Commentary on amendments to the Code in the light of the final guidance

A draft Code of Practice was agreed for circulation in December 2018. This draft has been amended in light of the final REF guidance, which was published in January 2019.

What has NOT changed

The basic premises of how staff are selected for return, how outputs will be selected and allocated to staff and how research independence will be determined have not been changed.

What has changed:

Introduction

Some paragraphs in the introduction have been moved wholesale to ‘Development of processes’ under the ‘selection of staff’ heading

Training, roles and responsibilities relating to selection of staff:

Inclusion of the new unconscious bias training being rolled out to all staff by OCSLD

Appeals relating to selection of staff

Amended to include University WLP Group member and Union rep

Determining research independence

Inclusion for clarity of assumption of independence of staff on teaching and research contracts and that Research Fellow title is assumed to be for independent researchers

Updating research independence indicators to reflect the final guidance (truncated list from the draft guidance apart for Main Panels C and D)

Selection of outputs: policies and procedures

Amended to reflect final guidance requirement that requests to reduce the output pool are to be considered the exception and not the norm and to reflect that staff will be voluntarily asked to declare circumstances which in their own opinion, have affected their ability to produce outputs.

More detail about the process for doing this has been included. This includes making it clear that when these requests are considered they are done in as anonymised way as possible and that minimal information will be asked to be disclosed, until it is known that the UoA wants to make use of the possible reduction in outputs. Changed HR rep on the Review of Circs process to Head of HR, rather than Equality and Diversity Rep, as Head of HR a member of the REF Steering Group

Some paragraphs have been deleted for repetition (primarily referencing requirement for 1 and no more than 5 outputs)

Some paragraphs have been moved around to group more – so references to support for staff who have not been at work full-time etc are more closely aligned

Reductions in output references have been updated for the final guidance

Sarah Taylor
22-02-2019
DRAFT for CONSULTATION Originally circulated 2018 and amended February 2019 in light of publication of the REF Final Guidance

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. Other faculties 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 achievement 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 researchers new to Brookes);
- access to university research funds and support, for example, Research Excellence Awards, 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 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 were conducted at key stages of the REF exercise using an agreed methodology in relation to the protected characteristics (see Annexe X), 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 require higher education institutions (HEIs) to submit to REF2021 all the eligible staff it employs who have a significant responsibility for research. In exceptional circumstances, an HEI can request, in advance, to except a very small unit from being returned (see below).

16. Staff eligible for submission are those:

- employed on a contract of 0.2 FTE or greater;
- on the payroll of the submitting institution 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 with Oxford Brookes.

17. Where the bullet points above 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. (Appendix X)

• 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 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.

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).

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 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.

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.

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

\(^3\) Professors on the research pathway
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.

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 Vice-Chancellors Group (which includes the V-C, Pro V-C and all 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description of Code of Practice Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July - October 2018</td>
<td>Code of Practice Working Group finalising first draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2018</td>
<td>REF Steering Group review first draft and suggest amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2018</td>
<td>Draft Code of Practice formally considered by University’s senior Research Committee, the Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Code of Practice amended in light of comments at Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December onwards</td>
<td>Amended Code of Practice sent to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Race Equality Steering Group (17-12-2018) and Race Equality Action Group (24-01-2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Group (07-3-2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Athena Swan Steering Group (16-01-2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workload Planning Group (05-02-2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The relevant Unions, via the usual regular meetings that HR and the unions have (raised in several discussions December 2018 - Jan 2019 e.g. 14-01-2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February - March 2019</td>
<td>Consideration of Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>Amendment of Code in relation to comments raised and final REF guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 May 2019</td>
<td>Submission of final draft to Vice-Chancellor's Group (attended by VC, Pro V-Cs, Deans and Directors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May 2019</td>
<td>Submission of final draft to University Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End May 2019</td>
<td>Code of Practice amended in light of comments from V C's Group and RKEC and set to Vice-Chancellor for final agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 June 2019</td>
<td>Code of Practice sent to REF Team. Final draft on University internal pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later 2019</td>
<td>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 say how to access the Code and 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

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 an unconscious bias training programme, which all senior staff will have undertaken by the end of Semester 1 2019 and with an intention that most other staff groupings will have undertaken 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 ADSDs.

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.

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 the paragraph 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.

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 the institution has not previously submitted, and has not been an area of investment and growth for the institution; 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 the institution

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 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 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 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
- February/March 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. 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;
- 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. The EIA regarding research independence to be undertaken initially after the REF Audit in June and then assessed in light of outcome and likelihood of change (given small population). Output review to be taken after REF Audits in June, with iterations over the next few months;
- 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 (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.

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.

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 16.-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 whether they have circumstances which they feel have affected their ability to produce outputs on or before October 2019 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 department.

84. 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.

85. 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.

86. 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.

87. 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.

88. 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.

89. 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.

90. 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.

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

91. 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.

92. 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 2019/03 Guidance on Submissions para 160-161):

a. Qualifying as an ECR (paragraph 93 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 95 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 if a staff member late in the assessment period does not affect their average FTE over the period as a whole.

93. ECR reductions (REF 2019/01 Guidance on Submissions annex L)

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

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

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

95. 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.

96. 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 requirements 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 92 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 is described in para 70 above.

Part 5: Appendices

University workload planning framework tariffs for 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 if available by CoP submission date

EIA for WLP data 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 if available by CoP submission date

WLP schematic

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

Individual submits PRP to Research Lead/ADRKE

WLP guidance published on website

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

Outcome communicated to staff member

Staff member accepts

Individual works to agreed WLP

Staff member rejects

Original WLP confirmed

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

Appeal supported

Feedback

Revised WLP for Research confirmed

Workload Planning Group meet to review WLP guidance

Revised WLP guidance issued to faculties

Staff with 'Significant Responsibility for Research' will be identified as those having a minimum 320 hours allocated within the workload plan.
REF 2021 Code of Practice Equality Impact Assessment
November 2018

Background
This is the first iteration of the EIA for the 2021 REF COP. The data on protected characteristics and contract information comes from the HR/Payroll system, and the identification of staff with significant responsibility for research is based on data from the workload planning system. This EIA looks at staff at the beginning of the 2017/18 academic year.

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.

- The table below shows the percentages of staff with significant responsibility for research by UCEA job level and contract type. For this analysis, research staff includes all staff with research contracts as well as staff in roles that would usually be expected to be research active i.e. Readers and Professors.
- The majority of academic staff have teaching and research contracts, which state that the employee may be required to undertake research. Whether or not the individual is allocated time for research is determined by the workload planning process, as described in the Code of Practice.
- In research roles at all grades the majority of staff have significant responsibility for research. The numbers of teaching only contracts used is low and no staff on this contract type have significant responsibility for research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Research</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching and research</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching only</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Not-significant</td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Not-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior academic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor (F1)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Lecturer</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post 92/Reader (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post 92/Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Fellow (J0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer (post 92)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Fellow/Teaching Fellow (K0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant (L0)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender

- Across the whole institution men are statistically more likely than women to be categorised as having significant responsibility for research ($X^2$, $P<0.005$). However at faculty level there are no statistically significant differences between the percentages of men and women with significant responsibility for research ($X^2$ Yates’ correction, $P>0.05$ in all cases).
- In the Faculty of Technology, Design and Environment (TDE) and Oxford Brookes Business School (OBBS) women are more likely than men to have significant responsibility for research.
- In the faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) and Health and Life Sciences (HLS) men are more likely than women to have significant responsibility for research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of significant responsibility for research by gender and faculty</th>
<th>All academic staff</th>
<th>Significant responsibility for research</th>
<th>% with significant responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole university</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBBS</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDE</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The gender profile for the whole organisation was further analysed by contract type. For the purposes of this analysis all staff on research contracts, Readers and Professors were categorised as research.
- This shows that across the whole university men in academic roles are more likely than women to be employed in research roles (29% of men and 22% of women). In these roles men are slightly more likely to have significant responsibility for research but the difference is not statistically significant.
- Women are more likely than men to be employed in teaching and research roles, which may involve research (73% of women and 69% of men are employed in teaching and research roles). Of staff in teaching and research roles men (57%) are more likely than women (46%) to have significant responsibility for research. This difference is statistically significant ($X^2$, $P<0.05$).
- The differences between men and women need to be analysed by UOA to investigate whether they are caused by differences in gender representation in different areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of significant responsibility for research by gender and contract type</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>% women with contract type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and research</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching only</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 organisation and in every faculty non-UK BME and non-UK white staff are more likely to have significant responsibility for research than white UK staff.
- Across the whole organisation and in three of the four faculties UK BME staff are more likely to have significant responsibility for research than white UK staff. In the faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences UK BME staff are less likely to have significant responsibility for research than white UK staff. However the difference is not statistically significant (Fisher’s exact test, P>0.05).

Analysis of significant responsibility for research by ethnicity and faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All academic staff</th>
<th>Significant responsibility for research</th>
<th>% with significant responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK white</td>
<td>UK BME</td>
<td>Non UK white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole university</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBBS</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDE</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disability

- 95% 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 ($X^2$, P>0.05).
- 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 (Fisher’s exact test, P>0.05 in all cases).

Analysis of significant responsibility for research by disability and faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All academic staff</th>
<th>Significant responsibility for research</th>
<th>% with significant responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Not disabled</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole university</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBBS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age

- The modal age group for academic staff is 45-54 with 83% of academic staff in age groups 35-44, 45-54 or 55-64.

Age profile of academic staff by faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>Under 35</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65 or over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole university</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBBS</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDE</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Across the whole institution and in all faculties staff who are aged under 35 are more likely to have significant responsibility for research than those in other age bands. Staff aged 65 or over are less likely to have significant responsibility for research at organisational level and in three of the four faculties. In Humanities and Social Sciences staff aged 65 or over are slightly more likely to have significant responsibility for research than those aged 35 to 64.

- Across the whole institution the differences in the number of staff with significant responsibility for research by age group is statistically significant ($X^2$, $p<0.05$). However the only faculty in which this is repeated is Oxford Brooks Business School.

Analysis of significant responsibility for research by age group and faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All academic staff</th>
<th>Significant responsibility for research</th>
<th>% with significant responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>35 to 64</td>
<td>65 or over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole university</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBBS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual orientation

- 72% of academic staff have declared their sexual orientation. 28% of academic staff have not responded or have given a “prefer not to say” response.

- Across the whole university LGB staff are more likely to have significant responsibility for research than heterosexual staff. Neither this nor any of the results at faculty level are statistically significant (Fisher’s exact, $p>0.05$).

Analysis of significant responsibility for research by sexual orientation and faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All academic staff</th>
<th>Significant responsibility for research</th>
<th>% with significant responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGB</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGB</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LGB</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OBU      | 27 | 556 | 223 | 19 | 307 | 153 | 70% | 55% | 69% |
| HLS      | 9  | 217 | 58  | 3  | 93  | 27  | 33% | 43% | 47% |
| HSS      | 8  | 120 | 61  | 8  | 85  | 50  | 100%| 71% | 82% |
| OBBS     | 4  | 87  | 36  | 3  | 47  | 22  | 75% | 54% | 61% |
| TDE      | 6  | 113 | 65  | 5  | 82  | 54  | 83% | 73% | 83% |
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.
- Across the whole university staff from other religions are more likely to have significant responsibility for research than staff who have told us that they are Christian or have no religion.
- Staff from other religions are more likely to have significant responsibility for research than staff who have told us that they are Christian or have no religion in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Oxford Brookes Business School and Faculty of Technology, Design and Environment.
- In the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences staff from other religions are less likely than staff with no religion, but more likely than staff who are Christian, to have significant responsibility for research. The difference between staff from other religions and staff with no religion is not statistically significant ($X^2$, P>0.05).

### Analysis of significant responsibility for research by religion/belief and faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All academic staff</th>
<th>Significant responsibility for research</th>
<th>% with significant responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>Other religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBU</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBBS</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pregnancy/maternity

- This analysis looks at all staff who have taken maternity leave starting on or after 1st August 2015.
- There are no statistically significant differences between the representation of staff who took maternity leave and those who did not (Fisher’s exact, P>0.05 in all cases).

### Analysis of significant responsibility for research by pregnancy/maternity and faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All academic staff</th>
<th>Significant responsibility for research</th>
<th>% with significant responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Took maternity leave</td>
<td>Did not take maternity leave</td>
<td>Took maternity leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole university</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBBS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>