



REF 2021
FINAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

University of Surrey

Version:	1.0
Approved:	22 July 2021, REF 2021 EDI Working Group

CONTENTS

1	Contents	
2	Introduction	2
3	Background	2
3.1	EDI training	2
3.2	Output selection	2
4	Scope	3
5	Analysis	3
5.1	Output Selection	3
5.1.1	Phase 1 Output Selection	3
5.1.2	Phase 2 Output Selection	3
5.1.3	Final Selection	4
5.2	REF 2021 Staff Processes	4
5.2.1	Research Independence	4
5.2.2	Staff Circumstances	4
6	Conclusions	5
7	Action Plan	6
7.1	Short Term (within a year)	6
7.2	Longer Term (within next 2-4 years)	6
8	FIGURES	7
A.	Gender	8
B.	Ethnicity	9
C.	Disability	11
D.	Age	12
E.	Role	13
F.	Part-time, Full-time working	14
G.	Gender and Role	15
H.	Research Independence Process Oct 2020 (final data November 2020)*	17
I.	Staff Circumstances Breakdown by gender (November 2020 data)	18
9	Terms of Reference for REF 2021 EDI Working Group	19
10	Equality Impact Assessment of Code of Practice	20

2 Introduction

As described in the University of Surrey's Code of Practice, Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) have been undertaken on the policy and procedures for identifying staff with significant responsibility for research (where applicable), determining research independence, and for selecting outputs for the REF. The University undertook EIAs at key periods throughout the submission period. The EIAs were overseen by the REF 2021 Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (ED&I) Working Group. The Working Group reported to the REF Management Group and fed into the University's ED&I Forum.

3 Background

REF 2021 ED&I Working Group met six times throughout the preparation period. The Working Group comprised of academic representatives, ED&I staff and a member of the REF 2021 Team.

The ED&I Working Group was required to:

- Ensure that ED&I considerations were fully integrated into the REF process at the University;
- Arrange for the provision of ED&I training appropriate to the REF process for all staff who were involved, even if indirectly, with staff identification and outputs selection;
- Contribute to and review the Code of Practice and ensure that it was properly communicated to all members of academic staff and all those engaged for the purposes of external assessment;
- Carry out and review at key stages EIAs, making recommendations as appropriate to the REF 2021 Management Group;
- Escalate any University wide ED&I issues to Surrey Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Forum (EDIF).

3.1 EDI training

REF specific ED&I training was provided for all staff who would play a role in staff identification, staff circumstances and output selection. Coverage for output selection panel members was 100%. Several new output selection panel members who joined in phase 2 were given training in advance of their selection meetings.

Feedback from ED&I training attendees was very positive with many commending the course for its direct relevance to REF processes and the opportunity to openly explore potential biases in the output selection meetings. The training was offered to staff from a variety of UOAs allowing disciplinary differences to also be recognised and shared.

ED&I representatives were present at 54% (7 out of 13) of the Phase 1 output selection meetings and 43% (6 out of 14) of Phase 2 output selection meetings. Briefings were provided at the start of each Output Selection meeting to remind members of the commitment to ED&I.

3.2 Output selection

The ED&I Group representatives observed all phases of output selection and confirmed that no ED&I concerns or negative behaviours arose in their meetings, and the Code of Practice was applied in a uniform way.

4 Scope

EIAs were conducted at key stages throughout the REF submission period including: May 2019, on Code of Practice and baseline population; March 2020, after phase 1 of output selection; November 2020, after phase 2 of output selection and April 2021, on the final REF 2021 submission.

The University of Surrey considered the definition for significant responsibility for research accurately reflected the Category A eligible population, and therefore returned 100% of Category A eligible staff, therefore analysis of submitted staff versus eligible staff was not necessary.

The EIAs have therefore focused on the process of output selection, staff circumstances and determining research independence, where it was considered that inequality may be introduced. The EIAs considered selected protected characteristics of gender, ethnicity, disability and age. The EIAs also reviewed job role and part-time versus full-time working. For research independence in particular, the researcher pool was reviewed, in all other analyses the eligible staff pool has been reviewed.

5 Analysis

5.1 Output Selection

5.1.1 Phase 1 Output Selection

The REF 2021 ED&I Working Group analysed the Phase 1 initial output selection outcomes in early 2020, reviewing the attribution of outputs provisionally selected and their distribution across the selected protected characteristics. Protected characteristics data was provided by the University's Human Resources department.

The proportion of outputs attributed to the respective groupings of ethnicity, part-time, full-time working and age reflected the REF eligible population very closely. This was, in itself, recognised as a positive indicator for ED&I in REF 2021. Applying Surrey's Code of Practice has had no discernible negative impact on these characteristics.

Gender however did warrant further investigation, with a five percentage point negative difference in the proportion of outputs attributed to women in the provisional output selections and the proportion of women in the eligible pool.

The REF 2021 ED&I Working Group identified that one of the key factors feeding into the REF Output selection, the annual output review (AOR) exercise, needed further investigation for potential inherent biases. EIAs had been conducted on the AOR exercise, but not to the extent that biases in results had been identified. Further analysis of AOR was therefore undertaken.

REF 2021 ED&I Working Group representatives discussed the Phase 1 output selection ED&I analysis with specific UOA Leads where it was deemed appropriate. All UOA Leads received EIA 1.

Furthermore, it was felt that continued communications on the un-coupling of REF from individual performance would be reassuring and support the approach taken by UOAs in output selection, the key messages were disseminated ahead of Phase 2 of output selections.

5.1.2 Phase 2 Output Selection

The REF 2021 ED&I Working Group oversaw a second EIA after phase 2 of output selections (late November 2020).

The ED&I Group representatives observing phase 2 output selection panels confirmed that no discernible ED&I concerns or negative behaviours arose in their meetings, and the Code of Practice was applied in a uniform way.

The proportion of outputs attributed to the respective groupings of part-time and full-time working, age and disability reflected the REF eligible population and largely remained unchanged since EIA 1. Applying Surrey's Code of Practice continued to not negatively impact the representation of these characteristics.

There remained a five percentage point difference in the proportion of outputs attributed to women overall compared with the REF eligible population, which warranted continued observation, taking action if necessary. UOA leads were provided with their UOA's EDI profile prior to final selection meetings in December 2020 to address issues specific to their UOA.

5.1.3 Final Selection

The REF 2021 ED&I Working Group oversaw the final EIA of the submission (June 2021) following final output selections.

The proportion of outputs attributed to the respective groupings of ethnicity, part-time and full-time working, age and disability reflected the REF eligible population and largely remained unchanged since the two previous EIAs. Applying Surrey's Code of Practice has not had any negative impact on the representation of these characteristics.

Compared to EIA 2, there were some improvements in the representation of gender in the selected outputs. There was a three percentage point negative difference in the proportion of outputs attributed to women overall, when compared to the REF eligible population.

The final EIA analysis is included as **Figures A-I**.

5.2 REF 2021 Staff Processes

5.2.1 Research Independence

Following the REF census date on 31st July 2020, the REF team finalised the REF eligible staff list for REF 2021 submission. The Research Independence process was completed and all REF eligible Research Fellows were identified (see **Figure H**). The number of staff included in these datasets was small and therefore the numbers for other protected characteristics (apart from gender) are not shared in this report to protect individual anonymity and in accordance with GDPR requirements.

The total number of cases reviewed was 103, of which 49 (48%) were submitted by female members of staff and 54 (52%) by male members of staff. The data does not indicate any bias in the internal process of identifying independence for REF 2021.

5.2.2 Staff Circumstances

The funding bodies, advised by the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP), identified equality-related circumstances that, in isolation or together, may significantly constrain the ability of submitted staff to produce outputs or to work productively throughout the assessment period. Staff were invited to declare any such circumstance via the Staff Circumstances process (detailed in the Code of Practice).

In total, the REF team received 52 Staff Circumstance forms for consideration. All cases were reviewed by the Staff Circumstances Committee and resulted in an agreed reduction of 49 outputs. Staff were

informed in writing of the decision of the Staff Circumstances Committee, and there were no requests for further consideration or an appeal to date.

Sixty five percent of all the cases received were from women of which 94% (32 cases) were awarded a reduction. Thirty five percent of cases received were from men, of these 77% (14 cases) were awarded a reduction. All cases from men that were not awarded a reduction related to paternity leave where the period of absence did not meet the required minimum period.

Maternity/paternity leave and early career researcher status were the two largest categories in the Staff Circumstances process. Approximately 46% of cases submitted related to maternity/paternity leave and a further 40% of cases related to early career researcher status. Several cases included multiple criteria for reduction.

UOAs with a high proportion of staff whose circumstances affected productivity during the assessment period, could make a request to reduce the number of outputs they needed to submit to REF2021, without penalty in the assessment.

For each UOA the percentage of cases approved by the Staff Circumstances Committee in relation to the number of REF eligible staff was calculated. Surrey's REF Executive Committee and REF Management Group agreed that any UOA with more than 10% of staff having a reduction approved by the Committee was likely to have been disproportionately affected. This led to 2 of the 14 UOA's applying for a unit request for a reduction in outputs. Both UOAs (UOA 23 and UOA 33) were awarded unit level reductions, and both received approval from the EDAP.

The Staff Circumstances Committee received one request to remove the minimum requirement of one output, but the application was not successful, and the request was not granted.

6 Conclusions

- The University of Surrey's REF processes (including staff circumstances, research independence and output selection) do not appear to have resulted in significant under-representation of key protected characteristic groups.
- The outputs submitted to REF 2021 are generally representative of the staff profile across all protected characteristics. Women are marginally underrepresented in the output attribution.
- Output selection was able to take account of a variety of characteristics and abilities to undertake research over the period.
- Members of the REF 2021 ED&I Working Group attended the majority of output selection meetings and this was valuable in providing reassurance and learning to both the panel members and the working group members.
- Training that is REF-specific and that involves academics from a variety of disciplines was well received and should be built upon for future REF exercises.
- It is noted that, although the REF process have not created any significant under-representation, the University recognises an under-representation of women in senior academic posts and will continue to develop processes and support to achieve a better

representation by the next REF. This, in part, will be managed via the University's Athena Swan action plan.

- The Group also noted the lack of data around sexual orientation and religion. Similarly, the lack of specific details around part-time working, distinguishing those with multiple contracts versus those without. This lack of data/detail limits the capacity to consider the impact on these characteristics.

7 Action Plan

7.1 Short Term (within a year)

- Disseminate the EIA findings to the University's EDI Forum.
- UOA leads to reflect on the ED&I data, training and processes undertaken for REF 2021 and make any recommendations for the future, this may extend to more fundamental structural equality related issues.
- Continue the work of the ED&I Working Group to monitor for potential ED&I issues in future output reviews, with the potential to incorporate this into the University's Athena Swan action plan.
- Incorporate learning from the REF 2021 ED&I Working Group into the University's Athena Swan action plan.

7.2 Longer Term (within next 2-4 years)

- Develop an intentions statement and code of practice for future review exercises and REF preparation, setting out the behaviours we expect from those undertaking reviews and preparing for REF.
- Ensure junior female academics receive leadership training, career support and mentoring.
- In future output review exercises, all external and internal reviewers must have undertaken suitable ED&I training within the last three years. All internal reviewers should receive calibration exercises and feedback on their reviews, this could be extended to external reviewers where possible.
- To avoid un-intended bias in the collation of the output pool data, future output reviews exercises will take account of all Surrey co-authors. The individual who submits an output to any internal exercises will, where possible¹, be irrelevant to any assessment or selection process.
- Stipulate output calibration activities take place at department/UOA level, alongside discussion of potential biases.

¹ Taking account of disciplines where author contribution statements may be required.

8 FIGURES

A.	<u>Gender</u>	8
B.	<u>Ethnicity</u>	9
C.	<u>Disability</u>	11
D.	<u>Age</u>	12
E.	<u>Role</u>	13
F.	<u>Part-time, Full-time working</u>	14
G.	<u>Gender and Role</u>	15
H.	<u>Research Independence Process Oct 2020 (final data November 2020)*</u>	17
I.	<u>Staff Circumstances Breakdown by gender (November 2020 data)</u>	18
9	<u>Terms of Reference for REF 2021 EDI Working Group</u>	19
10	<u>Equality Impact Assessment of Code of Practice</u>	20

A. Gender

Attribution of Selected Outputs per UOA

UOA	Women	Men	Grand Total
3	49.7%	50.3%	100.0%
9	21.6%	78.4%	100.0%
10	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%
11	20.4%	79.6%	100.0%
12	16.3%	83.7%	100.0%
16	22.0%	78.0%	100.0%
17	40.8%	59.2%	100.0%
18	36.0%	64.0%	100.0%
21	54.0%	46.0%	100.0%
23	67.9%	32.1%	100.0%
24	31.0%	69.0%	100.0%
25	36.4%	63.6%	100.0%
27	58.5%	41.5%	100.0%
33	13.3%	86.7%	100.0%
Grand Total	33.2%	66.8%	100.0%

Staff Submission (FTE) per UOA

UOA	Women	Men	Grand Total
3	53.1%	46.9%	100.0%
9	21.6%	78.4%	100.0%
10	16.7%	83.3%	100.0%
11	15.6%	84.4%	100.0%
12	21.0%	79.0%	100.0%
16	24.2%	75.8%	100.0%
17	43.0%	57.0%	100.0%
18	32.0%	68.0%	100.0%
21	56.9%	43.1%	100.0%
23	71.0%	29.0%	100.0%
24	41.8%	58.2%	100.0%
25	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
27	61.0%	39.0%	100.0%
33	15.4%	84.6%	100.0%
Grand Total	36.5%	63.5%	100.0%

Commentary: There is a three-point difference in the proportion of outputs attributed to women, compared to the proportion of women in the staff submission. This is an improvement from five-point difference observed in the initial EIA. Two UOAs (24 and 25) show almost a 10-point difference. Both were reviewed, discussed with the UOA Lead. Improvements were made where possible, whilst taking into account the role profile and size of the staff submission in both UOAs.

B. Ethnicity

Attribution of Selected Outputs per UOA

UOA	White	Black	Chinese	Asian	Other/Mixed	Unknown	Grand Total
3	297 (88%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	20 (6%)	10 (3%)	8 (2%)	336 (100%)
9	62 (84%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	7 (9%)	4 (5%)	74 (100%)
10	50 (89%)	0 (0%)	4 (7%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	56 (100%)
11	21 (39%)	0 (0%)	17 (31%)	10 (19%)	0 (0%)	6 (11%)	54 (100%)
12	257 (64%)	0 (0%)	78 (19%)	42 (10%)	16 (4%)	11 (3%)	404 (100%)
16	54 (92%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	59 (100%)
17	62 (60%)	4 (4%)	16 (16%)	12 (12%)	7 (7%)	2 (2%)	103 (100%)
18	43 (86%)	0 (0%)	3 (6%)	0 (0%)	4 (8%)	0 (0%)	50 (100%)
21	57 (90%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (5%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)	63 (100%)
23	24 (86%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (11%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	28 (100%)
24	28 (48%)	7 (12%)	12 (21%)	9 (16%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	58 (100%)
25	17 (77%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (23%)	22 (100%)
27	81 (86%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (7%)	6 (6%)	94 (100%)
33	38 (84%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (9%)	2 (4%)	45 (100%)
Grand Total	1091 (75%)	12 (1%)	131 (9%)	106 (7%)	59 (4%)	47 (3%)	1446 (100%)

Staff Submission (FTE) per UOA

UOA	White	Black	Chinese	Asian	Other/Mixed	Unknown	Grand Total
3	124 (91%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	6 (4%)	3 (2%)	3 (2%)	137 (100%)
9	26 (84%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	31 (100%)
10	21 (88%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	24 (100%)
11	10 (44%)	0 (0%)	7 (29%)	4 (18%)	0 (0%)	2 (9%)	23 (100%)
12	108 (65%)	0 (0%)	28 (17%)	17 (10%)	9 (5%)	5 (3%)	166 (100%)
16	23 (92%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	25 (100%)
17	27 (51%)	2 (4%)	9 (17%)	6 (12%)	7 (13%)	2 (4%)	54 (100%)
18	17 (85%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	20 (100%)
21	23 (92%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	25 (100%)
23	12 (86%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	14 (100%)
24	11 (44%)	2 (8%)	6 (24%)	5 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	25 (100%)
25	10 (91%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	11 (100%)
27	33 (86%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (8%)	2 (5%)	38 (100%)
33	15 (74%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	20 (100%)
Grand Total	460 (75%)	5 (1%)	53 (9%)	44 (7%)	29 (5%)	21 (3%)	611 (100%)

Commentary: Overall ethnicity profile of attributed outputs reflects that of the eligible pool.

C. Disability

Attribution of Selected Outputs per UOA

UOA	No Disability Declared	Disability Declared	Grand Total
3	96.4%	3.6%	100.0%
9	94.6%	5.4%	100.0%
10	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
11	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
12	98.8%	1.2%	100.0%
16	98.3%	1.7%	100.0%
17	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
18	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
21	96.8%	3.2%	100.0%
23	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
24	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
25	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
27	94.7%	5.3%	100.0%
33	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Grand Total	98.0%	2.0%	100.0%

Staff Submission (FTE) per UOA

UOA	No Disability Declared	Disability Declared	Grand Total
3	96.5%	3.5%	100.0%
9	93.5%	6.5%	100.0%
10	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
11	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
12	98.2%	1.8%	100.0%
16	96.0%	4.0%	100.0%
17	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
18	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
21	92.1%	7.9%	100.0%
23	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
24	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
25	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
27	97.4%	2.6%	100.0%
33	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Grand Total	97.7%	2.3%	100.0%

Commentary: The overall disability profile of attributed outputs reflects that of the eligible pool. It is noted that the number of reported disabilities remains low at Surrey.

D. Age

Attribution of Selected Outputs per UOA

UOA	<30	30-45	45-60	>60	Grand Total
3	0.0%	43.2%	46.1%	10.7%	100.0%
9	0.0%	41.9%	56.8%	1.4%	100.0%
10	0.0%	51.8%	41.1%	7.1%	100.0%
11	0.0%	51.9%	38.9%	9.3%	100.0%
12	0.2%	52.0%	30.2%	17.6%	100.0%
16	0.0%	50.8%	37.3%	11.9%	100.0%
17	0.0%	53.4%	32.0%	14.6%	100.0%
18	0.0%	44.0%	46.0%	10.0%	100.0%
21	0.0%	60.3%	33.3%	6.3%	100.0%
23	0.0%	78.6%	21.4%	0.0%	100.0%
24	1.7%	60.3%	29.3%	8.6%	100.0%
25	0.0%	90.9%	9.1%	0.0%	100.0%
27	0.0%	48.9%	37.2%	13.8%	100.0%
33	0.0%	46.7%	44.4%	8.9%	100.0%
Grand Total	0.1%	50.6%	37.5%	11.8%	100.0%

Staff Submission (FTE) per UOA

UOA	<30	30-45	45-60	>60	Grand Total
3	0.0%	44.8%	44.3%	10.9%	100.0%
9	0.0%	35.3%	61.4%	3.3%	100.0%
10	0.0%	50.0%	45.8%	4.2%	100.0%
11	0.0%	57.8%	33.3%	8.9%	100.0%
12	0.6%	55.4%	29.4%	14.6%	100.0%
16	0.0%	55.6%	31.5%	12.9%	100.0%
17	0.0%	51.4%	41.5%	7.1%	100.0%
18	0.0%	55.0%	37.0%	8.0%	100.0%
21	0.0%	66.4%	26.5%	7.1%	100.0%
23	0.0%	63.8%	36.2%	0.0%	100.0%
24	4.0%	65.7%	27.9%	2.4%	100.0%
25	0.0%	81.8%	18.2%	0.0%	100.0%
27	0.0%	54.6%	35.0%	10.4%	100.0%
33	0.0%	46.2%	43.6%	10.3%	100.0%
Grand Total	0.3%	52.8%	37.1%	9.8%	100.0%

Commentary: The overall age profile of attributed outputs reflects that of the eligible pool.

E. Role

Attribution of Selected Outputs per UOA

UOA	Professor	Reader	Lecturer	Research Fellow	Grand Total
3	39.3%	13.1%	44.6%	3.0%	100.0%
9	37.8%	14.9%	44.6%	2.7%	100.0%
10	33.9%	39.3%	25.0%	1.8%	100.0%
11	38.9%	1.9%	59.3%	0.0%	100.0%
12	38.4%	10.9%	46.5%	4.2%	100.0%
16	59.3%	18.6%	22.0%	0.0%	100.0%
17	50.5%	10.7%	38.8%	0.0%	100.0%
18	40.0%	10.0%	48.0%	2.0%	100.0%
21	34.9%	30.2%	25.4%	9.5%	100.0%
23	7.1%	3.6%	89.3%	0.0%	100.0%
24	51.7%	3.4%	44.8%	0.0%	100.0%
25	9.1%	0.0%	90.9%	0.0%	100.0%
27	36.2%	10.6%	42.6%	10.6%	100.0%
33	26.7%	6.7%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Grand Total	39.0%	12.7%	45.0%	3.3%	100.0%

Staff Submission (FTE) per UOA

UOA	Professor	Reader	Lecturer	Research Fellow	Grand Total
3	32.7%	13.5%	50.4%	3.3%	100.0%
9	36.6%	16.3%	41.2%	5.9%	100.0%
10	33.3%	37.5%	25.0%	4.2%	100.0%
11	31.1%	2.2%	66.7%	0.0%	100.0%
12	26.1%	13.0%	53.0%	8.0%	100.0%
16	44.4%	21.2%	34.3%	0.0%	100.0%
17	35.9%	10.0%	54.2%	0.0%	100.0%
18	30.0%	10.0%	55.0%	5.0%	100.0%
21	25.3%	18.2%	39.5%	17.0%	100.0%
23	7.2%	7.2%	85.5%	0.0%	100.0%
24	34.3%	4.0%	61.8%	0.0%	100.0%
25	18.2%	0.0%	81.8%	0.0%	100.0%
27	23.4%	8.3%	57.2%	11.1%	100.0%
33	17.9%	5.1%	76.9%	0.0%	100.0%
Grand Total	29.6%	12.8%	52.7%	4.9%	100.0%

Commentary: The overall role profile of attributed outputs reflects that of the eligible pool. The higher proportion of outputs associated with staff at Professor level is reflective of the expectations of this role.

F. Part-time, Full-time working

Attribution of Selected Outputs per UOA

UOA	Full-time	Part-time	Grand Total
3	75.6%	24.4%	100.0%
9	94.6%	5.4%	100.0%
10	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
11	98.1%	1.9%	100.0%
12	82.7%	17.3%	100.0%
16	79.7%	20.3%	100.0%
17	89.3%	10.7%	100.0%
18	88.0%	12.0%	100.0%
21	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
23	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
24	89.7%	10.3%	100.0%
25	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
27	95.7%	4.3%	100.0%
33	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Grand Total	85.4%	14.6%	100.0%

Staff Submission (FTE) per UOA

UOA	Full-time	Part-time	Grand Total
3	86.4%	13.6%	100.0%
9	94.8%	5.2%	100.0%
10	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
11	97.8%	2.2%	100.0%
12	92.8%	7.2%	100.0%
16	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%
17	97.1%	2.9%	100.0%
18	95.0%	5.0%	100.0%
21	87.0%	13.0%	100.0%
23	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
24	95.6%	4.4%	100.0%
25	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
27	98.8%	1.2%	100.0%
33	97.4%	2.6%	100.0%
Grand Total	92.9%	7.1%	100.0%

Commentary: The proportion of outputs attributed to part-time staff is higher than their representative proportion in the eligible pool. The group note that the staff included as “part-time” will include professorial staff who hold multiple contracts at this or another HEI.

G. Gender and Role

Attribution of Selected Outputs per UOA

UOA	Professors			Readers			Lecturers/Senior Lecturers			Independent Research Fellows			Grand Total
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total	
3	15.8%	23.5%	39.3%	8.0%	5.1%	13.1%	23.2%	21.4%	44.6%	2.7%	0.3%	3.0%	100.0%
9	1.4%	36.5%	37.8%	0.0%	14.9%	14.9%	17.6%	27.0%	44.6%	2.7%	0.0%	2.7%	100.0%
10	7.1%	26.8%	33.9%	3.6%	35.7%	39.3%	1.8%	23.2%	25.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.8%	100.0%
11	13.0%	25.9%	38.9%	1.9%	0.0%	1.9%	5.6%	53.7%	59.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
12	2.0%	36.4%	38.4%	2.7%	8.2%	10.9%	10.4%	36.1%	46.5%	1.2%	3.0%	4.2%	100.0%
16	14.0%	45.8%	59.3%	1.7%	17.0%	18.6%	6.8%	15.3%	22.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
17	16.5%	34.0%	50.5%	3.9%	6.8%	10.7%	20.4%	18.5%	38.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
18	18.0%	22.0%	40.0%	6.0%	4.0%	10.0%	12.0%	36.0%	48.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	100.0%
21	19.0%	15.9%	34.9%	11.1%	19.0%	30.2%	19.1%	6.4%	25.4%	4.8%	4.8%	9.5%	100.0%
23	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	3.6%	0.0%	3.6%	64.3%	25.0%	89.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
24	15.5%	36.2%	51.7%	0.0%	3.5%	3.5%	15.5%	29.3%	44.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
25	4.6%	4.6%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.8%	59.1%	90.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
27	17.0%	19.2%	36.2%	4.3%	6.4%	10.6%	33.0%	9.6%	42.6%	4.3%	6.4%	10.6%	100.0%
33	0.0%	26.7%	26.7%	0.0%	6.7%	6.7%	13.3%	53.3%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Grand Total	10.0%	29.0%	39.0%	4.2%	8.5%	12.7%	17.4%	27.7%	45.0%	1.6%	1.7%	3.3%	100.0%

Staff Submission (FTE) per UOA

UOA	Professors			Readers			Lecturers/Senior Lecturers			Independent Research Fellows			Grand Total
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total	
3	14.8%	17.9%	32.8%	6.8%	6.7%	13.5%	28.4%	22.1%	50.4%	3.1%	0.2%	3.3%	100.0%
9	0.7%	36.0%	36.6%	0.0%	16.3%	16.3%	15.0%	26.1%	41.2%	5.9%	0.0%	5.9%	100.0%
10	8.3%	25.0%	33.3%	4.2%	33.3%	37.5%	4.2%	20.8%	25.0%	0.0%	4.2%	4.2%	100.0%
11	8.9%	22.2%	31.1%	2.2%	0.0%	2.2%	4.4%	62.2%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
12	2.4%	23.7%	26.1%	2.4%	10.6%	13.0%	13.8%	39.2%	53.0%	2.4%	5.6%	8.0%	100.0%
16	8.1%	36.4%	44.4%	4.0%	17.2%	21.2%	12.1%	22.2%	34.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
17	13.1%	22.8%	35.9%	3.7%	6.3%	10.0%	26.1%	28.0%	54.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
18	12.0%	18.0%	30.0%	5.0%	5.0%	10.0%	15.0%	40.0%	55.0%	0.0%	5.0%	5.0%	100.0%
21	10.3%	15.0%	25.3%	7.1%	11.1%	18.2%	27.7%	11.9%	39.5%	11.9%	5.1%	17.0%	100.0%
23	0.0%	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%	0.0%	7.3%	63.8%	21.7%	85.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
24	12.0%	22.3%	34.3%	0.0%	4.0%	4.0%	29.9%	31.9%	61.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
25	9.1%	9.1%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	36.4%	45.5%	81.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
27	10.4%	13.0%	23.4%	3.1%	5.2%	8.3%	41.6%	15.6%	57.2%	5.9%	5.2%	11.1%	100.0%
33	0.0%	18.0%	18.0%	0.0%	5.1%	5.1%	15.4%	61.5%	76.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Grand Total	8.3%	21.3%	29.6%	3.7%	9.0%	12.8%	22.0%	30.7%	52.7%	2.5%	2.4%	4.9%	100.0%

Commentary: The gender and role profile of attributed outputs broadly reflects that of the eligible pool. It is noted that a higher proportion (9%) of outputs are attributed to Professors, this is reflected in those attributed to men, but to a lesser extent for women.

H. Research Independence Process Oct 2020 (final data November 2020)*

	Women	%		Men	%		Total (Headcount)
Total	49	100%		54	100%		103
Independent	9	18%		9	17%		18
Not Independent	40	82%		45	83%		85
Total (UOA 3)	19	68%		9	100%		28
Independent	2	11%		0	0%		2
Not Independent	17	89%		9	100%		26
Total (UOA 12)	13	100%		32	100%		45
Independent	2	15%		5	16%		7
Not Independent	11	85%		27	84%		38

* All Research Fellows at Surrey were invited to complete the independence process (as per the Code of Practice), a sub-set of these were deemed “likely” to be eligible. It is this sub-set that are used as a comparative group in Figure H. Only UOAs with more than two independent researchers, or where anonymity can be maintained, are included in Figure H. The number of staff included in these datasets was small and therefore the numbers for other protected characteristics (apart from gender) are not shared in this report to protect individual anonymity and in accordance with GDPR requirements.

I. Staff Circumstances Breakdown by gender (November 2020 data)

Circumstance and reduction awarded	Submitted by women		Submitted by men		Total
0 (i.e. no reduction)	2	6%	4	22%	6
Additional paternity leave			2		2
Early Career Researcher			1		1
Ill Health or injury	1		1		2
Disability	1				1
0.5	18	53%	4	22%	22
Ill Health or injury	1				1
Early Career Researcher	3		4		7
Maternity leave	14				14
1	10	29%	6	33%	16
Caring responsibilities			1		1
Early Career Researcher	3		5		8
Ill Health or injury	1				1
Maternity leave	6				6
1.5	1	3%	4	22%	5
Early Career Researcher	1		4		5
Additional circumstances (connected to above)	3				3
Ill Health or injury (0.5 reduction)	1				1
Maternity leave (0.5 reduction)	2				2
Grand Total	34	100%	18	100%	52

Commentary: Note the overall numbers of declared circumstances remains lower than for REF 2014, partly in response to the changes in output requirements. Each case is unique, and numbers are low, therefore no definitive conclusions will be drawn.

9 Terms of Reference for REF 2021 EDI Working Group

Membership	
Route of Appointment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable candidates identified by University ED&I Lead (2019) and the REF Team Lead (2019), based on the role requirements below. • Candidates invited to become members. • Membership endorsed by REF Management Committee.
Chair: Role requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A senior academic with a detailed understanding of the research process and REF. • An academic connected to ED&I through their own scholarship/research or through holding University ED&I related roles. • Demonstrable experience of managing academic staff, particularly related to REF, and understanding of staff policies and HR processes. • As the Group will be making decision that might have a bearing on individual's position in academic departments, it is important that the Chair of the REF ED&I Working Group has a position of standing within the broader academic community. • Experience of chairing, and bringing groups to a consensus is highly desirable
Members: Role requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An academic with good understanding of REF. • An academic connected to ED&I through their own scholarship/research or through holding University ED&I related roles. • Demonstrable experience of managing academic staff, particularly related to REF, and understanding of staff policies and HR processes.
Chair: Role Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair the ED&I Working Group meetings, ensuring the views of members are expressed and managed, and where possible consensus reached. Managing conflict and differing opinions sensitively, drawing views to a conclusion where required. • Manage the academic engagement of members of the Group. • Contribute to the review of ED&I data, identifying any ED&I issues and where appropriate escalating these to the University's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee. • This role is focused on the ED&I issues related to REF 2021, membership of this group does not therefore assume any further responsibilities for promoting, celebrating or raising awareness of ED&I more broadly.
Members: Role description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Express their views on any ED&I issue related to REF 2021 and Surrey's approach to the submission, based on their experience as an academic and associated roles in ED&I. • Contribute to the development and review of ED&I data associated with REF 2021, including; staff profiles of UOAs, representations on REF-related committees, groups and output selection and attribution. Members will identify any ED&I issues for the group to discuss. Where relevant these issues will be escalated by the Chair of the ED&I Working Group to the University's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee. • This role is focused on the ED&I issues related to REF 2021, membership of this group does not therefore assume any further responsibilities for promoting, celebrating or raising awareness of ED&I more broadly.

10 Equality Impact Assessment of Code of Practice

	Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited under the Equality Act 2010	Advance Equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it	Foster Good relations between different groups through tackling prejudice and promoting understanding
	Does the University of Surrey's REF2021 Code of Practice have a positive, negative or no impact on the protected characteristics covered by the Act?	Does the University of Surrey's Code of Practice have a positive, negative or no impact?	Does the University of Surrey's Code of Practice have a positive, negative or no impact?
Age	Positive – the University will be submitting all REF eligible staff	Positive - Early Career Researchers can follow Staff Circumstances process and request a reduction in outputs without penalty. (see Section 4.4 and Appendix D)	Positive – the REF2021 Code of Practice will be made available to all members of staff via SurreyNet and external website or by post. Ensuring all staff have access to the same information regarding REF 2021. (see Section 1.6.3) Positive – The Executive Board Lead on ED&I is named in the Code of Practice and is chair of the REF 2021 ED&I Working Group and available to advise eligible staff (see Section 1.1 and Annex C:4)
Disability	Positive - The code of practice (CoP) applies the REF 2021 policies on individual staff circumstances. (see Section 4.4 and Appendix D)	Positive – Staff Circumstances Process enable eligible staff to seek a reduction in outputs without penalty due to disability or mental health. (see section 4.4 and Appendix D)	
Gender Reassignment	Positive – In drafting the CoP several Working Groups have been consulted including; the REF 2021 Equality, Diversity & Inclusion (ED&I) Group, REF 2021 management group, Surrey's ED&I professionals and the Trade Unions.	Positive - Staff Circumstances process enable eligible staff to seek a reduction in outputs due to gender reassignment. (see Section 4.4 and Appendix D)	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	Positive – The code of practice (CoP) applies an Appeals process which is entirely separate from the REF2021	No impact - Eligible staff will automatically be included in REF2021	

Pregnancy and Maternity	<p>submission process – ensures impartiality (see Section 3.4)</p> <p>Positive – ED&I training (face-to-face where appropriate) for all REF Committees and Groups</p>	<p>Positive - Staff Circumstances process enable eligible staff to seek a reduction in outputs without penalty due to pregnancy/maternity/adoption/childcare. (see Section 4.4 and Appendix D)</p>	<p>Positive – Appeals process (see Section 3.4)</p> <p>Equality impact assessments conducted as part of REF 2021 will be published and made available to all staff.</p>
Race	<p>Positive – Research Independence process open to all staff (see Section 3.2.3)</p>	<p>No impact - Eligible staff will automatically be included in REF2021</p>	
Religion or Belief	<p>No Impact - The University recognises that staff may have concerns related to discrimination on the grounds of their protected characteristic that are outside of the REF2021 process. For example there are opportunities to raise concerns or provide feedback on the annual output review process via the REF Team, or broader ED&I concerns to the ED&I Team. Where it is deemed appropriate they can also be declared in accordance with the University of Surrey policies (including the Grievance Policy and Dignity at Work and Study Policy)</p>	<p>Positive - Staff Circumstances process enable eligible staff to seek a reduction in outputs without penalty due to caring responsibilities. (see Section 4.4 and Appendix D)</p>	
Sex		<p>Positive – each individual will be able to submit their strongest 5 outputs to be considered as part of the output selection process (see Section 4.2.2)</p>	
Sexual Orientation			
	<p>Positive - All staff involved in the process of identifying eligible staff and selecting outputs for inclusion in the REF2021 will complete ED&I training (face-to-face where appropriate). They will also complete the online Unconscious Bias training. (see Section 3.3 and Annex B:4)</p> <p>Positive – Staff who have responsibility for conducting Equality Impact Assessments on the Code of Practice will undertake specific Equality Impact Assessment training. (see Annex B:4)</p> <p>The ED&I Working Group recognises that there are inherent biases in the way outputs are assessed, selected and therefore welcome the introduction of the opportunity for individuals to self-nominate outputs. The Group also intends to pay particular attention to the proportion of outputs attributed to particular characteristics throughout REF preparations.</p>		