of outputs that best represents the excellent research undertaken in that discipline, as outlined in paragraph 89 below.

89. The UoA Coordinator, using information provided by UoA Internal Review Panels and, where appropriate, authors, is responsible for the selection of the mandatory single output - that output being deemed to represent the best research attributed to the individual whether as sole or co-author.

90. Once each member of staff has been returned with one output, additional outputs required to make up the 'output pool' will be selected using the following criteria:

    • inclusion of the highest quality outputs as determined by UoA Internal Review Panels so as to best represent the excellent research undertaken in the UoA;

    • fair distribution of co-authored outputs;

    • alignment with the narrative of the UoA Environment Statement so as to best represent the breadth and diversity of research undertaken in the UoA and the diversity of colleagues included in the return;

    • maximum 5 outputs per person;

    • prioritise outputs from existing rather than former staff where all other selection criteria are deemed equal. Outputs from former members of staff will be assessed and allocated in exactly the same way as those from current staff;

    • consideration of the EIAs undertaken on output selection over the course of Autumn 2019-Spring 2020.

91. Where the University chooses to apply for output reductions in the available areas (e.g. ECR status, maternity leave, etc.), the reduction in outputs resulting from the impacted individual, will be applied to that individual to the extent that is possible.

Staff, Committees and Training (REF 2019/03 Guidance on codes of practice paras 44-48)

As above at paras 38-48.

Staff circumstances (REF 2019/03 Guidance on codes of practice paras 49-56)

92. REF2021 requires a minimum of 1 output to be returned for each eligible member of staff, and a maximum of five. On average, 2.5 outputs are to be returned for each FTE, which comprises the output pool.

93. Whilst it is expected that most UoAs will have an output pool of sufficient size for their return, the REF Team accept that some UoAs will be affected by staff's individual circumstances more than others. Where staff voluntarily declare circumstances which, in their opinion, have

affected their ability to produce outputs, the University may request a reduction in the number of outputs in the pool that a UoA needs to submit. Such reductions must be agreed by the REF Team in advance, with any output reduction not agreed being scored as an unclassified output. Reductions may be requested on the basis of the following (REF 2019/01 Guidance on submissions para 160-161):

a. Qualifying as an ECR (paragraph 94 below)

b. Absence from work due to secondments or career breaks outside the HE sector (paragraph 94 below)

c. Qualifying periods of family-related leave (paragraph 96 below)

e. Circumstances with an equivalent effect to absence, that require a judgement about the appropriate reduction in outputs, which are:

i. Disability (defined in REF 2019/03 Guidance on codes of practice Table 1 under 'Disability)
ii. Ill health, injury or mental health conditions;
iii. Constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, paternity, adoption or childcare that fall outside of - or justify the reduction of further outputs in addition to - the allowances already being made;
iv. Other caring responsibilities (such as caring for an elderly or disabled family member);
v. Gender reassignment;
vi. Other circumstances relating to the protected characteristics listed in in REF 2019/03 Guidance on codes of practice Table 1, or relating to activities protected by employment legislation.

Only exceptionally, can requests for reductions relating to part-time working be considered, as this is taken account of in the decoupling of staff and outputs. Part-time working may be considered as an individual circumstance where the FTE of a staff member late in the assessment period does not reflect their average FTE over the period as a whole.

94. ECR reductions (REF 2019/01 Guidance on submissions annex L)

Date at which the individual first met the REF definition of an ECR	Output pool may be reduced by up to:
On or before 31 July 2016	0
Between 1 August 2016 and 31 July 2017 inclusive	0.5
Between 1 August 2017 and 31 July 2018 inclusive	1
On or after 1 August 2018	1.5

95. Absence from work due to secondments or career breaks (REF 2019/01 Guidance on submissions annex L)

Total months absent bet 1 Jan 2014 and 31 July 2020 due to secondment or career break	Output pool may be reduced by up to:
0-11.99	0
12-27.99	0.5
28-45.99	1
46 or more	1.5

96. Qualifying periods of family-related leave (REF 2019/01 Guidance on submissions annex L). The total output pool may be reduced by 0.5 for each discrete period of:

   a) Statutory maternity leave or statutory adoption leave taken substantially during the period 1 January 2014 to 31 July 2020, regardless of the length of the leave;

   b) Additional paternity or adoption leave, or shared parental leave lasting for four months or more, taken substantially during the period 1 January 2014 to 31 July 2020.

97. Where an individual voluntarily declares circumstances which they believe have had an exceptional effect on their ability to work productively throughout the period 1 January 2014 to 31 July 2020, such that they have not able to produce an eligible output, the University will make a request for the minimum of one requirement to be removed. This request may be made where any of the following circumstances apply: (REF 2019/01 Guidance on submissions paras 178-179)

   a) An overall period of 46 months or more absence from research, due to one or more of the circumstances set out in paragraph 95 above

   b) Two or more qualifying periods of family-related leave, as defined (REF 2019/01 Guidance on submissions annex L)

Equality Impact Assessment (REF 2019/03 Guidance on codes of practice paras 59-72)

The timings for the EIAs for the spread of outputs across staff used to inform the final selection of outputs are described in para 70 above.

Part 5: Appendices

Appendix 1: WLP schematic

Appendix 2: University workload planning framework tariffs for 2019-2020

Appendix 3: EIA for WLP data for 2018-2019

Appendix 4: Letter from the VC addressing issues relating to how the Code was communicated to staff including those on leave; the University's response to the REF requirement to comment on how outputs by staff made redundant would be considered for return and; confirmation of staff confirmation of the Code.

Part 6: List of Abbreviations used in the Code of Practice

ADRKE	Associate Dean, Research & Knowledge Exchange
ADSD	Associate Dean, Strategy & Development
Code	Code of Practice
CoPWG	Code of Practice Working Group
ECR	Early Career Researcher as defined by REF2021
EDI	Equality, Diversity and Inclusion
EIA	Equality Impact Assessment
FTE	Full time Equivalent
HEI	Higher Education Institution
HESA	High Education Statistics Agency
HR	Human Resources
PVC RGP	Pro Vice Chancellor Research & Global Partnerships
REF2021	Research Excellence Framework 2021
REF Team	UKRI Research England REF Team
UCU	University's & College's Union
RKEC	Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee
UKRI	UK Research & Innovation
UoA	Unit of Assessment
VC	Vice Chancellor
WLP	Workload Planning

Oxford Brookes University Code of Practice for REF2021

Appendix 1: WLP and appeals process schematic

Staff with 'Significant Responsibility for Research' will be identified as those having a minimum 320 hours allocated within the workload plan.

Individual discusses research through PDR and develops Personal Research Plan (PRP)

Individual submits PRP to Research Lead/ADRKE

WLP guidance published on website

Revised WLP guidance issued to faculties

Workload Planning Group meet to review WLP guidance

Faculty WLP for Research set by Head of Dept, ADRKE/R.

Outcome communicated to staff member

Staff member accepts

Y

Individual works to agreed WLP

N

Two stage appeal
(1) informal with RL &ADRKE
(2) PVC RGP and other ADRKE

Original WLP confirmed

Appeal supported

N

Y

Revised WLP for Research confirmed

Feedback

Feedback

Timeline -->

UNIVERSITY WORKLOAD PLANNING FRAMEWORK: TARIFFS FOR 2019-2020

1. The contractual context

1.1 The academic contract does not specify hours of work. However, **formal scheduled teaching activities** should not exceed 18 hours in any week, or a total of 550 hours per year, except in subject areas where the nature of the curriculum and teaching style make these limits inappropriate, such as aspects of teacher education, art, design, performing arts and music.

1.2 **Formal scheduled teaching** includes lectures, tutorials, seminars, practicals, workshops, laboratory work, studio work, other formal pedagogic work, and the direct supervision of projects, dissertations and higher degrees.

1.3 Formal scheduled teaching does **not** include assessment or marking, pastoral care, research, knowledge exchange, other scholarly activity, curriculum development, management and administration, quality assurance processes, committee work, the recruitment and admission of students, or staff development and training.

1.4 In order to secure greater consistency in managing workloads the University has adopted a notional 1600-hour working year for the calculation of the time to be allocated to formal scheduled teaching and to the wider range of workload activities listed in paragraph 1.3. The 1600-hour year is not a contractual term since the academic working year is contractually unregulated beyond the 550 hour limit on formal scheduled teaching, and the 48-hour maximum imposed by the Working Time Directive (from which individuals are statutorily permitted to opt out). For the purposes of operational planning, a standard working day on an annualised basis is taken to be 320 hours.

1.5 The WLP tariffs and their application are overseen by a central committee, chaired by a PVC and comprising the Associate Dean Strategy and Development for each faculty, a representative from OBI, members of UCU and members of HR.

1.6 Formal responsibility for the application of the WLP framework within each faculty rests with the PVC Dean, although operational decisions will be taken by the head of School/Department.

1.7 In accordance with the University's commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion, faculties are asked to exercise appropriate discretion in applying these tariffs to support colleagues returning from a break for family/caring responsibilities or other long-term absence, e.g. those on a research trajectory returning from maternity leave.

1.8 Workload Plans will be shared across Schools/Departments to aid transparency and consistency of application.

1.9   In accordance with the University's commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion and the University Code of Practice, Faculties will continue to have due regard for equality considerations in the application of WLP tariffs (e.g. to support colleagues returning from a break for family/caring responsibility, maternity leave, long-term absence due to illness etc.). The University is fully committed

to providing appropriate training and advice to all staff making decisions about Workload Planning.

1.10   This framework of tariffs has been approved by the Vice-Chancellor's Group for full-time staff.

2. The Tariff Framework

Activity	Allowance
1. Formal scheduled teaching activities (para. 1.2 above)	Actual hours as timetabled.
2. Preparation (and other activities related to the preparation of teaching materials)	Actual hours as timetabled x 1.5 for each presentation of the module/course/unit. PVC Deans have discretion to increase the allocation where a new lecturer is in the first or second year of teaching, or where an established lecturer takes over an existing module. Repeated sessions (e.g. seminars) will not attract this allocation within the same run of the module/course/unit.
3. Assessment (formative and summative), marking (and double-marking) and student evaluation (UG and PG)	An allocation of 0.8, 1.0, 1.2, 1.6 or 2.0 hours per student; assessed on module size, and the nature and complexity of assessment requirements. For double modules, a 100% increase is applied to the basic tariff value. For triple modules, a 150% increase is applied to the basic tariff value.
4. Dissertation supervision (assessment of dissertations should be reflected under 3 above)	UG – 10 hours PGT – 15 hours PGR – 75 hours (full-time) shared amongst the supervisory team 40 hours (part-time) shared amongst the supervisory team
5. New Programme Development	Hours to be determined by the PVC Dean. Includes development of new programmes or modules, substantial change to existing programmes, accreditation, and professional statutory re-accreditation.
6. Newly-appointed Lecturers and Senior Lecturers	As part of the University's First Three Years commitment to newly-appointed staff on a research trajectory, new L/SLs will receive a research allowance of up to 640 hours in years 1 and 2, including 120 hours (overall) to complete the PCTHE. In exceptional cases, this allocation may be increased to maximum of 800 hours (0.5 FTE). The use of these allocations, the associated mentoring and guidance provisions, and output objectives will be built into individual Research Plans and PDRs.
6.1 PCTHE	120 hours to complete the programme.
7. Scholarship	All academic staff receive 160 hours (0.1 FTE) for teaching-related scholarship activities. This is included within the tariffs (see below) for research and knowledge exchange.
8. Doctoral research	Staff reading for a PhD or equivalent may receive up to 320 hours per year for up to 5 years to complete a PhD, as determined by the PVC Dean, and subject to satisfactory progress assessed annually (as part of normal Research Degree monitoring processes). The 320 includes160 hours for scholarship.

9. Research	There are three tariff levels: tariffs (a) to (c) below are all inclusive of scholarship time (160 hours). Career and promotion routes would be expected to follow the research pathway to Reader and Professor.
	(a) 640 hours (0.4 FTE) Substantial research activity and submission to REF. The research plan set out last year has been fulfilled. Likely to have associated research management responsibilities (e.g. supervision of contract research staff funded on external income, PI or co-PI on externally-funded projects); external research-related commitments (e.g. peer review committees, advisory boards, invited talks, international collaborations); significant writing and funding applications; taking a full part in research impact process; contributing to research leadership within a School/Department (e.g. mentoring less experienced colleagues, internal review of grant applications and/or peer review of outputs for REF submission). May include some related KE activities (e.g. commercialisation of research, KTPs).
	(b) 480 hours (0.3 FTE) Significant level of research activity and submission to REF but volume of research/impact activity lower than in category (a). The research plan set out last year has largely been fulfilled.
	(c) 320 hours (0.2 FTE) Good level of research/impact contributions and submission to REF but not at the quality or volume of categories (a) and (b).
	● PVC Deans may agree an allocation of additional hours beyond the levels in the tariff framework where there is demonstrable project or commercial income to cover the staff member's full salary costs.
	● Leaders of research groups may receive an allocation of additional hours to reflect a higher than normal level of research management, project management or stakeholder interaction within categories (a) or (b) above.
	● The allocation for research will be agreed as part of the annual PDR round and must be clearly linked with Personal Research Plans, with School/Departmental and Faculty Research Plans, and delivery of the expected outputs.

10. Knowledge Exchange	There are two tariff levels: tariffs (a) to (b) below are all inclusive of scholarship time (160 hours). Career and promotion routes would be expected to follow the KE pathway to Reader and Professor.
	(a) 480 hours (0.3 FTE) Substantial KE activity: likely to have associated management responsibilities, external commitments (e.g. advisory boards, invited talks) and income generation activities; significant writing and funding applications. The KE plan set out last year has been fulfilled.
	(b) 320 hours (0.2 FTE) Significant KE/impact contributions but not at the quality or volume of category (a). The KE plan set out last year has been fulfilled.
	● PVC Deans may agree an allocation of additional hours beyond the levels in the tariff framework where there is demonstrable KE/commercial income to cover the staff member's full salary costs.
	● Leaders of KE groups may receive an allocation of additional hours to reflect a higher than normal level of KE management, project management or stakeholder interaction within categories (a) or (b) above
	● Allocation for KE will be agreed as part of the annual PDR round and must be clearly linked with personal KE plans, with School/Departmental and faculty plans, and the expected outputs/income generation targets.
11. Programme Leads	Undergraduate: minimum allocation: 320 hours (2 - 4 programmes and approx. 350 students); maximum allocation: 480 hours (6 programmes or more than approx. 1100 students)
	Postgraduate: minimum allocation: 200 hours (1 - 2 programme at less than 100 students); maximum allocation: 480 hours (3 - 5 programmes and more than 150 students)
	Notes: ● The allocation should reflect the number of staff line managed including ALs. ● Non-standard programmes (e.g. Global MBA and BSc Applied Accounting) will be treated as exceptions on an *ad hoc* basis. ● Where Programme Leads are responsible for both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, the maximum tariff level is 800 hours (0.5 FTE). ● Other Principal Lecturer roles with specialist functions will be eligible for equivalent allocations.
12. Principal Lecturer (Student Experience)	320 hours for work to enhance the student experience, including activities/projects/initiatives at University and/or faculty level linked to the TEF and NSS
13. Subject Co-ordinators	80 – 320 hours related to size of the subject area.
14. Research Leads	320 hours.

15. Postgraduate Tutors for PhD programmes	80 – 320 hours depending on the size and complexity of the programme, as determined by the PVC Dean.
16. UoA Co-ordinators	Where Research Leads are co-ordinating UoA submissions and the 320-hour allocation is judged to be insufficient, a small supplementary allocation may be made.
	Where a UoA Co-ordinator is not a Research Lead, an allocation may be made to accommodate the time required for the role which will depend of the size and complexity of the UoA.
17. University Research Ethics Committee	Chair: 480 hours
	Committee members: up to 240 hours
18. Academic Advisers	2 hours per student per year.
19. Academic Conduct Officers	Academic Conduct Officers Forum: Chair 140 hours.
	20-hour basic allocation plus 2 hours per case.
20. Module Leaders	As appropriate to the workload involved in coordinating module teaching team including ALs (if relevant); to be determined by PVC Deans
21. Mitigating Circumstance Panel	Chair: 240 hours
	Members: 40 hours
22. Interviewing student applicants	As appropriate to the workload involved; to be determined by PVC Dean.
23. Fieldwork/studies, work placements and any other aspects of teaching and learning not covered elsewhere	As appropriate to the workload involved; to be determined by PVC Dean.
24. Collaborative Provision Liaison Manager	Up to 160 hours per partnership, or higher if complex and/overseas programme as determined by PVC Dean.
25. General administrative duties	Baseline: 60 hours; maximum 120 hours
	Identify any hours for recruitment activity (e.g. open days marketing, conversion, etc.) separately within this total

REF 2021 Code of Practice Equality Impact Assessment

April 2019

Background

The university's REF 2021 Code of Practice sets out the procedures for identification of staff with significant responsibility, identification of independent researchers and output selection. The aims of the agreed procedures are to identify staff on an accurate and consistent basis across the organisation. Equality impact assessments will be conducted at key points throughout the exercise. This impact assessment uses staff data for 2018/19 to identify any emerging equality issues.

The data on protected characteristics and contract information comes from the HR/Payroll system. Employment status data from the HR/Payroll system is combined with tariff data from the workload planning system to identify how staff will be categorised in accordance with the criteria detailed in the code of practice.

This analysis considers all protected characteristics for which sufficient data exists. In the 2017/18 staff HESA return only one person responded that their gender identity did not match their sex as registered at birth. Thus gender reassignment is excluded as this does not allow for meaningful analysis. We do not collect data on marriage/civil partnership so that is not included. We have also analysed the data by contractual status, looking at full and part time working and permanent and fixed-term contracts.

1. Comparison of all staff who have significant responsibility for research with all academic staff and staff who are eligible for submission

The procedure for determining whether staff have significant responsibility is analysed by comparing staff with significant responsibility for research with both all academic staff and with REF-eligible academic staff. Data for each protected characteristic is analysed for the whole organisation and by faculty. Where there are sufficient numbers of people with different characteristics data is also analysed by academic department and unit of assessment so that the effects of differences in staff composition in different parts of the organisation are taken into account. All differences are tested for statistical significance and are considered to be significant if the p–value is less than 0.05.

The nature of our academic terms and conditions of employment means that there are very few academic staff who are not potentially REF-eligible as more than 95% of our academic staff are employed on either teaching and research or research only contracts. Therefore we have only commented separately on staff with significant responsibility for research in the context of all academic staff and staff with significant responsibility for research in the context of REF-eligible academic staff where there are significant differences between the two analyses.

1.1. Gender

Across the whole institution men are statistically more likely than women to have significant responsibility for research.

Table 1. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by gender, faculty and department

	All academic staff		REF eligible		% academic staff with SRR		% REF eligible with SRR	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Whole university	**508**	**406**	**476**	**389**	**39%**	**52%**	**41%**	**54%**
Faculty of Health and Life Sciences	213	105	195	95	27%	36%	30%	40%
Biological and Medical Sciences	34	31	33	30	53%	61%	55%	63%
Nursing and Midwifery	78	17	69	16	13%	24%	14%	25%
Psychology, Health and Professional Development	46	18	43	17	37%	33%	40%	35%
Sport, Health Science and Social Work	45	33	43	26	22%	18%	23%	23%
Faculty of Humanities and Sciences	119	89	114	88	58%	83%	61%	84%
Education	39	11	39	11	26%	36%	26%	36%
English and Modern Languages	22	10	20	10	64%	90%	70%	90%
History, Philosophy and Culture	18	25	18	25	78%	88%	78%	88%
Law	10	13	8	12	70%	69%	88%	75%
Social Sciences	25	28	24	28	84%	100%	88%	100%
Faculty of Technology, Design and Environment	74	143	74	139	64%	59%	64%	61%
Architecture	18	21	18	21	72%	52%	72%	52%
Arts	25	25	25	25	72%	64%	72%	64%
Built Environment	17	36	17	36	53%	50%	53%	50%
Engineering, Computing and Mathematics	12	53	12	49	58%	70%	58%	76%
Oxford Brookes Business School	88	66	88	65	23%	20%	23%	20%

However, this does not take into account the differences in the composition of staff in different units of assessment (appendix 1). 42% of all academic staff are allocated to our two largest units of assessment: Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy, and Business and Management Studies. In these units of assessment the percentage of staff with significant responsibility for research is much lower than the organisational average - 19% of staff in Health and 24% in Business and Management Studies have significant responsibility for research

compared with 46% overall. Women are over-represented in these two units of assessment with 49% of all academic women allocated to these UoAs compared with only 32% of men. This means that the lower REF return rate for these UoAs has a greater effect on women than men and causes the overall rate of inclusion in the REF to be lower for women than for men.

Analysis at faculty level shows that the only faculty in which men are statistically more likely than women to have significant responsibility for research is the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. In the Faculty of Technology, Design and Environment and Oxford Brookes Business School women are more likely than men to have significant responsibility for research.

Further analysis of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at department level shows that the only department in which men are statistically more likely than women to have significant responsibility for research is the Department of Social Sciences where 84% of all women academics and 100% of all men academics have significant responsibility for research. When analysed in the context of the REF eligible pool 88% of women and 100% of men have significant responsibility for research, which is not statistically significant. That department comprises three units of assessment and analysis by unit of assessment found that there were no statistically significant differences between men and women at that level.

In all other departments and in all units of assessment there are no statistically significant differences between the numbers of men and women with significant responsibility for research.

Table 2. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by gender and unit of assessment

	REF eligible		% of REF eligible with SRR		
	F	M	F	M	Total
Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	139	55	18%	20%	19%
Architecture, Built Environment and Planning	37	60	62%	55%	58%
Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory	8	6	50%	67%	57%
Biological Sciences	39	37	62%	68%	64%
Business and Management Studies	95	69	25%	22%	24%
Computer Science and Informatics	6	21	67%	67%	67%
Education	43	12	28%	33%	29%
Engineering	6	32	50%	69%	66%
English Language and Literature	17	8	82%	88%	84%
Geography and Environmental Studies	5	14	80%	100%	95%
History	21	26	81%	88%	85%
Law	8	12	88%	75%	80%
Music, Drama, Dance, Performing Arts, Film and Screen Studies	8	16	88%	63%	71%
Politics and International Studies	16	12	88%	100%	93%
Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	19	7	58%	86%	65%

The apparent negative impact on women based on high level analysis is caused by differences in the gender profile in different academic areas. The parity between men and women at unit of assessment level demonstrates that when gender profile differences are discounted, the procedure for identifying staff with significant responsibility for research does not result in any disproportionate impact for women.

1.2. Ethnicity

95% of academic staff have provided data about their ethnicity. Staff who have not provided information or have recorded a "prefer not to say" response are excluded from this analysis.

Across the whole university and at faculty and department level there are no statistically significant differences in the proportion of BAME and white staff with significant responsibility for research.

Table 3. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by ethnicity, faculty and department

	All academic staff		REF eligible		% academic staff with SRR		% REF eligible with SRR	
	White	BAME	White	BAME	White	BAME	White	BAME
Whole university	**753**	**114**	**713**	**107**	**45%**	**43%**	**47%**	**46%**
Faculty of Health and Life Sciences	269	34	246	30	30%	35%	33%	40%
Biological and Medical Sciences	50	11	48	11	58%	64%	60%	64%
Nursing and Midwifery	82	10	74	8	15%	20%	16%	25%
Psychology, Health and Professional Development	57	3	54	3	37%	67%	39%	67%
Sport, Health Science and Social Work	65	10	58	8	22%	10%	24%	13%
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences	183	16	179	14	68%	63%	70%	71%
Education	49	1	49	1	29%	0%	29%	0%
English and Modern Languages	25	6	24	5	76%	50%	79%	60%
History, Philosophy and Culture	38	2	38	2	87%	50%	87%	50%
Law	19	3	17	2	68%	67%	76%	100%
Social Sciences	45	4	44	4	91%	100%	93%	100%
Faculty of Technology, Design and Environment	167	34	163	34	60%	68%	62%	68%
Architecture	30	4	30	4	60%	50%	60%	50%
Arts	46	2	46	2	70%	100%	70%	100%
Built Environment	41	10	41	10	49%	60%	49%	60%
Engineering, Computing and Mathematics	43	15	39	15	67%	80%	74%	80%
Oxford Brookes Business School	120	28	119	28	23%	14%	23%	14%

BAME staff are more likely to have significant responsibility for research than white staff in several units of assessment. There are no units of assessment in which white staff are statistically more likely than BAME staff to have significant responsibility for research.

Table 4. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by ethnicity and unit of assessment

	REF eligible		% of REF eligible with SRR		
	White	BAME	White	BAME	Total
Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	170	16	19%	19%	19%
Architecture, Built Environment and Planning	73	17	56%	59%	57%
Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory	12	1	58%	100%	62%
Biological Sciences	59	11	66%	64%	66%
Business and Management Studies	130	28	25%	14%	23%
Computer Science and Informatics	15	9	67%	78%	71%
Education	54	1	30%	0%	29%
Engineering	27	7	67%	71%	68%
English Language and Literature	23	1	83%	100%	83%
Geography and Environmental Studies	17	1	94%	100%	94%
History	42	2	88%	50%	86%
Law	17	2	76%	100%	79%
Music, Drama, Dance, Performing Arts, Film and Screen Studies	23	0	74%	-	74%
Politics and International Studies	23	3	91%	100%	92%
Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	22	3	68%	67%	68%

The data for the whole organisation and at faculty level was further analysed by UK and non-UK. Across the whole organisation and in every faculty non-UK BAME and non-UK white staff are more likely to have significant responsibility for research than UK white staff. The numbers of staff were too small to allow analysis by department or unit of assessment.

Across the whole organisation and in the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences and Technology, Design and Environment UK BAME staff are more likely to have significant responsibility for research than white UK staff. In Oxford Brookes Business School and the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences UK BAME staff are less likely to have significant responsibility for research than white UK staff but the differences are not statistically significant.

REF 2021 Code of Practice Equality Impact Assessment
Table 5. Number of staff with those with significant responsibility for research by ethnicity (including UK/non- UK) and faculty

	All academic staff				% all academic staff with SRR				% of REF eligible with SRR			
	UK white	UK	Non UK white	Non UK	UK white	UK	Non UK	Non UK BAME	UK white	UK	Non UK	Non UK BAME
Whole university	**606**	**50**	**147**	**64**	**39%**	**48%**	**67%**	**39%**	**42%**	**53%**	**69%**	**40%**
HLS	232	20	37	14	28%	40%	41%	29%	31%	47%	44%	31%
HSS	146	6	37	10	64%	50%	84%	70%	66%	75%	84%	70%
OBBS	96	9	24	19	15%	11%	54%	16%	15%	11%	54%	16%
TDE	118	15	49	19	53%	80%	80%	58%	54%	80%	81%	58%

1.3. Disability

94% of academic staff have provided data about whether they have a disability. Staff who have not provided information or have recorded a "prefer not to say" response are excluded from this analysis.

Staff who have declared a disability are less likely to have significant responsibility for research across the whole organisation. However the difference is not statistically significant.

In three of the four faculties staff who have declared a disability are less likely to have significant responsibility for research and in Oxford Brookes Business School (OBBS) staff who have declared a disability are more likely to have significant responsibility for research. None of the differences are statistically significant.

The number of disabled staff is too small to enable analysis at department or unit of assessment level.

Table 6. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by disability and faculty

	All academic staff		REF eligible		% of all academic staff with SRR		% of REF eligible with SRR	
	Disabled	Not disabled	Disabled	Not disabled	Disabled	Not disabled	Disabled	Not disabled
Whole university	**39**	**819**	**34**	**777**	**36%**	**45%**	**41%**	**47%**
HLS	14	285	12	260	21%	31%	25%	34%
HSS	9	186	8	181	56%	68%	63%	70%
OBBS	4	140	4	139	25%	21%	25%	21%
TDE	10	194	9	191	50%	63%	56%	64%

1.4. Age

The modal age group for academic staff is 45-54 with 81% of academic staff in age groups 35-44, 45- 54 or 55-64. Across the whole institution and in the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences staff aged under 35 are significantly less likely to have significant responsibility for research than staff aged 35 to 64. There are no other statistically significant differences between age groups.

At department level the numbers of staff in lower and upper age bands are too small to enable meaningful analysis.

Table 7. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by age group and faculty

	All academic staff			REF eligible			% academic staff with SRR			% REF eligible with SRR		
	Under	35 to 64	65 or	Under	35 to 64	65 or	Under	35 to 64	65 or	Under	35 to 64	65 or
Whole university	**110**	**739**	**65**	**92**	**709**	**64**	**30%**	**47%**	**38%**	**36%**	**49%**	**39%**
HLS	51	247	20	37	233	20	12%	33%	40%	16%	35%	40%
HSS	22	174	12	21	170	11	59%	70%	67%	62%	72%	73%
OBBS	8	128	18	8	127	18	13%	23%	11%	13%	24%	11%
TDE	27	176	14	25	174	14	48%	64%	50%	52%	64%	50%

Analysis of staff by age group and grade shows that 75% of staff aged 35 or under are employed in roles at the lowest academic grades (HESA levels L0 and K0). Only 20% of staff aged 35 to 64 and 18% of staff aged 65 and over are employed at these levels. 16% of all staff with significant responsibility for research are at these levels. Analysis of the staff aged under 35 at higher grades shows that they are at least as likely as staff from other age groups to have significant responsibility for research. The apparent bias is caused by the fact that younger staff are more likely to be at lower grades that are less likely to involve independent research. When grade is taken into account staff aged under 35 are not statistically less likely to have significant responsibility for research than staff aged 35 to 64.

There are two units of assessment in which there are statistically significant differences: in Biological Sciences staff aged under 35 are less likely to have significant responsibility for research than staff aged 35 to 64, and in Law between staff aged 65 or over are less likely to have significant responsibility for research than staff aged 35 to 64. Analysis of the Biological Sciences unit by grade reveals that there are no significant differences at that level and the apparent bias is caused by the fact that younger staff are most likely to be employed in the lowest academic grades.

In the Law unit of assessment there are only two staff aged 65 or over, which means that small changes in the numbers would have a significant impact of the analysis. This will be monitored in future equality impact assessments to ensure that there is no evidence of an ongoing bias.

Table 8. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by age group and unit of assessment

	REF eligible			% of REF eligible with SRR		
	Under 35	35 to 64	65 or over	Under 35	35 to 64	65 or over
Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	24	158	12	21%	17%	33%
Architecture, Built Environment and Planning	4	86	7	50%	60%	29%
Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory	1	12	1	0%	58%	100%
Biological Sciences	13	56	7	15%	79%	43%
Business and Management Studies	8	135	21	13%	25%	19%
Computer Science and Informatics	6	19	2	50%	74%	50%
Education	3	49	3	0%	29%	67%
Engineering	9	29	0	44%	72%	-
English Language and Literature	3	22	0	33%	91%	-
Geography and Environmental Studies	5	12	2	80%	100%	100%
History	5	40	2	80%	85%	100%
Law	0	18	2	-	89%	0%
Music, Drama, Dance, Performing Arts, Film and Screen Studies	5	19	0	80%	68%	-
Politics and International Studies	3	23	2	100%	91%	100%
Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	1	23	2	0%	65%	100%

1.5. Sexual orientation

74% of academic staff have declared their sexual orientation. 26% of academic staff have not responded or have given a "prefer not to say" response. Across the whole university and in every faculty LGB staff are at least as likely to have significant responsibility for research as heterosexual staff.

The number of LGB staff is too small to enable analysis at department or unit of assessment level.

Table 9. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by sexual orientation and faculty

	All academic staff			REF eligible			% academic staff with SRR			% REF eligible with SRR		
	LGB	Heterosexual	Unknown	LGB	Heterosexual	Unknown	LGB	Heterosexual	Unknown	LGB	Heterosexual	Unknown
Whole university	**42**	**630**	**242**	**37**	**594**	**234**	**57%**	**41%**	**51%**	**65%**	**43%**	**53%**
HLS	10	242	66	7	221	62	30%	30%	30%	43%	33%	32%
HSS	12	132	64	11	128	63	92%	62%	78%	100%	64%	79%
OBBS	8	111	35	8	110	35	25%	20%	26%	25%	20%	26%
TDE	10	134	73	10	130	73	80%	59%	62%	80%	61%	62%

1.6. Religion/belief

73% of academic staff have responded to the question about religion and belief. 27% of academic staff have not responded or have given a "prefer not to say" response. 33% of all academic staff have told us that they have no religion, 32% are Christian and 9% have told us that they have another religion.

Across the whole university and in the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences staff who have no religion are statistically more likely to have significant responsibility for research than staff who have told us that they are Christian. There are no other statistically significant differences between groups.

Table 10. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by religion/belief and faculty

	All academic staff				% academic staff with SRR				% of REF eligible with SRR			
	Christian	No religion	Other religion	Unknown	Christian	No religion	Other religion	Unknown	Christian	No religion	Other religion	Unknown
Whole university	**293**	**299**	**78**	**244**	**35 %**	**49%**	**42 %**	**50 %**	**37 %**	**53 %**	**45 %**	**52 %**
HLS	113	108	26	71	21 %	43%	23 %	28 %	23 %	48 %	26 %	30 %
HSS	49	83	15	61	57 %	67%	73 %	79 %	60 %	69 %	79 %	80 %
OBBS	62	45	16	31	24 %	16%	25 %	23 %	25 %	16 %	25 %	23 %
TDE	63	56	21	77	54 %	68%	57 %	62 %	56 %	70 %	57 %	62 %

When analysed by unit of assessment, the only notable difference is in Biological Sciences, where the difference between the percentage of staff with no religion and the percentage of staff from other religions is statistically significant. Analysis by grade reveals that in this unit of assessment 60% of staff from other religions who do not have significant responsibility for research are employed in junior roles that are unlikely to have responsibility for research. When grade is taken into account there are no significant differences.

Table 11. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by religion/belief and unit of assessment

	REF eligible			% of REF eligible with SRR		
	Christia	No religion	Other religion	Christia	No religion	Other religion
Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	84	51	16	14%	27%	19%
Architecture, Built Environment and Planning	32	16	10	44%	75%	50%
Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory	3	5	0	67%	40%	-
Biological Sciences	17	33	5	59%	76%	20%
Business and Management Studies	63	52	16	25%	19%	25%
Computer Science and Informatics	5	7	5	60%	86%	60%
Education	22	18	3	27%	22%	67%
Engineering	13	7	6	69%	71%	67%
English Language and Literature	6	11	0	83%	82%	-
Geography and Environmental Studies	4	10	4	100%	90%	100%
History	10	14	2	80%	79%	100%
Law	3	7	4	100%	86%	75%
Music, Drama, Dance, Performing Arts, Film and Screen Studies	4	13	0	75%	77%	-
Politics and International Studies	4	16	0	100%	88%	-
Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	4	13	2	75%	62%	100%

1.7. Pregnancy/maternity

Analysis of staff who have taken maternity leave starting on or after 1st August 2015 shows that there are no statistically significant differences between the representation of staff who took maternity leave and those who did not. The number of staff taking maternity leave is too small to enable analysis at department or unit of assessment level.

Table 12. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by pregnancy/maternity and faculty

	All academic staff		REF eligible		% of all academic staff with SRR		% of REF eligible with SRR	
	Took maternity	Did not take maternity	Took maternity	Did not take maternity	Took maternity	Did not take maternity	Took maternity	Did not take maternity
Whole university	**50**	**864**	**49**	**816**	**42%**	**45 %**	**43 %**	**47 %**
HLS	23	295	23	267	35%	30 %	35 %	33 %
HSS	17	191	17	185	65%	69 %	65 %	71 %
OBBS	5	149	5	148	0%	22 %	0%	22 %
TDE	4	213	4	209	50%	61 %	50 %	62 %

1.8. Contractual status – part time working

Across the whole organisation, in every faculty and in the departments indicated with an asterisk in the table below, staff who work part-time are significantly less likely to have significant responsibility for research than full-time staff.

Table 12. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by full/part-time, faculty and department

	All academic staff		REF eligible		% academic staff with SRR		% REF eligible with SRR	
	Part time	Full time	Part time	Full time	Part time	Full time	Part time	Full time
*Whole university	**310**	**604**	**277**	**588**	**26%**	**54%**	**29%**	**55%**
*Faculty of Health and Life Sciences	129	189	106	184	17%	39%	21%	40%
Biological and Medical Sciences	19	46	17	46	37%	65%	41%	65%
*Nursing and Midwifery	49	46	40	45	4%	26%	5%	27%
Psychology, Health and Professional Development	26	38	23	37	35%	37%	39%	38%
*Sport, Health Science and Social Work	27	51	21	48	4%	29%	5%	31%
*Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences	55	153	51	151	42%	78%	45%	79%
Education	23	27	23	27	22%	33%	22%	33%
*English and Modern Languages	12	20	10	20	42%	90%	50%	90%
*History, Philosophy and Culture	9	34	9	34	56%	91%	56%	91%
Law	3	20	2	18	67%	70%	100%	78%
Social Sciences	7	46	6	46	71%	96%	83%	96%
*Faculty of Technology, Design and Environment	63	154	63	150	48%	66%	48%	68%
Architecture	19	20	19	20	74%	50%	74%	50%
*Arts	21	29	21	29	48%	83%	48%	83%
*Built Environment	13	40	13	40	23%	60%	23%	60%
*Engineering, Computing and Mathematics	10	55	10	51	30%	75%	30%	80%
*Oxford Brookes Business School	57	97	57	96	11%	28%	11%	28%

Analysis by grade shows that at grade 12 and above (HESA levels I0 and above) there are no significant differences between the numbers of part time and full time staff who have significant responsibility for research. The only grades in which part time staff are significantly less likely to have significant responsibility for research are 8, 9 and 10/11 (HESA levels K0 and J0).

When analysed by academic employment function part time staff in grade 8 are not disadvantaged in comparison with full time staff.

Teaching and research staff in grades 9 and 10/11 were further analysed to examine whether the number of hours worked affected the likelihood of having significant responsibility for research. In both grades staff working 0.8 FTE or more were not significantly less likely to have responsibility for research than full-time staff. However staff with lower FTEs were significantly less likely to have responsibility for research.

REF 2021 Code of Practice Equality Impact Assessment
In the units of assessment indicated with an asterisk in the table below part-time staff are significantly less likely to have significant responsibility for research than full-time staff. Further analysis by FTE shows that there are no significant differences between part time staff working 0.8FTE or more and full time staff in any of these units. This suggests that, although the university workload planning tariffs are pro-rated for part-time staff there may be some barriers preventing some part-time staff being allocated sufficient hours for research to be categorised as having significant responsibility for research.

Table 13. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by full/part-time and unit of assessment

	REF eligible		% of REF eligible with SRR	
	Part time	Full time	Part time	Full time
*Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	83	111	11%	24%
Architecture, Built Environment and Planning	32	65	53%	60%
Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory	3	11	33%	64%
Biological Sciences	19	57	47%	70%
*Business and Management Studies	64	100	14%	30%
*Computer Science and Informatics	5	22	20%	77%
Education	23	32	22%	34%
Engineering	5	33	40%	70%
English Language and Literature	7	18	71%	89%
Geography and Environmental Studies	3	16	100%	94%
History	11	36	64%	92%
Law	2	18	100%	78%
Music, Drama, Dance, Performing Arts, Film and Screen Studies	10	14	50%	86%
Politics and International Studies	3	25	67%	96%
Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	4	22	100%	59%

Although part time men are more likely than part time women to have responsibility for research none of the differences are statistically significant. Women are more likely to be part time and therefore more likely to be disadvantaged by the apparent bias towards part time staff but part time men are similarly disadvantaged. This suggests that it is FTE and not gender that is the primary issue.

Table 14. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by full/part-time, gender and faculty

	All academic staff				% of all academic staff with SRR				% of REF eligible with SRR			
	Part time women	Full time women	Part time men	Full time men	Part time women	Full time women	Part time men	Full time men	Part time women	Full time women	Part time men	Full time men
Whole university	**204**	**304**	**106**	**300**	**24%**	**49%**	**31%**	**59%**	**27%**	**50%**	**34%**	**61%**
HLS	95	118	34	71	17%	36%	18%	45%	20%	37%	23%	46%
HSS	41	78	14	75	34%	71%	64%	87%	38%	71%	64%	88%
OBBS	36	52	21	45	8%	33%	14%	22%	8%	33%	14%	23%
TDE	26	48	37	106	58%	67%	41%	66%	58%	67%	41%	69%

1.9. Contractual status – fixed term employment

Across the whole institution fixed term staff are significantly less likely to have significant responsibility for research than permanent staff. In the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences and Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, and in the departments indicated by an asterisk in the table below, fixed term staff are significantly less likely to have significant responsibility for research in the context of all academic staff.

Table 15. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by fixed-term/permanent and faculty

	All academic staff		REF eligible		% academic staff with SRR		% REF eligible with SRR	
	Fixed term	Permanent	Fixed term	Permanent	Permanent	Fixed term	Permanent	Fixed term
*Whole university	**156**	**758**	**135**	**730**	**31%**	**47%**	**36%**	**49%**
*Faculty of Health and Life Sciences	87	231	71	219	20%	34%	24%	36%
*Biological and Medical Sciences	28	37	26	37	29%	78%	31%	78%
Nursing and Midwifery	18	77	15	70	6%	17%	7%	19%
Psychology, Health and Professional Development	16	48	14	46	38%	35%	43%	37%
Sport, Health Science and Social Work	20	58	14	55	5%	26%	7%	27%
*Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences	20	188	17	185	45%	71%	53%	72%
Education	3	47	3	47	0%	30%	0%	30%
*English and Modern Languages	2	30	2	28	0%	77%	0%	82%
*History, Philosophy and Culture	5	38	5	38	40%	89%	40%	89%
Law	3	20	0	20	0%	80%	-	80%
Social Sciences	6	47	6	46	100%	91%	100%	93%
Faculty of Technology, Design and Environment	42	175	40	173	48%	64%	50%	65%
Architecture	10	29	10	29	50%	66%	50%	66%
Arts	7	43	7	43	57%	70%	57%	70%
Built Environment	6	47	6	47	50%	51%	50%	51%
Engineering, Computing and Mathematics	15	50	13	48	47%	74%	54%	77%
Oxford Brookes Business School	6	148	6	147	50%	20%	50%	20%

When analysed by academic employment function, fixed-term teaching and research staff are not significantly less are likely to have significant responsibility for research than permanent staff with the same types of contracts. However, fixed-term research only staff are significantly less likely to have significant responsibility for research than permanent research only staff. Further analysis of research only staff reveals that permanent staff are no more likely than fixed term staff to have significant responsibility for research when analysed by grade. The overall difference for research only staff is caused by the fact that research only staff at lower grades are more likely to be fixed-term than those at higher grades. This reflects the nature of the funding for research assistant roles, which tends to be funded by research grants. Although fixed term staff are less likely to have responsibility for research it is not the cause of the difference. This analysis does not indicate any overall bias in the procedure.

In the units of assessment indicated with an asterisk in the table below fixed-term staff are significantly less likely to have significant responsibility for research than permanent staff. When analysed by grade there are no significant differences, reflecting the fact that fixed-term contracts are more likely to be used for staff on lower grades due to the limited funding for those roles.

Table 16. Number of staff with significant responsibility for research by fixed-term/permanent and unit of assessment

	REF eligible		% of REF eligible with SRR	
	Fixed term	Permanent	Fixed term	Permanent
Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	37	157	14%	20%
Architecture, Built Environment and Planning	17	80	53%	59%
Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory	0	14	-	57%
*Biological Sciences	28	48	36%	81%
Business and Management Studies	8	156	50%	22%
Computer Science and Informatics	6	21	67%	67%
Education	3	52	0%	31%
Engineering	9	29	33%	76%
*English Language and Literature	2	23	0%	91%
Geography and Environmental Studies	3	16	100%	94%
*History	6	41	50%	90%
Law	0	20	-	80%
Music, Drama, Dance, Performing Arts, Film and Screen Studies	5	19	60%	74%
Politics and International Studies	2	26	100%	92%
Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	7	19	43%	74%

2. Identification of independent researchers

The procedure for identifying independent researchers is analysed by comparing independent researchers with other research-only staff in the same grades. Our grades 6 to 9 (HESA levels L0 and K0) are the only grades in which both independent and non-independent researchers are found. Therefore we have compared research only staff at those levels.

Although staff who are aged under 35 are significantly less likely to be independent researchers

than staff aged 35 to 64, when analysed by faculty and grade there are no significant differences.

Although fixed-term staff are significantly less likely to be independent researchers than permanent staff, when analysed by grade there are no significant differences. Both of these findings reflect the fact that younger staff and fixed-term staff are more likely to be employed at lower grades which are less likely to involve independent research.

Table 17. Profile of independent researchers in the context of all research only staff at grades 6-9

		Headcount	% independent
Gender	Woman	50	24%
	Man	34	35%
Ethnicity	BAME	15	20%
	White	60	33%
Disability	Disabled	2	50%
	Not disabled	71	30%
Age	Under 35	38	13%
	35 to 64	44	41%
	65 or over	2	50%
Sexual orientation	LGB	6	67%
	Heterosexual	63	29%
	Unknown	15	13%
Religion or belief	Christian	22	37%
	No religion	34	26%
	Other religion	8	25%
	Unknown	20	35%
Pregnancy/maternity	Took maternity leave	8	25%
	Did not take maternity leave	76	29%
Contractual status	Part time	28	25%
	Full time	56	30%
	Fixed-term	76	25%
	Permanent	8	63%

3. Decision-makers

The Code of Practice defines the roles that include responsibilities for decision making during the REF exercise. We have compared the profile of staff in decision-making roles with that of all academic staff to examine whether the profile of decision-makers reflects the diversity of the academic workforce.

Comparison of decision-makers with the whole academic workforce shows that decision-makers are less diverse in terms of ethnicity and sexual orientation, and are less likely to have taken recent maternity leave or to work part-time.

Analysis of decision making roles by grade shows that decision making responsibilities are only found at grades 10/11 and above, with 95% of decision-makers at grade 12 or senior staff. Further analysis of staff in grades 12 and above only shows that the profile of decision makers is broadly in line with all staff at those grades, although decision makers are still less diverse in terms of ethnicity and sexual orientation, and are less likely to have taken recent maternity leave or to work part-time. As described in the code of practice the university has implemented a training programme that includes relevant equality issues as well as an unconscious bias training programme, which all senior staff will have undertaken by the end of 2019. One of the aims of this training will be to mitigate any potential disadvantages that arise from the fact that decision-makers

are less diverse in terms that the whole academic workforce in terms of some protected characteristics.

Table 18. Profile of REF decision-makers compared with all academic staff and all academic staff at grade 12 and above

		All academic staff	Grade 12 and above	Decision makers
Gender	Woman	56%	50%	50%
	Man	44%	50%	50%
Ethnicity	BAME	12%	7%	3%
	White	83%	88%	92%
Disability	Disabled	4%	3%	3%
	Not disabled	90%	95%	97%
Age	Under 35	12%	1%	2%
	35 to 64	81%	90%	93%
	65 or over	7%	9%	5%
Sexual orientation	LGB	5%	2%	0%
	Heterosexual	69%	62%	70%
	Unknown	26%	35%	30%
Religion or belief	Christian	32%	32%	27%
	No religion	33%	28%	40%
	Other religion	9%	7%	3%
	Unknown	27%	32%	30%
Pregnancy/maternity	Took maternity leave	5%	1%	0%
	Did not take maternity leave	95%	99%	100%
Contractual status	Part time	34%	15%	7%
	Full time	66%	85%	93%

4. Conclusion and next steps

Although this equality impact assessment highlights differences in staff profiles in different areas of the organisation, for most protected characteristics the available data suggests that the selection procedures defined in the code of practice will not disproportionately impact particular groups when all relevant factors are taken into account. This assessment will be reviewed by the REF Steering Group, who will determine any actions that are to be recommended.

A further equality impact assessment will be carried out to look at the position in 2019/20 when data is available. As well as exploring all available data to check for disproportionate impacts this will revisit any areas that have been highlighted as areas of concern in this document to examine whether the data indicates that any changes have taken place.

Table 19. Number of staff and REF return rate by unit of assessment

	Number of staff	% returned to REF
Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy	194	17%
Business and Management Studies	164	23%
Architecture, Built Environment and Planning	97	57%
Biological Sciences	76	59%
Education	51	31%
History	47	83%
Engineering	38	66%
Politics and International Studies	28	93%
Computer Science and Informatics	27	59%
Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience	26	62%
English Language and Literature	25	84%
Music, Drama, Dance, Performing Arts, Film and Screen Studies	24	71%
Law	20	80%
Geography and Environmental Studies	19	95%
Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory	14	57%
Modern Languages and Linguistics	5	60%
Area Studies	3	33%

Both Area Studies and Modern Languages and Linguistics are excluded from analyses by unit of assessment as the small numbers of people in the UoA would result in individuals being identifiable.

Appendix 4

OXFORD BROOKES UNIVERSITY

6 September 2019

Dear Madam/Sir

Thank you for confirming acceptance of our Code of Practice.

I am writing to provide the additional clarification that was requested:

i) **There is insufficient information on how the Code was communicated with staff on leave**

The announcement of the opening of the consultation on our Code of Practice was included in our staff newsletter 'Onstream'. The announcement for this was sent to all staff employed by the University via email. The consultation process covered December 2018 to May 2019 and the initial notification to all employed staff was sent on the 13 December 2018. The amendments to the Code in light of the final REF guidance were highlighted in a further Onstream article on 22 February 2019.

In addition, the Human Resources Directorate sent a hardcopy of the Code to the home address of the small number of staff on leave for the entirety of the consultation period.

Once the formal approval process for the Code is completed, and when our Workload Planning allocations are finalised, we will also be contacting all staff by email to advise them as to their REF status. We will, at that point, ask HR to contact those staff who are away from the University for a significant period to advise them of their status, at their home address.

ii) **Institution's approach to outputs of former staff, including staff who have been made redundant**

Our Code explains that we will prioritise outputs from existing staff over those of former staff, where all other selection criteria are equal. Outputs from former staff will be assessed and allocated in exactly the same way as those for current staff, and will, therefore, be included as part of our programme of equality impact assessments which will review the allocation of outputs across staff prior to making the final return. We have a process in place to review the eligibility of both former staff and their outputs to ensure we are compliant with REF 2021 guidelines. We have made no reference to staff who have been made redundant in the Code, as no staff have been made redundant between the beginning of this REF cycle and the present time. We have no plans for redundancies between now and the census date, and we feel that any reference to redundancy within the Code would be inappropriate and unnecessary.

iii) **Explicit confirmation that staff agreement has been received for the process established to identify staff with significant responsibility for research**

I confirm that staff agreement has been received for the process established to identify staff with significant responsibility for research. This agreement has been received from:

University's Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee	21 May 2019
Faculty Research and Knowledge Exchange Committees:	
Faculty of Health and Life Sciences RKEC	5 March 2019
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences RKEC	14 February 2019
Faculty of Technology, Design and Environment RKEC	11 March 2019
Oxford Brookes Business School RKEC	26 March 2019
Vice-Chancellor's Group	20 May 2019
Workload Planning Group	5 February 2019
Race Equality Steering Group	17 December 2018
Race Equality Action Group	24 January 2019
Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Group	7 March 2019
Athena Swan Steering Group	16 January 2019
Relevant Unions via Joint Staff Committee	29 May 2019

The relevant unions have agreed explicitly the mechanisms for identifying staff with significant responsibility for research but it should also be noted that they also support the national union position of not endorsing the return of outputs of former staff.
I trust this is sufficient clarification.

Yours faithfully

Professor Alistair Fitt
Vice-Chancellor