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PART 1: Introduction

Context:

1. De Montfort University is proud to be an inclusive university that values the contribution of staff in all its many guises – research, teaching, knowledge exchange and administration. We see engagement in the Research Excellence Framework as one facet of the contribution that staff make. We seek to nurture and grow our staff who want to build their research profiles, enabling and motivating them to conduct high-quality research, generating impact and outputs.

2. This Code of Practice establishes DMU’s processes for (i) the fair and transparent identification of staff with significant responsibility for research; (ii) determining who is an independent researcher; and (iii) the selection of outputs, including approaches to supporting staff with individual circumstances that adversely affect their productivity (‘individual circumstances’), and the process for taking reductions into account within units of assessment.

3. Fairness and inclusion are at the heart of DMU, set out through values enshrined in our strategic plan. The value of ‘respect’ is defined at DMU as our responsibility to cultivate sustainable working and learning environments that embody and promote equality of opportunity amongst communities, both within and outside the university. DMUfreedom, the university’s equality and diversity charter, commits the university to addressing diversity related gaps wherever they manifest. A comprehensive range of policies spanning from Flexible Working through to Dignity at Work enact these commitments. The most relevant to this code is our Equality of Opportunity in Employment Policy (see Appendix 1). This sets out how we uphold the requirements of the Equality Act 2010, including the duty to advance equality of opportunity.

4. Our Improving Outcomes Process ensures that our policies and procedures are evaluated at key stages to improve opportunities for under-represented groups and a strong governance framework exists to ensure that both – compliance with our legal and own policy requirements are met; and opportunities for advancing equality of outcome are realised. These governance arrangements include a central Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC), individual faculty EDICs, formally recognised staff representation groups and a Race Equality Board.

5. Included in our successful Athena SWAN and Race Equality Charter applications are action plans and activities that will support diversifying the demographic composition of our researchers. This extends to identifying and supporting talent at postgraduate researcher (PGR) level through to Early Career Researchers (ECRs), and movement into substantive teaching and research posts. It includes researcher development activities led by Research Services (including the Doctoral College), with support for a range of opportunities to strategically develop research careers, including taking a research idea to funding and implementation, delivering impact and enhancing researchers’ digital footprint. A key strategic initiative here is the Future Research Leaders Programme, which offers monthly developmental sessions over a year-long course to develop researchers’ leadership skills. Those unsuccessful in getting a place on the programme may be selected for the ‘Leading Research Mentoring’ programme.

6. In 2018, we introduced a positive action development programme for women, disabled staff, and staff of a Black or minority ethnic heritage. In meeting the commitments set out in our Athena SWAN and Race Equality Charter action plans, through our communications and line management structures, we ensure that we actively encourage women, BAME and other
under-represented groups to apply for opportunities in relation to promotion and development. Our commitment to the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers informed our Concordat Action Plans (2018-20) and secured us the HR Excellence in Research Award in 2018.

**Update on Actions Since REF2014**

7. This Code of Practice builds on DMU’s REF2014 code. DMU’s REF 2014 submission was guided by the 2009-12 Research Strategy, which stated the objective of expanding ‘the range and volume of research activity across the University, while continuing to drive up quality, so that a mature and sustainable research environment is created’. The 2012-15 strategy articulated the desire to ‘attain, at a minimum, internationally recognized research excellence in all areas of DMU research activity...’ and its commitment to ‘not only expanding our research base but also deepening our research interventions’.

8. DMU’s current strategic vision builds on that earlier strategy, and includes a commitment to ‘nurture, recognise and support researchers and research leaders’ (Strategic Framework 2015-20). And DMU’s Research Strategy for 2018-23, approved by its Board of Governors, sets out its ambition of ensuring that 60% of all its academic staff are research active by 2023.

9. In order to encourage research activity at all levels, a key initiative from 2014 has been a scheme where staff could bid for an allocation of research time. As stated in the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) for REF 2014, the Individual Research Plan (IRP) exercise, piloted in 2014, was created to assist research-active staff to plan and develop their research careers. All full-time and pro rata academic staff on the single pay spine at DMU are appointed on Teaching and Research (T&R) contracts, with a 0.1 FTE allocation for research/scholarship. The IRP, aimed at supporting staff to build their research portfolio, was formally rolled out in 2014. All academic staff on the single pay-spine seeking a research allowance in excess of the allocated scholarly activity allowance, as well as all professorial staff in post were invited to apply for an IRP.

10. The IRP was introduced following consultation with the University and College Union (UCU), and the scheme has since been run each year with extensive communications outlining the process, sent out to all staff on T&R contracts by individual email and promoted through Research Services communications, as well as communications through Faculty Associate Deans of Research. The People and Organisational Development (POD) Directorate ensured that communications were sent to T&R staff off campus on extended leave. An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) was conducted on the pilot iteration as well as subsequent iterations, and actions have been taken to ameliorate discrepancies identified in application and allocation rates by protected characteristics. The scheme was renamed Individual Innovation and Research Plan (IIRP) in 2016-17, and took on its current name, Research and Innovation Allowance (RIA), in 2017-18.

11. To assess our preparedness for REF, we conducted an initial gap analysis and systems check in 2017-18, followed by a more comprehensive survey in 2018-19. The latter exercise included an attempt to ascertain how researchers themselves defined what constituted ‘significant responsibility for research’ (SRR). We carried out a survey of all staff on T&R contracts in January 2019. The survey had 89 responses and provided the initial signals linking the RIA allocation to SRR, to enable us to move forward with a more comprehensive REF-related communications strategy, using RIA allocations as a potential measure for substantial research activity.
12. There have been a number of other initiatives since the REF 2014 exercise to enhance the research environment and support researcher careers at DMU. These have included:

a. A series of initiatives to showcase research and promote impact and engagement:
   - #DMUGlobal PhD Research Fellowship Scheme for postgraduate research students (to support travel to overseas research institutes)
   - DMULocal (to support public engagement, potentially leading to Impact)
   - DMUEngage (to support activities to generate research impact)
   - The expansion of public engagement activities, including creation of the Stephen Lawrence Research Centre, the DMU Heritage Centre and the expansion of the Public Engagement Team
   - DMUResearchMatters (linked to our research communications strategy to support public engagement)
   - A revamped website prominently promoting DMU research
   - The Doctoral College Lecture Series
   - The appointment of dedicated Research Impact Officers
   - Regular research impact events throughout 2016-2019

b. Initiatives to augment and incentivise researcher career support:
   - The Future Research Leaders Scheme (a leadership development opportunity for researchers)
   - The Research Leave Scheme, now replaced by the Global Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Fellowship Scheme (an annual competitive programme offering a term of research leave to staff across all faculties)
   - The establishment of a Research and Innovation Fund (RIF) that staff could bid to for pump-priming research activities (run every year except 2018-19, when it was specifically allocated to impact activities as the Impact Acceleration Fund), as well as faculty-led seedcorn funding initiatives
   - An Early Career Researcher network with training programmes (including writing retreats and workshops) and mentoring from senior staff
   - The creation of 32 new research institutes
   - Research OSCARs to celebrate research and research-related achievements

**Principles**

13. In line with REF2021 Guidance, this Code of Practice demonstrates the University’s adherence to the principles of transparency, consistency, accountability and inclusivity, particularly in the identification of staff with significant responsibility for research.

   a. **Transparency**: All processes informing DMU’s submission to REF 2021 will be available for scrutiny through a process of consultation on this Code, which details the steps being taken to ensure clear, transparent and auditable processes. Particularly relevant here is the process for the identification of staff with significant responsibility for research (SRR), a key signifier of which will be the Research and Innovation Allowance (RIA). The RIA is an allocation of a block of time for research through an application process. The RIA, which was initially launched in 2014 as the ‘Individual Research Plan (IRP)’, was designed to (i) ensure fairness and provide increased transparency regarding the allocation of research allowances and (ii) ensure that research-active members of staff had appropriate support to carry out their research. As stated in the Equality Impact Assessment for REF 2014, the IRP was intended to support the promotion of research in terms of both quality and equality. All academic (T&R) staff on the single pay spine seeking a research
allowance in excess of the allocated scholarly activity allowance (0.1 FTE), as well as all professorial staff, are invited to apply for a RIA. DMU’s processes in relation to identifying research independence, as well as the selection of outputs, is outlined later in this document.

b. **Consistency:** Through all the iterations of the RIA, we have ensured that the process is rolled out consistently, with consistent messaging, providing equal opportunities for all staff, whether on full-time or part-time contracts, and whether in more traditional or practice-based disciplines, to bid for a RIA.

Extensive communications and guidance will accompany each of the steps en route to the final REF 2021 submission to ensure consistency in messaging and processes. This will include communications concerning the ‘readiness for REF’ exercises, output reviews (internal as well as external reviews), impact case study reviews, three-weekly meetings of the Units of Assessment Coordinators (REF Working Group), guidelines for the operations of panels, and guidance on individual feedback.

A key message consistently being reinforced through all our communications to staff is that decisions on the identification of staff with significant responsibility for research, or outputs, will not affect staff career progression.

c. **Accountability:** We are clearly defining the responsibilities and accountabilities for individuals and groups involved in the identification of staff and selection of outputs for the REF submissions, with clear terms of reference, whilst also ensuring diversity across the hierarchy (see Appendix 2).

d. **Inclusivity:** This principle is informing all aspects of our REF 2021 submission. Here we outline how we are ensuring inclusivity of (i) staff and (ii) outputs.

- **Staff:** We are ensuring inclusivity of staff (whether full- or pro rata, and by protected characteristics) by reviewing data on RIA applications and awards, to consider the representativeness of overall staff profiles to those applying for RIAs. In a bid to encourage staff to engage in research, the May 2019 RIA process is inviting applications for staff who wish to identify as ‘researchers-in-training’, with a structured cohort-based year-long development programme in place to build professional researcher capabilities.

Key decision-makers (Deans of Faculties/Heads of School), and those with research-related responsibilities (Associate Deans of Research, Unit of Assessment Coordinators) have been advised on patterns emerging from Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) for past iterations of the RIA/IRP so they are aware of differential application and allocation rates (see Appendix 3 for equality data on RIA 2018). All Chairs of RIA decision-making panels (e.g. senior executives like the PVC for Research and APVC for Research as well as Associate Deans for Research & Innovation) have been required to undergo Advance HE Equality, Diversity and Inclusion training in addition to the University’s Unconscious Bias training. Members of panels are mandated to have recently (within the last two years) completed the University’s Equality, Diversity and Inclusion training. Panel members will also be briefed by the members of the Equalities team and Research Services on key issues to be mindful during the decision-making process (drawing on REF 2021 guidance).
Outputs: Our output selection will reflect and be representative of the breadth of research carried out at DMU. As part of our preparedness for REF exercises, we have internally reviewed and rated outputs, and we have had at least 20% of all outputs also reviewed externally. The reviewer criteria copied the REF 2021 criteria of originality, significance and rigour, and were made available to all staff. Communications around this have underlined that it is not an attempt to judge individual outputs; instead, these exercises seek to establish the overall state of the unit of assessment. Staff have been provided the overall grade point average for the Unit based on the entirety of submissions, with individual feedback made available to those who requested this. The final REF submission will also mirror this, with all staff identified as having SRR returned, keeping to the minimum of 1 and a maximum of 5 outputs in a submission (overall 2.5 outputs per FTE). An Individual Circumstances Panel, run independently of the REF Steering Committee, will advise where reductions in outputs or removal of the requirement of the minimum of one output are warranted.

Communications

14. The REF Steering Committee (see Appendix 5 for the Terms of Reference for this Committee and the section below) is the strategic decision-making body on all processes in relation to REF 2021, informing the University Executive and the Academic Board on strategy and implementation. This body is responsible for the underpinning communications plan and ensuring, in keeping with the principles of transparency and inclusivity, that staff feedback through the consultation on the Code is fully considered.

15. Communications with staff around REF 2021 have been ongoing since submission to the last REF, including through the two preparedness-for-REF audit exercises, completed over 2017-18 and 2018-19. A survey was sent out to all staff on T&R contracts to ascertain their definitions of significant responsibility for research and research independence in January 2019, which has informed institutional guidance on identification of staff with SRR.

16. Communications on the REF have been primarily through the Associate Deans for Research & Innovation (ADRs) in each faculty, as well as through Units of Assessment (UoA) Coordinators and their deputies (see Appendix 6 for the REF 2021 timetable that includes communications programme).

17. The communications plan includes: (i) consultation on the Code of Practice, including with staff who are on fractional contracts or currently away from the university; (ii) the strategy for delivering REF 2021; (iii) the processes DMU will follow to make the submission; and (iv) guidance on good practice to ensure transparency and consistency of processes.

18. Communications on the Code of Practice began through REF Roadshows to each of the faculties in late April, led by the Pro Vice Chancellor (PVC) for Research, the Associate PVC for Research and the Head of Policy, Governance and Research Student Services. Further open forums on the Code of Practice, and DMU’s REF preparations, took place in late May.

19. The University’s highest executive has been kept apprised of preparations towards REF 2021, and a presentation on the Code of Practice was delivered in April 2019 to the Academic Board, which is chaired by the Vice Chancellor.

20. An open consultation on the Code of Practice was launched on 9 May 2019 for three weeks, with the circulation of a draft Code. All T&R staff were invited to feed back through a
dedicated email (refcop@dmu.ac.uk). Staff could also feed back in confidence through their Associate Deans of Research & Innovation (ADRs), who sit on the REF Steering Committee.

21. The consultation included engagement with relevant committees and unions, and saw representation from different characteristics and career levels. It included key committees (including the University Research and Innovation Committee) and the University and College Union. REF preparations (and the development of the Code of Practice) constituted one of the foci of the visits of the PVC and Associate PVC for Research to all of our Research Institutes/Centres, where colleagues were able to pose questions and offer suggestions.

22. Clear, confidential pathways to disclosing individual circumstances, and for an appeals process, are also being communicated to all academic staff.

23. People and Organisational Development identified staff on extended leave from the University and had the Code forwarded to them by post, with an invitation to participate in the consultation.

Roles and Responsibilities (Staff, Committees and Training)

24. In the spirit of accountability, the Code of Practice identifies staff who will be making decisions on the DMU REF 2021 submission. All staff in any REF decision-making capacity have undergone Equality, Diversity and Inclusion training along the lines promoted by Advance HE, with a special focus on REF-related decision-making. This includes those on the REF Steering Committee, as well as the REF Working Group. Only trained members can chair decision-making panels.

25. The REF Steering Committee is the key decision-making body for REF2021. It keeps the highest bodies in the University informed on progress on strategy and implementation, including the Academic Board, which is chaired by the Vice-Chancellor. It also monitors processes to ensure that the Code is appropriately applied, both in word and in spirit, conducting equality impact and outcomes assessments following RIA exercises; and that the principle of inclusivity is upheld. It ensures that DMU’s policies on equality and diversity are applied and equality outcomes assessments conducted at every stage. Whilst this does not constitute an exhaustive list, we will conduct Equality Impact and Outcomes Assessment on our REF 2021 submission when:

- identifying staff with significant responsibility for research and determining research independence;
- selecting outputs for submission;
- considering impact case studies;
- considering appeals regarding identification of staff who do not have significant responsibility for research.

26. Reporting to the REF Steering Committee is the REF Working Group. The REF Working Group consists of Unit of Assessment (UoA) Coordinators (and their deputies), who implement the criteria for identifying staff with significant responsibility for research, and the selection of research outputs. The UoA Coordinators are responsible for liaising with academic staff, ensuring appropriate communication and feedback is given to individuals at each stage, and advising them of the process for appealing decisions on inclusion or exclusion (see Appendix 7 for Terms of Reference and the role descriptors for UoA Coordinators and their deputies).
27. Key experts outside these committees/groups are drawn together in a REF Advisory Group. This Group includes the Head of Library Services, Head of Research Services, Director of People and Organisational Development, and the Director of ITMS, with other members drawn in as necessary to provide specialist advice and guidance on specific aspects of the REF submission process.

28. The REF Appeals Panel will comprise members independent of the REF management structure outlined above, and will be chaired by the Chief Operating Officer, with membership consisting of the Associate Pro Vice Chancellor (Academic), HR Policy and Strategy Manager, and the Head of Executive, Legal and Governance Services.

29. The University’s researchers have the responsibility of providing full and accurate records of published research outputs and other relevant information to the REF Working Group.

PART 2: Identifying Staff with Significant Responsibility for Research

Policies and Procedures

30. DMU is committed to the principle that identification of staff for the REF will meet the requirements of the REF Guidance on Submission and meet the standards of Equality legislation, ensuring the avoidance of direct or indirect discrimination of any kind. Plans and procedures for the preparation of DMU REF submissions will be Equality Impact Assessed in accordance with University’s Equality and Diversity policies and procedures.

31. As per the Guidance on Codes of Practice, Significant Responsibility for Research (SRR) comprises ‘those for whom explicit time and resources are made available’, ‘who actively engage in independent research’, and where research ‘is an expectation of their job role’.

32. DMU is a largely teaching-intensive university with recognised pockets of research excellence. Our University Research Strategy has the ambitious goal of increasing our research footprint, so that at least 60% of all academic staff are research active by 2023. The supported training trajectory we propose below is key to ensuring that we are able to meet this objective.

33. DMU’s academic staff, full-time and pro rata, are appointed on a T&R contract, with a 0.1 FTE (half a day a week) allocation for research/scholarship -- an allocation which, in itself, would not constitute ‘significant responsibility for research’ (SRR). DMU has a very few (currently at 18) members of staff appointed on ‘research only’ contracts (largely as research assistants).

34. As a post-92 institution, we have a range of staff with differing experiences, and we do not expect every researcher to have several outputs. The University’s ambition is to support and protect research(er) careers in a more structured way. We have a number of staff who:
   a. Are practitioners who currently do not hold PhDs or equivalent;
   b. Have not had significant responsibility for research;
   c. Have joined DMU after a teaching-focused post elsewhere;
   d. Have joined DMU straight after completing their PhD.

35. DMU is currently creating an academic career framework. We recognise and equally value all contributions to the academic endeavour, be it via teaching, research or a combination thereof. A programme of activities to support research careers in a much more targeted way is in development, to be rolled out after a period of consultation and equality impact assessment in October 2019.
36. The RIA scheme is a marker of significant responsibility for research. The consultation on the Code indicated agreement on moving forward with the RIA as a basis for identifying staff with SRR. The RIA moved from an annual to a bi-annual allocation in 2018 (making for a two-year research allocation for all successful applicants). It was felt that this would better enable researchers to complete research and start producing outputs. An invitation to apply for a RIA opened towards the end of May 2019, targeting particularly those who may not have a RIA, or who may have joined the university since the last round of RIA allocations. RIA allocations are in blocks, with a minimum block being 320 hours (or a day a week), with additional blocks of 480 and 640 hours annually.

37. As for previous RIA iterations, a streamlined panel-led process will be utilised for 2019/20. The RIA closes on 13 June 2019 (see Appendix 4 for RIA Application Form 2019). There is a two-stage process, with preliminary panels at School-level, chaired by the Associate Deans of Research & Innovation (ADRs), taking place in late June 2019. Due consideration is given to the balance of the panels, and all panel members are required to have Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, as well as Unconscious Bias training. Panels are required to be representative of career-stage, and by protected characteristics, with membership including at least two senior members of the professoriate, two early career researchers, and a representative from Research Services. The recommendations by these panels feed into final Faculty-level panels (taking place over the first two weeks of July 2019), chaired by the APVC or PVC Research who, together with the relevant ADRs as well as the Deans of Faculties and the Heads of Schools, will make the final allocation. All applicants receive feedback on their application.

38. Heads of School are required to ensure that where appropriate, adequate mentoring and support is available to applicants in order to support the achievement of a RIA. The research allowance forms include a section in which applicants can request, and be allocated, mentors to support them in their research endeavours.

39. The identification of staff with significant responsibility for research will be as follows:

   a. All staff who have a RIA of **320 hours or more**, excluding those assigned to the Next Generation Researchers’ Programme (see 39c below) at the REF census date (31 July 2020) will automatically be submitted to the REF.

   b. Senior staff (e.g. PVCs, PVC/Deans) who, in addition to their leadership role, are research active and have a RIA of 320 hours or more for research, will be returned.

   c. We are inviting staff new to research, returning to research or those relaunching their research careers, to apply for the 320 hours RIA to support the development of their careers. These members of staff will be invited to a consultation with their UoA Coordinator and Faculty Associate Dean of Research, during which:

      i. Their CV and career plans are discussed;

      ii. Research-related appraisal systems are put in place; and

      iii. Training opportunities outlined, if deemed suitable.

40. These staff (39c above) will have the option of identifying themselves as ‘researchers-in-training’, with resources in place to help them acquire significant responsibility for research and to fulfil this responsibility over a clear timeline. This will include:

   a. Enrolment on the Next Generation Researchers’ Programme, a researcher development initiative, tailored to individual needs. There will be a separate
University-wide funding stream dedicated to training such cohorts.

b. Pairing with a senior researcher at DMU, with structured mentoring.

c. Appraisal targets and milestones to build research capabilities in a supportive manner. The aim here is to build research capacity and empower aspiring researchers, which is consistent with the University Research Strategy 2018-2023. Non-submission to the REF will not adversely impact career development at DMU, and will not inform the promotion process.

41. Heads of School, and Associate Deans of Research have been apprised that new members of staff, or staff who have not had the opportunity to put in for a RIA in 2019 (and do not have a two-year allocation from 2018) will be invited to do so at specific points before the REF census date. These will not be open exercises but geared specifically at ensuring that new staff, or staff currently away during the 2019 RIA process, are not disadvantaged.

42. All staff who have requested, and been allocated, a RIA, will be advised in writing by panels reviewing their RIA applications (in late July for the 2019 May RIA process); new dates and times will be publicised for invitations to apply, restricted to new staff or staff who are currently away, ahead of the REF staff census date of 31 July 2020.

43. Those with no RIA and therefore no allocation above the contractual baseline of 0.1 FTE for research/scholarship, are not deemed to have significant responsibility for research and will, therefore, not be submitted.

44. The process is represented diagrammatically in Appendix 8.

Appeals processes and equality impact assessments are discussed below in Part 3.

PART 3: Determining Research Independence

Policies and Procedures

45. Based on REF guidance, an independent researcher is defined as an individual who undertakes self-directed research, rather than carrying out another individual’s research programme.

46. The University, in accordance with the REF Guidance on Submission, does not recognise Research Assistants, Research Associates and Research Fellows as independent researchers where the primary employment function is to carry out/deliver on another individual’s research programme. R-only staff funded from research grants will normally be ineligible for submission.

47. Here we set out how we will determine which staff on research only (R-only) contracts meet the definition of independent researcher. Staff on R-only contracts will be included in the submission where independence has been demonstrated as of the census date.

48. Our criteria for determining independence have been drawn from the indicators listed in the REF 2021 Guidance on Submissions (paras 131-134). Where a member of staff is on a research-only contract, the key considerations for independence will be as follows:

• 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 (as per illustrative though not exhaustive list provided by REF under Guidance);
• leading a research group or a substantial or specialised work package.

49. Authorship on research outputs in and of itself does not constitute a demonstration of independence.

DMU Procedure for Determining Research Independence

50. A number of steps will be taken to determine which R-only staff are independent, as follows:

a. HR records and research grant records will be used to identify individuals who hold fellowships which are a match with the list provided by Research England. Individuals who hold one of these fellowships and will be employed by the University on an eligible contract on the census date of 31 July 2020 will normally be considered eligible. The REF Steering Committee will ratify the inclusion of these staff, before the individuals and respective UoA Coordinators are informed.

b. Data on R-only staff will be cross-checked with grant data to identify individuals who are research assistants funded on a research grant held by another individual. In line with the REF guidance, these R-only staff will normally be ineligible for submission. UoA Coordinators and Heads of School will be asked to verify the data and agree the ineligibility of these staff.

c. Where the independence of R-only staff is not clear from the steps outlined above, individuals will be asked to provide additional information to help determine whether or not they meet the criteria for independence on the census date of 31 July 2020. This will be done in a consistent and transparent manner through the use of a standard form (see Appendix 10). Forms will be counter-signed by the Head of School or the applicant’s line manager, and will be submitted to ref@dmu.ac.uk. Examples of this group include individuals who hold internally-awarded fellowships or grants.

d. Any member of R-only staff may submit a self-initiated case to help determine whether they meet the criteria for independence. Individuals should use the same standard form as for point ‘c’ above, but should discuss their application with their Head of School/line manager prior to submission.

e. All cases will be reviewed at regular intervals in batches by a panel which will include representation from each faculty, together with People and Organisational Development (POD) and the Research Services Directorate (RSD). This cross-institutional panel approach ensures that the criteria are applied consistently across the University. The panel will consider the evidence of experience supplied by the staff member against the REF 2021 Guidance on Submissions (paras 128-133) and Panel Criteria and Working Methods (paras 87-89), and make recommendations about which individuals meet the criteria for independence to the REF Steering Committee. Following ratification by the REF Steering Committee, individuals, their Heads of School and UoA Coordinators will be advised of the outcome. Individuals will have the right of appeal.

f. Data on R-only staff will be reviewed regularly to identify new members of staff joining the University and any changes in status. The above process will be repeated as required.
Appeals Process

51. All communications about the REF will remind staff of their right to appeal, and the appeals process is clearly outlined and communicated in paras 52-56, below. There are three defined appeals processes – (i) an appeal against a decision of identification of SRR; (ii) an appeal against a decision on research independence; (iii) an appeal against the decision of an individual circumstances panel evaluation.

52. During the identification process, staff may consult with the Unit of Assessment Coordinators at any stage, whether they self-identify as having SRR, or not. A guidance document will be provided to all UoA Coordinators/Heads of School to discuss research career support and development (see Appendix 9).

53. Individual staff wishing to appeal the outcome of the process for identification of staff with SRR must forward their appeal no later than Friday, 22 May 2020. Appeals must be addressed to the REF Appeals Panel and sent to refappeals@dmu.ac.uk.

54. Appeals may be considered on the grounds that:
   - criteria for selection of SRR or independent research were not applied in accordance with this Code;
   - there was a material error in the data used by the REF Working Group in applying the criteria; or
   - individual circumstances were not considered as per the guidance offered by REF in relation to the REF Individual Circumstances process.

55. Appeals cannot be made on the basis of the perceived quality of research outputs. Identification of SRR is not a judgement on the quality of outputs.

56. Appeals must be made in writing and include all relevant supporting evidence. Appeals cannot be made by a third party, except in cases of incapacity, where evidence is provided. In accordance with data protection legislation, written authorisation to correspond with a third party from the individual must be submitted.

57. The REF Appeals Panel will investigate and forward a written response within 28 days of the meeting of the panel. The panel is scheduled to meet on or before Friday, 12 June 2020. The decision of the Appeals Panel is final. Details of the appeals process will be published on the University’s research webpages in the REF-related section. Information about the appeals process will also be included in all communication with individual staff about outcomes of the identification process for SRR and, where relevant, identification of researcher independence.

Equality Impact Assessment

58. The University’s initial plans and procedures for preparations for the REF have been equality impact assessed.

59. The Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) is part of an on-going process to provide a thorough and systematic analysis of our criteria for identifying staff with a significant responsibility for research, and to understand whether these criteria have a detrimental impact upon particular groups and to prevent indirect or direct discrimination. The EIA also helps both to identify inadvertent discrimination that may have occurred and to highlight positive impacts on the achievement of equality. The EIA will be reviewed and revised at key points in the process,
with major dates centred around RIA allocation rounds, particularly the RIA invitations for 2019-20.

60. Equalities data for RIA 2018 by protected characteristics is provided in Appendix 3. This will form part of the EIA conducted for RIAs in both, 2018 and 2019, to identify staff with significant responsibility for research, to be returned alongside the REF 2021 submission.

61. The institution, via the REF Steering Committee, reserves the right to undertake an EIA at the UoA level if there is any perception of imbalance within a specific UoA.

PART 4: Selection of Outputs

Policies and Procedures

62. In selecting outputs for our REF submission, our key priorities will be to ensure representativeness of the breadth and diversity of our research, whilst ensuring that our submissions are of the highest quality.

63. The quality of research outputs is judged using a combination of internal review (by at least two reviewers) and external peer review of at least 20 per cent of all outputs.

64. Reviewers are selected on the basis of:
   a. Relevant research expertise and seniority in the field;
   b. Being representative of the cohort of eligible staff (as far as possible)

65. The appointment of external reviewers is based on previous experience of REF and expertise in the broad UoA subject area.

66. Reviewers, external and internal, are provided guidance as to the level of detailed comment they should provide on individual outputs. Comments made by external advisors appointed by the University are viewed alongside other evidence about the quality of outputs and appropriateness of draft submissions.

67. The preparedness for REF exercises were set up not to provide judgement on already published work, but to assess the general state of each unit of assessment. UoA leads communicated with researchers to provide them with the emerging grade point average for the Unit, taking all outputs into consideration. Individual grading of outputs was only provided if sought, as the overall tenor in which these audits were conducted was to establish the health of units, and create an enabling rather than a judgemental ethos around the REF.

68. The data generated from the scoring process will allow us to build a profile of submissions. We will be able to attribute at least one single output to each individual (except where procedures taking into account the effect of individual circumstances have been applied). We will select the best of the remaining, subject to the constraint of a maximum of 5 outputs allocated to an individual member of staff, to arrive at a representative group.

69. The REF Steering Committee will be the ultimate arbiter on decisions concerning which Units of Assessment individuals are submitted to.
70. Outputs will not be considered from staff who have been made redundant. Outputs from former staff who have left the University will only be included in exceptional cases where there has been a significant and substantial connection to the UoA.

71. Where the cumulative effect of individual circumstances has disproportionately affected a UoA’s output pool, we will request a reduction without penalty in the total number of outputs required for submission, where the individual circumstances of Category A submitted staff have constrained their ability to produce outputs or to work productively throughout the assessment period. This includes measures to remove the minimum of one requirement where an individual’s circumstances have had an exceptional effect on their ability to work productively, so that the individual has not been able to produce an eligible output.

**Consideration of Individual Staff Circumstances and Confidentiality**

72. The REF guidelines clearly indicate that individual circumstances that might have had an effect on an individual’s contribution should be taken into account. All staff will be made aware of this provision through briefings and direct communication and will be invited to inform the University confidentially of any circumstances that may have had a material impact on their ability to produce the expected volume of research outputs. Staff will be invited to provide information through returning the Individual Staff Circumstances Disclosure Form set out in Annex 12 via a confidential and dedicated email address, IndCircs@dmu.ac.uk. This is accessible only by the Equality and Diversity team. Requests must be based on the circumstances defined by the REF2021 and must be supported, where appropriate, by further information/evidence.

73. People and Organisational Development will make special arrangements to communicate with any member of staff absent from the University on long-term sick leave/maternity leave, etc. by email and through other personal communications.

74. Applications for consideration of individual circumstances are entirely voluntary and staff are under no obligation to declare individual circumstances if they do not wish to do so. We will not take account of any individual circumstances other than those that staff have declared voluntarily in the REF submission process.

75. The University supports staff through its occupational health and well-being services, which are accessible via the University’s Online Portal. Internal staff communications routinely promote the avenues of support available and staff will be reminded of the support provision in our communications about Individual Circumstances. Responsibility for oversight of this provision rests with the University’s Health and Safety and Wellbeing Committee.

76. We will draw on the circumstances detailed in the Guidance on Submissions (REF 2019/01, paragraphs 160-161) and the defined reductions set out in Appendix L (Appendix 11 of this document) to identify individual circumstances which have been identified as, in isolation or together, potentially significantly constraining the ability of a member of staff to produce outputs or to work productively throughout the assessment period. These circumstances include:
   b. Absence from work due to secondments or career breaks outside the HE sector.
   c. Qualifying periods of family-related leave.
   d. Other circumstances that apply in UOAs 1–6, as defined in paragraphs 162 to 163 of REF2019/01).
e. Circumstances with an equivalent effect to absence, that require a judgement about the appropriate reduction in outputs (see Appendix 11 for details).

77. As part-time working is taken account of within the calculation for the overall number of outputs required for the unit (which is determined by multiplying the unit’s FTE by 2.5) reduction requests on the basis of part-time working hours will only be made exceptionally.

78. Similarly, we will follow the Guidance on Submissions requirements (paragraphs 178-183) for members of staff who have not been able to produce an eligible output, where any of the following circumstances apply within the period 1 January 2014 to 31 July 2020:
   a. An overall period of 46 months or more absence from research during the assessment period, due to one or more of the circumstances set out in the guidance (such as an Early Career Researcher who has only been employed as an eligible staff member for part of the assessment period);
   b. Circumstances equivalent to 46 months or more absence from research, where circumstances set out in Appendix 11 apply (such as mental health issues, caring responsibilities, long-term health conditions); or
   c. Two or more qualifying periods of family-related leave, as defined in Appendix 11.

79. Staff may discuss their circumstances and/or seek support provided with an appropriate person, for example an HR Adviser or line manager.

80. The internal deadline for submitting requests for staff circumstances to the formal panel for REF2021 is Wednesday, 22 January 2020 to ensure that requests can be processed and approved in good time to meet the Research England deadline of 31 March 2020 for submission of cases requesting unit and individual reductions. We will still consider circumstances after this date on an exceptional basis, e.g. for new members of staff or where there have been serious or unexpected changes to circumstances.

81. A ‘REF Individual Circumstances Review Panel’, chaired by the Deputy Vice Chancellor, and including the University Head of Equality and Diversity, the HR Operations Manager, the Head of HR and the academic representative on the Board of Governors, will meet to review the circumstances put forward to ensure that they fall within the criteria indicated in the REF2021 Guidance on Submissions REF2019/01 and to make recommendations to the REF Steering Committee. Sensitive information submitted by individual members of staff will be kept confidential to the Individual Circumstances Review Panel. Any staff making an application or appealing via the individual circumstances process will have their individual outcome confirmed in writing. It is still the decision of the individual whether to use the reduction or not.

82. All forms will be treated with full confidentiality. They will be reviewed by members of the Individual Circumstances Panel, who will ensure compliance with any relevant legislation and advice on the individual’s eligibility for reductions using the REF guidance. Non-sensitive data, for example, about ECR status, may be shared with designated staff in the Research Governance team, if and where appropriate.

**Adjustment of expectations of individual contribution to output pool where circumstances are declared**

83. The REF Steering Committee will receive regular anonymised updates on the number of circumstances disclosed, broken down by broad category (e.g. parental leave or Early Career Researcher) and by UoA. Data will always be anonymised to protect the identity of individuals and to respect confidentiality.
84. The internal process for deciding whether an individual is entitled to a reduction is distinct from any request to Research England for a Unit-level reduction. There is no set expectation of staff contribution to the output pool as the RIA is allocated for a range of independent research activities and might include grants, impact, knowledge exchange and outputs (see Appendix 12 for communication and support offered).

   a. Unit-level reduction request

   The Individual Circumstances Panel will calculate the anonymised cumulative effect of requests relating to an individual unit according to the REF Guidance on Submissions. The Individual Circumstances Panel members will work with the relevant UoA Coordinator to draft the supporting statement for submission to Research England. The statement will provide context about the unit and will articulate the impact of the circumstances on the output pool, thereby making the case for the reduction.

   The Research Governance team will ensure that statements and supporting data for each UoA are submitted to Research England no later than 31 March 2020. They will also communicate the outcome of the requests for reductions to the REF Steering Committee, UoA Coordinators and the EDI team as soon as these are received from Research England.

   b. Removing the ‘minimum of one’ requirement

   In line with the Guidance on Submissions (paragraphs 178-183), there will be a route for members of staff to be returned without the required minimum of one output where their circumstances have had an exceptional effect on their ability to work productively throughout the period, such that the staff member has not been able to produce the required minimum of one output.

85. The process for submitting circumstances that may lead to the University requesting the removal of the minimum of one output requirement will be the same as that outlined above for circumstances impacting on the wider unit.

Communication of Key Decisions to Staff Individually

86. We have expanded in sections above on the various communication strategies used to reach our T&R and R-only staff collectively. Here we set out how key decisions will be communicated to staff individually.

87. All T&R staff are sent emails to invite their participation in the research allocation exercise. This is further cascaded through Associate Deans of Research and Innovation (ADRs) and Unit of Assessment Coordinators.

88. The ADRs, through the Faculty Research and Innovation Offices, communicate the outcomes of the RIA panel deliberations individually to each member of staff, with staff invited to meet with the ADR or the Associate Pro Vice Chancellor for Research (APVCR) or Pro Vice Chancellor for Research (PVCR) if they want to further discuss any matters.

89. The timetable for further individual communications is set out below:

   Letters to R-only staff on research independence and confirming whether they might be deemed eligible By Tuesday, 1 October 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date/Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for receipt of letters where R-only staff independence status unclear or where they self-initiate a case for independence</td>
<td>Monday, 28 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes on research independence claims and notification of appeals process</td>
<td>By Wednesday, 27 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to all staff holding a RIA inviting them to declare any individual circumstances</td>
<td>By Friday, 30 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal deadline for declaring individual circumstances</td>
<td>Wednesday, 22 January 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction requests to Research England</td>
<td>By 31 March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for appeals</td>
<td>Friday, 22 May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals panel meets</td>
<td>By Friday, 12 June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals outcomes communicated to individuals</td>
<td>By Friday, 26 June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equality of Opportunity Policy

May 2016
INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE

1.1 De Montfort University is committed to promoting equality of opportunity in employment. Employees and job applicants will receive equal treatment regardless of race, colour, ethnic or national origin, sex or sexual orientation (for example gay, lesbian, bisexual or heterosexual), marital or civil partnership status, religion or belief (or no religion or belief), gender identity or status (transgender), age, disability, or any other protected characteristic.

1.2 This policy sets out the university’s approach to equality of opportunity and the avoidance of discrimination at work. It applies to all aspects of employment with us, including recruitment, pay and conditions, training, appraisals, promotion, conduct at work, disciplinary and grievance procedures, and termination of employment. It should be applied alongside and with reference to the university’s other policies and procedures including those referred to in this policy.

1.3 Where applicable, this policy covers all staff working for or on behalf of De Montfort University e.g. all DMU employees, secondees, consultants, contractors, volunteers, interns, casual workers and agency workers.

1.4 Breaches of this policy may be dealt with in accordance with the disciplinary procedure. Serious cases of deliberate discrimination may amount to gross misconduct resulting in dismissal.

1.5 This policy does not form part of any employee's contract of employment and the university may amend it at any time.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE POLICY

2.1 The university’s Executive Board has overall responsibility for the effective operation of this policy but has delegated day-to-day responsibility for overseeing its implementation to PVC/Deans, directors and managers.

2.2 The Equality and Diversity Steering Group (EDSG) is responsible for supporting the development of this policy and its implementation, review and publication. It will make recommendations on good practice as required in accordance with its terms of reference.

2.3 HR will ensure that staff policies, procedures and processes support the effective implementation of this policy. All policies and procedures referred to in this policy are available on the intranet.

2.4 All managers must set an appropriate standard of behaviour, lead by example and ensure that those they manage adhere to the policy and promote our aims and objectives with regard to equality of opportunity.

2.5 Managers will ensure that self-employed contractors, agency workers or any other individuals working temporarily in the university are made aware of the policy.

2.6 All staff are responsible for ensuring they act in accordance with this and other related university policies at all times.
RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

3.1 The university is committed to open and diverse recruitment with equality and diversity at the heart of all recruitment and selection processes and decisions. Recruitment, promotion, and other selection exercises such as redundancy selection and redeployment will be conducted on the basis of merit, against objective criteria that avoid discrimination.

3.2 The university will strive to source candidates from a wide pool in order to find the best person for the job, to achieve a diverse workforce, to ensure talent is not blocked from entering the university, and to support people from all backgrounds and cultures to realise their full potential.

3.3 All university recruiters need to be aware of the principles of equality and diversity and understand how unfair bias and/or unlawful discrimination can occur both directly and indirectly in the recruitment process.

3.4 Shortlisting, interviewing and selection will always be carried out without regard to age, disability, sex, sexual orientation, gender re-assignment, marital or civil partner status, pregnancy or maternity, race, nationality, ethnic or national origin or religion or belief.

3.5 Recruitment processes and systems will be regularly reviewed to ensure there is no hidden bias.

3.6 “Positive Action” programmes may be explored where there is evidence of underrepresentation in certain jobs or at certain levels.

3.7 Every person who has been offered employment with DMU will need to be checked to ensure they are eligible to work in the UK before they are allowed to start work. These checks should be carried out for all employees who have been given a conditional offer of employment to ensure individuals are not being unlawfully discriminated against because of their nationality at any stage of the recruitment and selection process.

3.8 The university will consider ex-offenders for employment on their individual merits and will not automatically refuse to employ an individual because they have a criminal record.

3.9 The university welcomes applications from disabled people and has been awarded the Jobcentre Plus Disability Two Ticks Symbol. Reasonable adjustments to the recruitment process will be made to ensure that no applicant is disadvantaged because of their disability.

See the following related policies:
- Recruitment and Selection Policy
- Redeployment Procedure
- Immigration and preventing illegal working
- Agency Worker Regulations – Guidance for Managers
- Religion or Belief Policy Statements and Guidance for Staff and Students

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

4.1 DMU is committed to providing a learning environment for all staff which enables them to fully contribute to achieving DMU’s vision for success.
4.2 The university will provide employees with appropriate training, developmental and educational opportunities that will enable them to acquire the skills and competencies that are needed by the university and for their own development. The principles of equality of opportunity underpin the university’s commitment to life-long learning.

4.3 All DMU employees are required to complete equality and diversity training. See the following related policies:

- Staff Development Policy and Guidelines
- MyAppraisal

CONDUCT

5.1 The university aims to provide a supportive environment where respect is shown to all, and where all staff and students are encouraged to perform to their potential. The university prohibits unlawful direct and indirect discrimination, harassment, bullying and victimisation of others and provides definitions and clear examples of the type of conduct that will not be tolerated.

5.2 The university will ensure that disciplinary procedures and penalties are applied without discrimination, whether they result in disciplinary warnings, dismissal or other disciplinary action. See the following related policies:

- Code of conduct for DMU staff: in particular the following sections: “Dignity at work”; “Dress and appearance”; and “Work-related social events and activities”.
- Dignity At Work Policy.

PAY AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE

The university’s conditions of service, benefits and facilities are reviewed regularly to ensure that they are available to all who should have access to them and that there are no unlawful obstacles to accessing them.

PART-TIME AND FIXED TERM WORK

Part-time and fixed-term staff should be treated the same as comparable full-time or permanent staff and enjoy no less favourable terms and conditions (on a pro-rata basis where appropriate), unless different treatment is justified.

FLEXIBLE WORKING AND WORK LIFE BALANCE

8.1 The university is committed to developing work practices and policies that support work-life balance and offers progressive and flexible family-friendly policies to working parents or those with other care responsibilities, irrespective of their sex or sexual orientation.

8.2 Guidance is available to ensure managers are making decisions on flexible working requests fairly and to avoid discrimination.

See the following related policies:
TIME OFF WORK

9.1 The university is supportive of employees who wish to take time off work for the purpose of religious observance. Subject to reasonable notice being given of leave dates requested, employees will normally be able to use their annual leave entitlement for this purpose.

9.2 Employees who are members of a university Involvement Group; such as the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Staff Group (LGBT); Black and Minority Ethnic Staff Group or Disabled Staff Group, will be granted time off with pay in order to attend university approved meetings of these groups that fall within their normal working hours.

9.3 All employees are entitled to take a reasonable amount of time off during their normal hours of work for family emergencies.

See the following related policies:

- Special Leave Policy
- Religion or Belief: Policy Statements and Guidance for Staff and Students

TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT

10.1 The university will ensure that redundancy criteria and procedures are fair and objective and are not directly or indirectly discriminatory. Consideration must be given to the equality and diversity impact of any restructuring proposals.

10.2 The university recognises the contributions of a diverse workforce, including the skills and experience of older employees. It believes that employees should, wherever possible, be permitted to continue working for as long as they wish to do so. The university does not operate a compulsory retirement age for its employees.

See the following related policies:

- Managing Change, Restructuring and Redundancy
- Retirement Policy

DISABILITY

11.1 The university encourages staff to disclose if they have a disability so that they can be appropriately supported at work.

11.2 If staff experience difficulties at work because of their disability, they may wish to contact their line manager or HR to discuss any reasonable adjustments that would help overcome or minimise the difficulty.
11.3 The university will monitor the physical features of its premises to consider whether they might place anyone with a disability at a substantial disadvantage. Where necessary, the university will take reasonable steps to improve access.

11.4 Employees who have a disability will be entitled to paid time off for medical appointments related to their disability. Appointments should be approved with line managers and time off does not need to be made up in respect of appointments of this nature.

See the following related policies:

- Special Leave Policy
- Disability-related absence: guidance

WORKFORCE MONITORING

Workforce composition will be regularly monitored to ensure equality of opportunity at all levels of the university. Where appropriate, steps will be taken to identify and remove unjustified barriers and to meet the needs of disadvantaged or underrepresented groups.
APPENDIX 2: REF Accountabilities Structure at DMU
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Staff with Significant Responsibility for Research
APPENDIX 3: Equalities Data Review of RIA Allocation 2018

Work Area: The 2018 Research and Innovation Allowance (RIA) Exercise

Persons with authority to make changes to the work area:

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation)

Person responsible for drafting the assessment:

Head of Policy, Governance and Research Student Services

Date of Report: May 2019

1. Aims of the work area, process or function

The university’s Research and Innovation Allowance (RIA) Exercise supports research-active staff in developing and planning their career. The RIA exercise is designed to ensure fairness and provide increased transparency regarding the allocation of research allowances and ensure that research-active members of staff have appropriate support to carry out their research. The RIA Exercise is intended to support the promotion of research in terms of both quality and equality.

The Exercise involves completing a form detailing the applicant’s progress against the current year’s RIA (where applicable) and their research plans for the next academic year. For 2018, applicants are required to complete their research plans looking ahead to the next two years. Applicants are also asked to provide information about their training and development needs and mentoring requirements. The plans are peer reviewed by School-based panels in order to inform workload allocation discussions. Final decisions about staff loading are made by the line managers responsible for resource allocation (in most cases the Head of School).

The deadline for applications for the RIA in the academic year 2018 was 16 April 2018 the school-based panels took place during late April/early May 2018, faculty final decisions in June 2018, so that final allocations were made by the start of the 2018/19 academic year.

2. Equality Relevance

All academic staff on the single pay spine seeking a research allowance in excess of the allocated scholarly activity allowance and all professorial staff in post on 1st April 2018 were invited to apply for a RIA.

The RIA Exercise has equality relevance for individuals and groups with protected characteristics.

DMU is able to monitor staff on all of the protected characteristics where people have disclosed, but very few disclose sexual orientation, religion or belief. This EIA focuses on sex, disability, age and race/ethnicity. (NB - under-reporting of disability is a known issue.)

A full Equality Impact Assessment will be carried out following the 2018, 2019 and 2020 RIA rounds, and will be constitute part of the EIA towards the REF final 2021 submission.
3. Data Used

DMU equality monitoring data (i.e. numbers of eligible staff with disclosed protected characteristics) was used for the EIA screening.

4. Consultations

People and Organisational Development (POD) and the relevant trade unions were consulted before the launch of the first IRP Exercise in December 2013.

5. Actions taken to address potential issues

The following actions to promote equality and avoid discrimination were implemented before the launch of the 2018 exercise:

- Information about the 2018 RIA Exercise was updated on the university’s website and intranet (DMU Connect) and communicated to all eligible staff via university-wide communications (email) and through meetings, events and briefings. A dedicated email was set up (ria@dmu.ac.uk) to answer any questions/problems in relation to the online RIA form and personalised responses sent within 2 working days.

- Heads of School/Department were required to ensure that where appropriate (and especially for female and early career research staff) adequate mentoring and support was made available to applicants in order to support the achievement of a RIA.

- Panels were established at School/Department level. Due consideration was given to the balance of the panels and all panel members were required to have up-to-date Equality & Diversity training. Panels were required to have a mixture of senior and junior research-active members of academic staff (a minimum of two from each category) and were appointed by the Faculty Heads of Research and Innovation subject to the Chair’s approval. The university’s Equality and Diversity mission statement was read before the start of Panel meetings.

6. Analysis of staff eligible to apply for a RIA / staff who applied¹ (Appendices A1, A2)

Across the university as a whole, the data shows that 46.2% of eligible staff applied for a RIA

6.1 Gender:
Of those applied, 56.0% of staff were male
Of those applied 44.0% of staff were female

6.2 Disability:
90.5% of all eligible staff declared to have no disability compared with 5.4% with a disability. Similar levels of disability is reflected across staff who applied for a RIA: the proportion without a disability is 92.2% and those with disability is 4.9%.

6.3 Age:
Of the staff who applied for a RIA, 11.8% were under the age of 34.
Of the staff who applied for a RIA, the 35-44 and 45-54 age groups had roughly the same numbers of applications 144(32.1%) and 147(32.8%) respectively.

¹ Please note that all RIA data is analysed by headcount.
Of the staff who applied 23.2% were aged 55 and over.

6.4 **Ethnicity:**
42.7% of eligible white staff applied.
55.3% of eligible BAME staff applied.

Broken down by Faculty, the data for the **applied group** shows the following:

6.5 **Eligible staff who applied for a RIA:**

- Arts, Design and Humanities (ADH) (71/176) 40.3%;
- Business and Law (BAL) (119/254) 46.8%;
- Computing, Engineering and Media (CEM) (121/213) 56.8%;
- University Executive (EXEC) (1/7) 14.3%;
- Health and Life Sciences (HLS) (136/320) 42.5%;
- DMU overall (448/970) 46.2%.

6.6 **Gender:**

- ADH: 40% of eligible female staff applied compared to 40.2% of eligible male staff.
- BAL: 42.9% of eligible female staff applied compared to 50% of eligible male staff.
- CEM: 40.2% of eligible female staff applied compared to 62% of eligible male staff.
- EXEC: numbers too small to report.
- HLS: 37.4% of eligible female staff applied compared to 51.2% of eligible male staff.

6.7 **Disability\(^2\):**

- ADH: 37.5% of eligible staff with a declared disability applied, compared to 41.3% of eligible staff with no declared disability.
- BAL: 46.7% of eligible staff with a declared disability applied, compared to 47.8% of eligible staff with no declared disability.
- CEM: 40% of eligible staff with a declared disability applied, compared to 57.5% of staff with no declared disability.
- EXEC: numbers too small to report.
- HLS: 42.1% of eligible staff with a declared disability applied, compared to 47% of eligible staff with no declared disability.

6.8 **Age:**

- ADH: 28.5% of eligible staff aged 34 and under applied, compared to 46.2% of eligible staff aged 35-54 and 32.6% of eligible staff aged 55 and over.
- BAL: 46.6% of eligible staff aged 34 and under applied, compared to 46.4% of eligible staff aged 35-54 and 48.7% of eligible staff aged 55 and over.
- CEM: 41.3% of eligible staff aged 34 and under applied, compared to 60% of eligible staff aged 35-54 and 57.1% of eligible staff aged 55 and over.
- EXEC: numbers too small to report.
- HLS: 38.6% of eligible staff aged 34 and under applied, compared to 48.3% of eligible staff aged 35-54 and 45% of eligible staff aged 55 and over.

---

\(^2\) Actual numbers in each Faculty are low (see Appendix Table A).
6.9 Race/Ethnicity:

ADH: 47.8% of eligible BAME staff applied, compared to 38% of eligible white staff.
BAL: 52.6% of eligible BAME staff applied, compared to 42.4% of eligible white staff.
CEM: 66.6% of eligible BAME staff applied, compared to 53.1% of eligible white staff.
EXEC: numbers too small to report.
HLS: 50.7% of eligible BAME staff applied, compared to 40.5% of eligible white staff.

7. Analysis of Requested Allowances versus Obtained Allowances (Appendix A3)

Across the university as a whole the data shows that of 448 applicants, 50.4% (226/448) obtained their requested allowance. 40.4% (181/448) of applicants obtained an allowance lower than requested whilst 7.1% (32/448) received no allowance. Detailed breakdown by Faculty and characteristics can also be found in A3.

7.1 Gender

49.7% (98/197) of female applicants obtained their requested allowance compared with 50.9% (128/251) of male applicants.
43% (83/197) of female applicants obtained lower allowances than requested compared with 39% (98/251) of male applicants.
7.6% (15/197) of female applicants received no allowance at all despite requests compared with 6.7% (17/251) of male applicants.

7.2 Disability

All applicants who identified as having a disability secured an allowance, with 50% (11/22) of applicants obtaining their requested allowance, and 50% being awarded a lower allowance. 50.6% (209/413) applicants who declared themselves as having no disability were awarded their requested allowance, and 39.9% (164/413) of applicants who declared themselves as having no disability got less than they asked for.

7.3 Age

For the group aged 34 or under, 73.5% (39/53) of applicants obtained their requested allowance; 18.8% (10/53) of applicants got a lower allowance than requested and 5.6% (3/53) of applicants obtained zero allowance.
For the group aged 35-54, 47.4% (138/291) of applicants obtained their requested allowance; 43.9% (128/291) of applicants got a lower allowance than requested and 6.5% (19/291) of applicants obtained zero allowance.
For the group aged 55 or over, 47.1% (49/104) of applicants obtained their requested allowance; 41.3% (43/104) of applicants got a lower allowance than requested and 9.6% (10/104) of applicants obtained zero allowance.

7.4 Race/Ethnicity

58% (79/136) of BAME applicants obtained their requested allowance compared with 46.7% (138/295) White applicants.
37.5% (51/136) of BAME applicants obtained a lower allowance than requested compared with 42%

---

2 Actual numbers in each Faculty are low (see Appendix Table A).
(124/295).
2.9% (4/136) of BAME applicants did not receive any allowance compared with 8.8% (26/295) White applicants.

8 Summary

8.1 Applications

There is an increase in applications to RIA 2018, with 46.2% of eligible staff applied (compared to 41.9% in 2016).

There are no immediate disability-related issues arising from the data. It is interesting that consistently proportionately more BAME staff applied in each of the faculties (with the percentages of White and BAME staff applicants being roughly the same in Arts, Design and Humanities). The highest proportion applying were from CEM, with over half (56.8%) of eligible staff applying. However, proportionately far more men than women are applying, with that gap most highlighted in Health and Life Sciences.

8.2 Allowances

The data shows that 90% of applicants obtained an allowance, with 50.4% getting the allowance they requested, and 40.4% getting less than they requested.

Overall, slightly fewer female applicants obtained their requested allowance (21.9%) compared to their male counterparts (28.6%), though slightly more male applicants (20.3%) than female (18.5%) obtained lower allowances than requested.

9. Conclusion and Action Plan

The 2018 application process saw a few changes, including the change from a paper-based form to an online form submitted through Bristol Online Surveys (now Jisc Online Surveys) and allocations moving from a one-year to a two-year allocation against a research plan.

Overall, there were no major or significant issues arising. The letter from the PVC Research inviting applicants who had not had a RIA in 2018 went out with encouraging female and pro rata to staff to apply for a RIA.

Heads of School/Department are to ensure that adequate mentoring and support is made available to staff, particularly in terms of encouraging under-represented groups to apply (female staff, staff aged 55 and over), and targeted support for the application itself (staff aged 34 and under, BAME staff) in order to support the achievement of a RIA in the 2019 exercise.

The 2019 exercise will also open the RIA to a cohort-based developmental trajectory for staff new to research or returning to research after a long time.
A1. **Analysis of All Staff Eligible to Apply for an RIA as at 01.06.18**

This data shows the staff eligible to apply (by headcount), broken down by four protected characteristics (Gender, Disability, Age and Ethnicity) and by Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Staff</th>
<th>ADH</th>
<th>BAL</th>
<th>CEM</th>
<th>EXEC</th>
<th>HLS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Staff</th>
<th>ADH</th>
<th>BAL</th>
<th>CEM</th>
<th>EXEC</th>
<th>HLS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No known disability</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information refused</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Staff</th>
<th>ADH</th>
<th>BAL</th>
<th>CEM</th>
<th>EXEC</th>
<th>HLS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Staff</th>
<th>ADH</th>
<th>BAL</th>
<th>CEM</th>
<th>EXEC</th>
<th>HLS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAME</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information refused</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis of Staff who applied for an RIA as at 01.06.18

This data shows the staff who applied for an RIA (by headcount), broken down by four protected characteristics (Gender, Disability, Age and Ethnicity) and by Faculty.

**Base = Not Applied and Applied Staff Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied for RIA</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>ADH</th>
<th>BAL</th>
<th>CEM</th>
<th>EXEC</th>
<th>HLS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base = Not Applied and Applied Staff Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied for RIA</th>
<th>Disability group</th>
<th>ADH</th>
<th>BAL</th>
<th>CEM</th>
<th>EXEC</th>
<th>HLS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No known disability</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No known disability</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applied for RIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Band</th>
<th>ADH</th>
<th>BAL</th>
<th>CEM</th>
<th>EXEC</th>
<th>HLS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No 16-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 25-34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for RIA</td>
<td>Ethnic group</td>
<td>ADH</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>CEM</td>
<td>EXEC</td>
<td>HLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nos</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAME</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAME</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information refused</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A3. Analysis of Applications for RIAs versus Obtained

This data shows the numbers of staff (by headcount) who obtained an allowance lower than requested, or no allocation, and the numbers of staff (by headcount) who obtained the requested allowance, broken down by four protected characteristics (Gender, Disability, Age and Ethnicity) and by Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied for RIA</th>
<th>Nos of Eligible Staff</th>
<th>% Eligible Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied for RIA</th>
<th>Allowance outcomes</th>
<th>ADH</th>
<th>BAL</th>
<th>CEM</th>
<th>EXEC</th>
<th>HLS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nos</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Got allowance requested</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Got lower allowance</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requested and got 0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknowns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowance outcomes</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>ADH</th>
<th>BAL</th>
<th>CEM</th>
<th>EXEC</th>
<th>HLS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nos</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got allowance requested</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got allowance requested Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got lower allowance</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got lower allowance Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested and got 0</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested and got 0 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance outcomes</td>
<td>Disability group</td>
<td>ADH</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>CEM</td>
<td>EXEC</td>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got allowance requested</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No known disability</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got allowance requested Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got lower allowance</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No known disability</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got lower allowance Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested and got 0</td>
<td>No known disability</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested and got 0 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No known disability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowance outcomes</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>ADH</th>
<th>BAL</th>
<th>CEM</th>
<th>EXEC</th>
<th>HLS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
<td>Nos %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got allowance requested</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got allowance requested Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got lower allowance</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got lower allowance Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested and got 0</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested and got 0 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance outcomes</td>
<td>Ethnic group</td>
<td>ADH</td>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>CEM</td>
<td>EXEC</td>
<td>HLS</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nos</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Nos</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got allowance requested</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAME</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information refused</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got allowance requested Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got lower allowance</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAME</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got lower allowance Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested and got 0</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAME</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested and got 0 Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAME</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4: The RIA Application Form

RIA 2019

PAGE 1: PAGE 1

Welcome to the Research and Innovation Allowance (RIA) Scheme 2019

Please refer to the guidance notes when filling in this application. If you have any queries or questions in relation to the RIA process, or require mentoring through your application, please contact your Head of School, Head of Research Institute or Associate Dean for Research.

The deadline for completing this form and submitting it is 1600 hrs on Thursday, 13 June 2019. The survey should take about 30 minutes to complete.

Faculty/Directorate  Required

- Arts, Design and Humanities (ADH)
- Business and Law (BAL)
- Computing, Engineering and Media (CEM)
- Health and Life Sciences (HLS)
- University Executive

If you selected Other, please specify:

If you selected Other, please specify:

ADH School/Department

- Humanities
- Design
- Visual & Performing Arts Architecture
BAL School/Department
- Accounting & Finance
- Law
- People, Politics & Place
- Strategic Marketing & Management
- Economics and Marketing Management
- Centre for Urban Research on Austerity
- Local Governance Research Centre
- People, Organisations and Work
- Centre for Enterprise and Innovation
- Applied Economics and Social Value
- Evidence-Based Law Reform
- Finance and Banking Research Centre
- Accountability, Governance and Sustainability
- Allied Health Sciences Research
- Pharmaceutical Innovation: From Molecules to Practice
- Health, Health Policy and Social Care
- Psychological Science
- Criminology, Community, Education & Social Justice
- Mary Seacole Research Centre
- Centre for Reproduction Research
- Cinema and Television History Institute
- Creative Technologies
- Media and Communication Research Centre
- Media Discourse Centre
- Music, Technology & Innovation - Institute for Sonic Creativity

CEM School/Department
- Computer Science and Informatics
- Leicester Media School
- Engineering and Sustainable Development

HLS School/Department
- Allied Health Sciences Nursing & Midwifery
- Pharmacy
- Applied Social Sciences

Institute  Optional
- Architecture
- Art & Design
- English
- History
- Drama, Dance and Performance Studies
- Centre for Urban Research on Austerity
- Local Governance Research Centre
- People, Organisations and Work
- Centre for Enterprise and Innovation
- Applied Economics and Social Value
- Evidence-Based Law Reform
- Finance and Banking Research Centre
- Accountability, Governance and Sustainability
- Allied Health Sciences Research
- Pharmaceutical Innovation: From Molecules to Practice
- Health, Health Policy and Social Care
- Psychological Science
- Criminology, Community, Education & Social Justice
- Mary Seacole Research Centre
- Centre for Reproduction Research
- Cinema and Television History Institute
- Creative Technologies
- Media and Communication Research Centre
- Media Discourse Centre
- Music, Technology & Innovation - Institute for Sonic Creativity
**Personal details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name <strong>Required</strong></th>
<th>First name <strong>Required</strong></th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Job title</th>
<th>FTE <strong>Required</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(dd/mm/yyyy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Assessment <strong>Required</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please select no more than 2 answer(s).

- 3 - Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy
- 4 - Psychology, Psychiatry and Neuroscience
- 11 - Computer Science and Informatics
- 12 - Engineering
- 13 - Architecture, Built Environment and Planning
- 17 - Business and Management Studies
- 18 - Law
- 20 - Social Work and Social Policy
- 27 - English Language and Literature
- 28 - History

Please indicate whether there are individual circumstances that you want the panel to consider. If there are issues that you would like to raise, please inform your Head of School/Department directly by 1 July 2019, ahead of the meetings of the final RIA panels.

- Yes
- No

**Do you currently have a mentor to support your research career?**

- Yes
- No

**Would you like to be assigned a mentor?**

- Yes
- No
Would you like to be considered a 'researcher-in-training' over the next year (please see Guidance for more details)?

- Yes
- No
Were you allocated a RIA in 2018?

- No, I do not currently have a RIA allocation. Yes,
- but it was to be reviewed after one year.
- Yes, I have a 2-year allocation but in light of changed circumstances I want to request a different band.

If you did have a RIA allocation (but subject to review after a year), or you are requesting a change to your RIA allocation, please indicate your current (2018-19) RIA allocation:

Please indicate the annual RIA band (August 2019 -July 2020) you would like to apply for:  

- Band A (320 hrs per year)
- Band B (480 hrs per year)
- Band C (640 hrs per year)
## Progress against top 5 2018/19 objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective description</th>
<th>BRAG status (Blue - completed/ Red - compromised/ Amber - may or may not complete / Green - will complete)</th>
<th>Short commentary (no more than 150 words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Top 5 planned 2019/2020 objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective description</th>
<th>Short commentary (no more than 150 words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PAGE 4: PLANNED OUTPUTS

Please provide details of your top 5 planned outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Title</th>
<th>Output Type</th>
<th>Details of how the output will be made publicly available (including place or publisher)</th>
<th>Expected submission/production date (between August 2019 and August 2020)</th>
<th>State if single, co- or multi-authored. Please indicate if you will be the lead/corresponding author:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next few questions are for you to outline internal and external research and innovation funding applications and agreements.

Please provide details of up to top 5 applications and new agreements to be submitted/set up between August 2019 and July 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Funder/Source</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Role (PI/CI etc)</th>
<th>Expected start date</th>
<th>Expected end date</th>
<th>Status (e.g. submitted/under review)</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Hours of staff time per week</th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Collaborator details</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Innovation for this purpose, includes

- Knowledge Exchange, broadly covering activities aimed at developing partnerships between businesses and the University. This could be KTPs, Knowledge Catalyst and Knowledge Transfer Fellowships and Knowledge Exchange Projects.

- Consultancy, usually involving the provisions of expert advice and work that is dependent on a high degree of intellectual input from the institution to the client (commercial or non-commercial) without the creation of new knowledge.

- Commercial activities which have their origin in research e.g. commercialisation of intellectual property, spin-out companies, licencing deals, materials testing. This does not include the provision of teaching or CPD activities.

If applicable please give a short description (max 1000 characters) of any expected innovation activities from your planned research outlined above between August 2019 and July 2020 (Please see above for the definition of innovation being used).
If you would like support from Research Services in relation to training needs, applying for external research/innovation funding or developing/evidencing impact from your research please contact ria@dmu.ac.uk with your query, specifying 'RIA development' in the subject line.

If you have any feedback on the RIA application process for 2019/20 please email ria@dmu.ac.uk specifying 'RIA FEEDBACK' in the subject line.

Thank you for submitting your RIA application. You will be notified of your allocation in due course which will be loaded on to your workload planner. If you have any queries in the meantime, please contact your Head of School or Associate Dean for Research.

To save a copy of your application, please click on 'download responses'.
APPENDIX 5: REF Steering Committee Terms of Reference and Constitution (2019/20)

A. Scope and purpose of the committee

The REF Steering Committee has been set up to make strategic decisions on REF and related issues, and oversee and direct policies and processes for delivering DMU’s return to the Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2021. The REF Steering Committee informs the University Research and Innovation Committee, and reports to the VC/ University Executive Board.

Terms of reference:

a. To agree and make recommendations on DMU’s 2021 REF submission in line with REF criteria, optimising our return;
b. To develop, communicate and consult on the REF Code of Practice, ensuring that all REF-related processes are aligned with the Code of Practice;
c. To agree on and recommend structures and resources to enable and enhance the production and selection of outputs, environment statements and impact case studies for REF2021 in a fair and transparent manner;
d. To receive reports on progress from the REF Working Group, and elicit the views of UoA Coordinators as part of the decision-making process;
e. To inform the University Research and Innovation Committee on REF planning activities;
f. To keep other senior bodies (e.g. Executive Board, Academic Board) informed, as required, on progress towards REF 2021;
g. To set out the principles for the identification of staff with significant responsibility for research and research independence;
h. To ensure ongoing communications with the wider DMU community on REF 2021

B. Membership

The committee consists of the following members:

PVC Research
Associate PVC Research (Chair)
ADH Associate Dean Research & Innovation
CEM Associate Dean Research & Innovation
BAL Associate Dean Research & Innovation
HLS Associate Dean Research & Innovation
Head of Policy, Governance & Research Student Services
Head of Equality and Diversity
Research Governance Manager

Membership will be confirmed by the committee’s secretary to the People and Organisational Development directorate on an annual basis so that an anonymous analysis of equality participation may be undertaken, as part of the university’s equality obligations.

C. Quorum

Quoracy is 50% of the membership -1.

D. Servicing and support

Servicing and support will be provided by Sarah Paternostro: sarah.paternostro@dmu.ac.uk
E. Meeting schedule
Meetings will be held every two weeks during term times and as required over the course of the year.

Notes on the operation of the Committee:
1. The Committee will monitor the diversity of its membership and will only meet within core working hours of 9.30 – 4.30.
2. Members are expected to attend regularly and participate fully in the work of the Committee and any task groups it may establish.
3. Members are expected to take collective ownership of the issues within the Committee’s remit.
4. Members are required to nominate deputies, and should members be unable to attend, the deputy must attend in their stead and brief them appropriately.

Approval and revision
This constitution will be reviewed and re-approved by the committee at its first meeting of every academic year, or sooner, if significant amendments are required.
## APPENDIX 6: REF 2020 Timetable and Schedule of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness for REF 2017-18</td>
<td>Summer 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey on staff views on mechanism to identify those with significant responsibility for research</td>
<td>December 2018/January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness for REF 2018-19</td>
<td>Completed May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF Roadshow (presentations to faculties and institutes)</td>
<td>w/c 15 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft of CoP to ADRs, UoA leads, Deans/PVCs</td>
<td>w/c 15 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to Executive Board</td>
<td>30 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to Academic Board</td>
<td>1 May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open consultations (individuals, committees, unions)</td>
<td>9 May – 30 May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External academic review of impact case studies and environment statements</td>
<td>Documents sent out late May 2019, with reviews back in late June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIA allocations 2019-20</td>
<td>Late-May/early June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of DMU CoP</td>
<td>1200 hrs, 7 June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body notifies HEI if it meets requirements or requests further work</td>
<td>16 August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of additional outputs (staff who have left, new staff, new outputs) (end September for REF deep dive)</td>
<td>July-October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates for funding application deadlines released</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resubmit Code of Practice if changes requested</td>
<td>20 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESA return identifying staff with SRR</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions to impact case studies and environment statements and standardisation</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body notifies HEI if Code of Practice meets requirements or requests still further work</td>
<td>By 8 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution submits Code of Practice again</td>
<td>15 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body notifies institution whether or not code meets REF requirements</td>
<td>By 29 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual circumstances disclosures (internal)</td>
<td>13 December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of submission intentions complete</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final deadline for requests for multiple submissions, case studies requiring security clearance, and exceptions to submission for small units</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised output reviews submitted</td>
<td>January 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for providing further details for outputs pending publication; redacted versions of impact case studies</td>
<td>29 January 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal release of submissions system and technical guidance</td>
<td>Early 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for reductions based on individual circs (REF 6a/b)</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penultimate review of outputs and impact case studies</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIA applications call opened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final review of additional outputs, impact case studies and environment statements</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census date</td>
<td>31 July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF submission</td>
<td>27 November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of publication period</td>
<td>31 December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary outcomes (overall quality) for submissions</td>
<td>December 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further feedback and reports</td>
<td>Early 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7: REF Working Group and Unit of Assessment Coordinators’ and Deputies’ Role Descriptions

Scope and purpose of the Working Group

The REF Working Group has been set up to organise and implement the timetable and preparations for all elements of the REF submission, including raising any risks related to the submission. It will provide a forum to discuss issues arising within units of assessment, and consider institutional make strategic decisions on REF and related issues, and oversee and be governed by the REF Steering Group’s institutional direction with regard to outputs, impact case studies and environment statements, discussing and agreeing optimum approaches.

Membership

The Working Group consists of the following members:

PVC Research
Associate PVC Research (Chair)
Units of Assessment Coordinators and Deputies for the 13 units DMU will submit to Head of Policy, Governance & Research Student Services (Chair)

Unit of Assessment (UoA) Coordinators: Job Description

Overall purpose of role

To work with Associate Deans of Research (ADRs) and colleagues in Research Services to maximise the performance of UoA outputs and Impact Case Studies within the UoA and strategically across the institution. To be the main point of contact for researchers within the UoA on matters relating to the REF.

Main duties and responsibilities

1. Offer guidance and support to colleagues on research outputs and potential impact case studies.

2. Attend and contribute to the institutional UoA co-ordinator network meetings, contributing to the institutional strategy for REF including outputs, impact, environment, interdisciplinary and collaborative research and equality and diversity issues.

3. Engage with and support central internal review exercises. Co-ordinate internal reviews as required, providing support and guidance to colleagues in Faculties to ensure maximum compliance across the UoA.

4. Mentor staff in the UoA, offering guidance on publications strategies within the context of their discipline. Provide advice on the most up to date guidance on open access and eligibility requirements, working closely with colleagues in Research Services and Library & Learning Services.
5. Work closely with Research Services staff to provide best practice advice and signposting to support the realisation and evidencing of impact.

6. To work with ADRs and relevant Research Services colleagues to regularly review environment data and to contribute to the development of environment statements.

7. Proactively engage with the Maximising our Performance in the REF project work-streams, as appropriate.

8. Responsible for proactive liaison with relevant colleagues in Research Services and the Associate PVC Research, to contribute to the institutional REF submission strategy. This includes maximising the performance of outputs by facilitating strategic selection of the highest quality outputs and facilitating the development of Impact Case Studies.

9. Manage funding related to REF as devolved to Faculty/School/UoA. Act as liaison with Research Services colleagues in the allocation of any centralised funding and work with researchers to maximise the return on investment and realisation into tangible improvements for REF readiness.

10. Support the early identification of potential impact case studies. Work with relevant Research Services colleagues and researchers in the UoA to develop and track potential REF impact in the UoA.

Faculties are expected to give a minimum 20% time (320 hours) allocation for this role for 2 years prior to the submission year. UoA Co-ordinators will be members of the Faculty Research (and Innovation) Committees and other committees relating to the REF and thereby actively involved in the development of Faculty research strategies. They will have received Equality and Diversity training and be involved in the RIA decision-making process regarding recommendations for time allowances.

**Deputy Unit of Assessment (UoA) Co-ordinator: Job Description**

**Overall purpose of role**

To work with the UoA Co-ordinator to maximise the performance of UoA outputs and Impact Case Studies within the UoA and strategically across the institution. To deputise for the UoA Co-ordinator in matters relating to the REF.

**Main duties and responsibilities**

1. Offer guidance and support to colleagues on research outputs and potential impact case studies.

2. Where required, on behalf of the UoA Co-ordinator, to attend and contribute to the institutional UoA co-ordinator network meetings, contributing to the institutional strategy for REF including outputs, impact, environment, interdisciplinary and collaborative research and equality and diversity issues.
3. Engage with and support central internal review exercises. Help co-ordinate internal reviews as required, provide support and guidance to colleagues within the UoA.

4. Mentor staff in the UoA, offering guidance on publications strategies within the context of their discipline. Provide advice on the most up to date guidance on open access and eligibility requirements, working closely with colleagues in Research Services and Library & Learning Services.

5. Work closely with Research Services staff to provide best practice advice and signposting to support the realisation and evidencing of impact.

6. Help support the early identification of potential impact case studies. Work with relevant Research Services colleagues and researchers in the UoA to develop and track potential REF impact in the UoA.

Faculties are expected to give a minimum 10% time (160 hours) allocation for this role for 2 years prior to the submission year. Deputy UoA Co-ordinators will have received Equality and Diversity training and may deputise for the UoA Co-ordinator in the RIA decision-making process regarding recommendations for time allowances.
APPENDIX 8: SRR and Identification Pathway

Already secured 2-year RIA in 2018 with allocation of 320 hrs or more → Will have RIA allocation on 31 July 2020 → Automatically returned to REF 2021

Request allocation in 2019 RIA → Allocation granted (whether same or reduced, but minimum of 320 hrs) → Automatically returned to REF 2021

Allocation requested as Researcher-in-Training → On pathway to getting SRR

Allocation denied → Appeal → Appeal denied → Appeal upheld
APPENDIX 9: Guidance to Support Identification of SRR

Does the colleague have significant responsibility for research?

Meetings with UoA Co-Ordinators/ Deputy Co-Ordinators/ Institute Directors/ Deputy Directors

Does the colleague have a PhD or equivalent qualification? (Yes/ No)

How many publications/ outputs have been produced in the last 5 years? (1-2/ 3-4/ 5+)

How would the UoA co-ordinator/ the colleague assess the quality of the outputs? (L-M-H)

How would the UoA co-ordinator/ the colleague assess the quality of the publisher? (L-M-H)

Has the colleague applied for any external research funding within the last 5 years? (Y/N)

Has the colleague been successful in securing external research funding within the last 5 years? (Y/N)

Does the colleague have any PhD students as first supervisor? (Y/N)

Recommended for research training programme

Not recommended for research training programme

The training programme

Researchers-in-training enter a 12-month research training programme. Each ‘researcher-in-training’ is assigned a mentor who is a (research) professor. They meet once every 6 weeks.

A clear research plan is created with the mentor. This includes key milestones that are monitored at each meeting.

There is a cohort-based developmental journey to support strategic understanding and career management on various dimensions of research and innovation.

Each colleague is awarded a research training bursary for research development.
APPENDIX 10: Establishing Research Independence (R-only Staff)

We will submit all staff on Research-only (R-only) contracts who meet the definition of an independent researcher and hold a contract of employment of 0.2 FTE or greater on the census date of 31 July 2020. The process for determining research independence will be applied consistently across all Units of Assessment.

Our criteria for determining independence are drawn from the indicators stated in paragraphs 131–134 of the REF 2021 Guidance on Submissions. These indicators will be used to help us to determine whether an individual is independent. They are:

- holding an independently won, competitively awarded externally-funded fellowship. An illustrative, but not exhaustive, list of independent fellowships supplied by Research England can be found at www.ref.ac.uk;
- leading or acting as principal investigator or equivalent or co-investigator on an externally funded research project;
- leading a research group or a substantial or specialised work package on an externally funded project.

Staff on R-only contracts are not deemed to have undertaken independent research purely on the basis that they are named on one or more research outputs. R-only staff funded from research grants, such as research assistants or associates, are normally ineligible for submission.

The Research Governance Team use a combination of HR and research grant records to identify, as far as possible, R-only staff who are either clearly eligible or ineligible based on the indicators above. Only individuals clearly eligible to be entered are able to apply for a RIA. These individuals are informed of their status, copying in their Head of School and, for eligible staff, the Unit of Assessment Coordinator.

If it is not clear whether a member of staff is eligible or ineligible, they will be asked to complete the attached form. After having it checked and approved by the Head of Department or School, or line manager/UoA Coordinator, the completed form should be sent to ref@dmu.ac.uk no later than Monday, 28 October 2019. Outcome on research independence claims will be communicated to applicants by Wednesday, 27 November 2019.

For new starters or staff whose contract details change after this date, forms should be submitted as soon as contractual details are clear. The final date for receipt of forms is 31 July 2020.

On receipt, all forms will be checked by the Research Governance team, with additional information or clarification requested where required. Forms will then be reviewed by a cross-faculty panel who will decide on independence and REF2021 eligibility. The panel will review forms in batches to ensure consistency of approach, so it may take a few weeks for panel decisions to be communicated. Head of School and line managers/group leaders will also be informed of the outcome.

If the applicant is deemed ineligible for inclusion, they will be provided with feedback on the reasons and they have the right to appeal this decision, normally within 15 days of notification. Details of the appeals process are provided in the University’s Code of Practice.

If they are deemed eligible for inclusion, the REF2021 Unit of Assessment Coordinator will be informed and will contact the applicant to organise a review of outputs.
Decisions on research independence and eligibility for submission to REF2021 are separate from consideration of any personal circumstances and applications for reductions which may be applicable.

FORM FOR DETERMINING RESEARCH INDEPENDENCE

Name:

Department:

Source of funding, including grant code if externally funded:

Start and end dates of employment:

I believe that I meet the following criteria as an independent researcher (please tick all that apply):

- holding an independently won, competitively awarded externally-funded fellowship. (An illustrative, but not exhaustive, list of independent fellowships supplied by Research England can be found at www.ref.ac.uk);
- leading or acting as principal investigator or equivalent or co-investigator on an externally funded research project;
- leading a research group or a substantial or specialised work package on an externally funded project;
- other independent activities, such as holding a significant grant or fellowship awarded internally within the University.

Please provide a brief explanation of how you meet the criteria above for an independent researcher. Your completed form must be no longer than 2 sides of A4 (11pt, 1.5 line spacing). Please do not submit additional documents such as grant applications or publications.

Signature of applicant: Date:

As Head of Department/line manager for the applicant (delete as appropriate), I confirm that the above statement provides full and accurate details and that the applicant should be assessed for eligibility as an independent researcher for inclusion in REF2021.

Signature: Date:
APPENDIX 11: REF Defined Tariff Reductions for Staff Circumstances
(From Guidance on Submissions 2019/01 Appendix L)

1. Given the reduced output requirement for 2021, the tariffs for the defined reductions differ from those set in REF 2014. This is to ensure that a broadly equivalent reduction is given in the context of the submitted output pool, and to ensure that panels receive a sufficient selection of research outputs from each submitted unit upon which to base judgements about the quality of that unit’s outputs.

Early career researchers (ECRs)

2. ECRs are defined in the ‘Guidance on submissions’ (paragraph 148). Table L1 sets out the permitted reduction in outputs without penalty in the assessment that HEIs may request for ECRs who meet this definition.

Table L1: Early career researchers: Permitted reduction in outputs

<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>

Absence from work due to secondments or career breaks

3. Table L2 sets out the permitted reduction in outputs without penalty in the assessment that HEIs may request for absence from work due to secondments or career breaks outside of the HE sector, and in which the individual did not undertake academic research.

Table L2: Secondments or career breaks: Permitted reduction in outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total months absent between 1 January 2014 and 31 July 2020 due to a staff member’s secondment or career break:</th>
<th>Output pool may be reduced by up to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 12 calendar months</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 12 calendar months but less than 28</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 28 calendar months but less than 46</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 calendar months or more</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The allowances in Table L2 are based on the length of the individual’s absence or time away from working in HE. They are defined in terms of total months absent from work.

5. As part-time working is taken account of within the calculation for the overall number of outputs required for the unit (which is determined by multiplying the unit’s FTE by 2.5), reduction requests on the basis of part-time working hours should only be made exceptionally. For example, where the FTE of a staff member late in the assessment period does not reflect their average FTE over the period as a whole.

Qualifying periods of family-related leave

6. 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\(^4\), or shared parental leave\(^5\) lasting for four months or more, taken substantially during the period 1 January 2014 to 31 July 2020.

7. This approach to reductions for qualifying periods of family-related leave is based on the funding bodies’ considered judgement following consultation in the previous REF exercise that the impact of such a period of leave and the arrival of a new child into a family is generally sufficiently disruptive of an individual’s research work to justify the specified reduction.

8. While the above reduction of outputs due to additional paternity or adoption leave is subject to a minimum period of four months, shorter periods of such leave could be taken into account as follows:
   a. By applying a reduction in outputs where there are additional circumstances, for example where the period of leave had an impact in combination with other factors such as ongoing childcare responsibilities.
   b. By combining the number of months for shorter periods of such leave in combination with other circumstances, according to Table L2.

9. Any period of maternity, adoption, paternity or shared parental leave that qualifies for the reduction of an output under the provisions in paragraph 6 above may in individual cases be associated with prolonged constraints on work that justify more than the defined reduction set out. In such cases, the circumstances should be explained in the request.

**Combining circumstances**

10. Where individuals have had a combination of circumstances that have a defined reduction in outputs, these may be accumulated up to a maximum reduction of 1.5 outputs. For each circumstance, the relevant reduction should be applied and added together to calculate the total maximum reduction.

11. Where Table L1 is combined with Table L2, the period of time since 1 January 2014 up until the individual met the definition of an ECR should be calculated in months, and Table L2 should be applied.

12. When combining circumstances, only one circumstance should be taken into account for any period of time during which they took place simultaneously.

13. Where an individual has a combination of circumstances with a defined reduction in outputs and additional circumstances that require a judgement, the institution should explain this in the reduction request so that a single judgement can be made about the appropriate reduction in outputs, taking into account all the circumstances. The circumstances with a defined reduction in outputs to be requested should be calculated according to the guidance above (paragraphs 2 to 10).

\(^4\) ‘Additional paternity or adoption leave’ refers to leave of up to 26 weeks which is taken to care for a child where the person’s spouse, partner or civil partner was entitled to statutory maternity leave or statutory adoption leave, and has since returned to work. The term ‘additional paternity leave’ is often used to describe this type of leave although it may be taken by parents of either gender. For the purposes of the REF, we refer to this leave as ‘additional paternity or adoption leave’.

\(^5\) ‘Shared parental leave’ refers to leave of up to 50 weeks which can be shared by parents having a baby or adopting a child. This can be taken in blocks, or all in one go.
Other circumstances that apply in UOAs 1–6

14. In UOAs 1–6, the number of outputs may be reduced by up to one, without penalty in the assessment, for Category A submitted staff who are junior clinical academics. These are defined as clinically qualified academics who are still completing their clinical training in medicine or dentistry and have not gained a Certificate of Completion of Training (CCT) or its equivalent prior to 31 July 2020.

15. This allowance is made on the basis that the staff concerned are normally significantly constrained in the time they have available to undertake research during the assessment period. Where the individual meets the criteria in paragraph 14, and has had significant additional circumstances – for any of the other reasons set out in the ‘Guidance on submissions’ in paragraph 160 – the institution can make a case for further reductions in the unit reduction request.

Circumstances requiring a judgement about reductions

16. Where staff have had other circumstances during the period including in combination with any circumstances with a defined reduction in outputs – the institution will need to make a judgement about the effect of the circumstances in terms of the equivalent period of time absent, apply the reductions as set out in Table L2 by analogy, and provide a brief rationale for this judgement. Staff submitting a request for a reduction in outputs should therefore return the form attached to Appendix 12.

Please note that ‘Circumstances requiring a judgement about reductions’ include:
   a. Disability, as defined in Table 1 of the REF Guidance on Codes of Practice REF2019/03) (relevant extracts below), including ill health, injury, or mental health conditions.
   b. 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 set out in paragraph 6 – 8, above. Please see Table 1 extracts, below.
   c. Other caring responsibilities (such as caring for an elderly or disabled family member).
   d. Gender reassignment. Other circumstances relating to the protected characteristics, or relating to activities protected by employment legislation.

TABLE 1 EXTRACTS: SUMMARY OF RELEVANT EQUALITY LEGISLATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Equality Act 2010, the Disability Discrimination Act (1995) (Northern Ireland only) and the Disability Discrimination (Northern Ireland) Order 2006 prevent unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment relating to disability. Individuals are also protected if they are perceived to have a disability or if they are associated with a person who has a disability (for example, if they are responsible for caring for a family member with a disability). A person is considered to have a disability if they have or have had a physical and/or mental impairment which has ‘a substantial and long-term adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities’. Long-term impairments include those that last or are likely to last for at least 12 months.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cancer, HIV, multiple sclerosis and progressive/degenerative conditions are disabilities too, even if they do not currently have an adverse effect on the carrying out of day-to-day activities. An impairment which is managed by medication or medical treatment, but which would have had a substantial and long-term adverse effect if not so managed, is also a disability.

The definition of disability is different in Northern Ireland in that a list of day-to-day activities is referred to.

There is no list of day-to-day activities for England, Scotland and Wales but day-to-day activities are taken to mean activities that people generally, not a specific individual, carry out on a daily or frequent basis.

While there is no definitive list of what is considered a disability, it covers a wide range of impairments including:

- sensory impairments
- impairments with fluctuating or recurring effects such as rheumatoid arthritis, depression and epilepsy
- progressive impairments, such as motor neurone disease, muscular dystrophy, HIV and cancer
- organ specific impairments, including respiratory conditions and cardiovascular diseases
- developmental impairments, such as autistic spectrum disorders and dyslexia
- mental health conditions such as depression and eating disorders
- impairments caused by injury to the body or brain.

It is important for HEIs to note that people who have had a past disability are also protected from discrimination, victimisation and harassment because of disability.

Equality law requires HEIs to anticipate the needs of people with disabilities and make reasonable adjustments for them. Failure to make a reasonable adjustment constitutes discrimination. If a researcher’s impairment has affected the quantity of their research outputs, the submitting unit may return a reduced number of outputs (see ‘Guidance on submissions’, Part 3, Section 1, ‘Staff circumstances’).

**Gender reassignment**

The Gender Recognition Act 2004 gave enhanced privacy rights to trans people who undergo gender reassignment. A person acting in an official capacity who acquires information about a person’s status as a transsexual may commit a criminal offence if they pass the information to a third party without consent.

Consequently, staff within HEIs with responsibility for REF submissions must ensure that the information they receive about gender reassignment is treated with particular care.

If a staff member’s ability to work productively throughout the REF assessment period has been constrained due to gender reassignment, the unit may return a reduced number of research outputs (see ‘Guidance on submissions’, Part 3, Section 1, ‘Staff circumstances’).

Information about the member of staff will be kept confidential as described in ‘Guidance on submissions’, paragraph 195.

HEIs should note that the Scottish government recently consulted on, and the UK government is currently consulting on, reform of the Gender Recognition Act 2004, which may include streamlining the procedure to legally change gender.
**Pregnancy and maternity**

Under the Equality Act 2010 and the Sex Discrimination (Northern Ireland) Order 1976 women are protected from unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation related to pregnancy and maternity.

Consequently, where researchers have taken time out of work, or their ability to work productively throughout the assessment period has been affected, because of pregnancy and/or maternity, the submitting unit may return a reduced number of research outputs, as set out in ‘Guidance on submissions’, paragraphs 169 to 172.

In addition, HEIs should ensure that female researchers who are pregnant or on maternity leave are kept informed about and included in their submissions process.

For the purposes of this summary it is important to note that primary adopters have similar entitlements to women on maternity leave.

**Sex (including breastfeeding and additional paternity and adoption leave)**

The Equality Act 2010 and the Sex Discrimination (Northern Ireland) Order 1976 protect HEI staff from unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation related to sex. Employees are also protected because of their perceived sex or because of their association with someone of a particular sex.

The sex discrimination provisions of the Equality Act explicitly protect women from less favourable treatment because they are breastfeeding.

Consequently, the impact of breastfeeding on a woman’s ability to work productively will be taken into account, as set out in ‘Guidance on submissions’, Part 3, Section 1, ‘Staff circumstances’.

If a mother who meets the continuity of employment test wishes to return to work early or shorten her maternity leave/pay, she will be entitled to shared parental leave with the father or her partner within the first year of the baby’s birth. Partners may also be eligible for shared parental leave or pay. Fathers/partners who take additional paternity or adoption leave will have similar entitlements to women on maternity leave and barriers that exist to taking the leave, or as a result of having taken it, could constitute unlawful sex discrimination. Consequently, where researchers have taken additional paternity and adoption leave, the submitting unit may return a reduced number of outputs, as set out in ‘Guidance on submissions’, Annex L.

HEIs need to be wary of implementing procedures and decision-making processes in relation to REF 2021 that would be easier for men to comply with than women, or vice versa. There are many cases where a requirement to work full-time (or less favourable treatment of people working part-time or flexibly) has been held to discriminate unlawfully against women.

HEIs should note that there are now requirements under UK and Scottish legislation for public authorities (including HEIs) to report information on the percentage difference amongst employees between men and women’s average hourly pay (excluding overtime).
Dear Colleague:

As part of the University’s commitment to supporting fairness, equality and inclusion in REF 2021, we have implemented a voluntary and confidential process by which staff who are eligible for inclusion in our REF submission can declare information about circumstances that may have affected their ability to research productively during the assessment period (1 January 2014 – 31 July 2020), and particularly their ability to produce research outputs at the same rate as staff not affected by circumstances.

We are writing to all eligible staff to ensure they are aware of the process and to enable individuals to make a decision as to whether this process is applicable to their circumstances. We have contacted you as our records suggest you are eligible for entry to REF 2021 because you are employed on a teaching and research contact of 0.2 FTE or greater, and have a current RIA allocation. This letter explains what individual circumstances might be declared, why you might wish to declare these and how to make a declaration.

The purpose of eligible staff declaring information about individual circumstances is:

1. To recognise the effect that individual circumstances defined below can have on an individual’s ability to research productively, and to adjust expectations in terms of expected workload / production of research outputs;
2. To establish whether there are any Units of Assessment where the proportion of declared circumstances is sufficiently high to warrant a request to the funding bodies for a reduction in the required number of outputs to be submitted by that Unit of Assessment;
3. To enable those who have not been able to produce a REF-eligible output during the assessment period to be entered into REF without penalty where they have qualifying (as defined below) individual circumstances.
4. To enable, should you wish, a dialogue to be instigated between you and DMU / your manager on the support that the university may be able to provide in the future.

Further details about qualifying circumstances and the tariffs for the defined reductions can be found in the University’s Code of Practice (https://demontfortuniversity.sharepoint.com/sites/DMUHome/org/RSD/Pages/REF-2021.aspx) in Appendix 11. We also list below the individual circumstances that are recognised:

1. Qualifying as an Early Career Researcher (i.e. starting your career as an independent researcher) on or after 1 August 2016;
2. Absence from work due to secondments or career breaks outside the HE sector;
3. Qualifying periods of family-related leave;
4. Other circumstances that apply to UOAs 1–6 only;
5. Circumstances with an equivalent effect to absence, that require a judgement about the appropriate reduction in outputs, which are:
   a. Disability, as defined in Annex 11, Table 1 extracts and including ill health, injury, or mental health conditions;
   b. 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 set out in Appendix 11 of the University’s REF Code of Practice;
   c. Other caring responsibilities (such as caring for an elderly or disabled family member);
   d. Gender reassignment;
e. Other circumstances relating to the protected characteristics, or relating to activities protected by employment legislation.

If you wish to notify the university of any qualifying individual circumstances that have impacted your ability to research productively throughout the census period, please complete the Declaration of Staff Circumstances Form below. Declaring individual circumstances is voluntary, but we encourage you to make a declaration if you have eligible circumstances. Completed forms must be returned to the dedicated email address: REFindcircs@dmu.ac.uk, which is only accessible to members of the University’s Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Team. Anonymised information will be considered by the REF Individual Circumstances Review Panel, and the outcome notified in writing.

The form is the only means by which the university will be gathering this information; we will not be consulting HR records, contract start dates, etc. You should therefore complete and return the form if any of the above circumstances apply and you are willing to provide the associated information. In many cases, such as qualifying as an Early Career Researcher or taking parental leave, the process of making a declaration will be straightforward, but we recognise that some situations will be more complex, for example for those with long term health issues. If you have a question, please email REFindcircs@dmu.ac.uk, or request a confidential face-to-face meeting with one of the EDI team.

The internal deadline for submitting requests for staff circumstances to the formal panel for REF2021 is Wednesday, 22 January 2020 to ensure that requests can be processed and approved in good time to meet the Research England deadline of 31 March 2020 for submission of cases requesting unit and individual reductions. We will still consider circumstances after this date on an exceptional basis, e.g. for new members of staff or where there have been serious or unexpected changes to circumstances.

If you are awarded a reduction in output and elect to use this, the university may need to provide Research England with data and information that you have disclosed about your individual circumstances, to show that the criteria have been met for reducing the number of outputs. Submitted data will be kept confidential to the REF Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel and Research England who are subject to confidentiality arrangements. The REF team will destroy the submitted data about individuals’ circumstances on completion of the assessment phase.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Hall

Head of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion
Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Team,
John Whitehead Building
De Montfort University
Individual Circumstances Disclosure Form

This form should be emailed to IndCircs@dmu.ac.uk at the very latest by Wednesday, 22 January 2020. We will still consider circumstances after this date on an exceptional basis, e.g. for new members of staff or where there have been serious or unexpected changes to circumstances.

Only members of the Equality and Diversity Team have access to the inbox, and forms will be anonymised before being considered by the REF Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel.

Name: Click here to insert text.

School and Faculty: Click here to insert text.

Unit of Assessment: Click here to insert text.

Do you have a REF-eligible output published between 1 January 2014 and 31 July 2020?

Yes ☐
No ☐

Please complete this form if you have one or more applicable individual circumstance (see above, and Annex 11 (attached) of the university’s Code of Practice) which you are willing to declare. Please provide requested information in relevant box(es).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstance</th>
<th>Time period affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Career Researcher (started career as an independent researcher on or after 1 August 2016).</td>
<td>Click here to enter a date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date you became an early career researcher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior clinical academic who has not gained Certificate of completion of Training by 31 July 2020.</td>
<td>Tick here ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career break or secondment outside of the HE sector.</td>
<td>Click here to enter dates and durations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates and durations in months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-related leave;</td>
<td>Click here to enter dates and durations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• statutory maternity leave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• statutory adoption leave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional paternity or adoption leave or shared parental leave lasting for four months or more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each period of leave, state the nature of the leave taken and the dates and durations in months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabilty (including chronic conditions)</td>
<td>To include: Nature / name of condition, periods of absence from work, and periods at work when unable to research productively. Total duration in months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health condition</td>
<td>To include: Nature / name of condition, periods of absence from work, and periods at work when unable to research productively. Total duration in months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill health or injury</td>
<td>To include: Nature / name of condition, periods of absence from work, and periods at work when unable to research productively. Total duration in months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints relating to family leave that fall outside of standard allowance</td>
<td>To include: Type of leave taken and brief description of additional constraints, periods of absence from work, and periods at work when unable to research productively. Total duration in months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring responsibilities</td>
<td>To include: Nature of responsibility, periods of absence from work, and periods at work when unable to research productively. Total duration in months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>To include: periods of absence from work, and periods at work when unable to research productively. Total duration in months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other exceptional reasons e.g. bereavement</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To include: brief explanation of reason, periods of absence from work, and periods at work when unable to research productively. Total duration in months.

Please confirm, by ticking the box provided, that:

- ☐ The above information provided is a true and accurate description of my circumstances as of the date below.
- ☐ I realise that the above information will be used for REF purposes only and will be seen (in an anonymised format) by the Individual Circumstances Review Panel (as set out in the university’s Code of Practice).
- ☐ I give my permission for a member of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion team to contact me if further information is required in relation to this application.
- ☐ I realise it may be necessary for DMU to share the information with Research England if requested.
- ☐ I understand that if I am awarded a reduction in output by the Panel, I am giving permission for the reduction in outputs to be communicated to the UoA coordinators. The reasons for the reduction would not be communicated, but my name and the number of reductions awarded can be shared.
- ☐ I understand that it remains my choice whether to use the reduction awarded, but if I choose not to use the reduction, I will notify the REF Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel in writing within 10 working days of receiving notification of award from the panel.

Name:  Print name here
Signed:  Sign or initial here
Date:  Insert date here

The following section is distinct from the REF Individual circumstances process and is related to putting into place ongoing support if you are disclosing relevant circumstances such as a disability.

☐ I give my permission for an HR Advisor to contact me to discuss my circumstances, and my requirements in relation this these.

☐ I give my permission for relevant information to be passed to my line manager on the understanding that such information is shared to assist the university make anticipatory or reasonable adjustments that will support me at DMU.

I would like to be contacted by:

- Email  ☐  Insert email address
- Phone  ☐  Insert contact telephone number
Thursday 19 September 2019

Dear Dr Hill:

I am writing to confirm that academic staff at De Montfort University have endorsed the processes we have established to identify staff with significant responsibility for research (SRR).

We have had extensive campaigns and roadshows (including REF/ RIA Roadshows; Institute Directors away days; Units of Assessment (UoA) regular meetings; Impact Case Study author away days; Code of Practice forums and EDI/ REF workshops), and our communications to staff on REF 2021 continue apace to ensure that staff have been made fully aware of the requirement to identify staff with significant responsibility for research, and our process for doing so. Indeed, it has been an ongoing programme since 2014, when the current Research and Innovation Allowance (RIA) exercise was launched, albeit under a different name (the Individual Research Plan or IRP) to support research-active staff to plan and develop their research careers. Since then, each year, all academic staff (including professorial staff) seeking a research allowance in excess of the allocated scholarly activity allowance (0.1 FTE) have been invited to apply for an RP/RIA.

The research allocation process, the IRP, was developed in consultation with the University and College Union (UCU), and it has since been run each year with
extensive communications outlining the process, sent out to all staff on teaching and research (T&R) contracts by individual email and promoted through Research Services communications, as well as communications through Faculty Associate Deans of Research and Innovation (ADRIs). The scheme was renamed Individual Innovation and Research Plan (IIRP) in 2016-17, and took on its current name, Research and Innovation Allowance (RIA), in 2017-18.

We are ensuring inclusivity of staff (whether full- or pro rata, and by protected characteristics) by reviewing data on RIA applications and awards, to consider the representativeness of overall staff profiles to those applying for RIAs. In an attempt to encourage more academic staff to engage in research, the May 2019 RIA process has invited applications for staff who wish to identify as 'researchers-in-training', with a structured cohort-based year-long development programme, the Next Generation Researcher Programme, in place to build professional researcher capabilities.

We have ascertained academic staff endorsement of the processes we have established to identify staff with SRR in the following ways:

1. DMU's Academic Board endorsed the Code of Practice and the principles for identifying staff with SRR in May 2019. Four out of six elected academic representatives on this Board have since provided written support for our processes for identifying SRR. The two colleagues who have abstained are UCU representatives (see below).

2. All 32 Directors of Research Institutes at DMU have provided explicit written endorsement of the processes we have established to identify staff with significant responsibility for research.

3. Preparatory to REF 2021, in January 2019 we ran a survey of all staff on T&R contracts to ascertain how researchers themselves defined what constituted 'significant responsibility for research'. Responses to the survey showed that the RIA process, of allocating time to carry out research, was viewed by respondents as a defining feature of SRR.

4. An open consultation on the Code of Practice was launched on 9 May 2019 for three weeks, with the circulation of a draft Code. All T&R staff were invited to provide feedback through a dedicated email (refcop@dmu.ac.uk), with letters sent out to staff away from the University to ensure every member of T&R staff
had an opportunity to read and contribute to the process. Staff could also provide feedback in confidence through their ADRIs, who sit on the REF Steering Committee. The consultation included engagement with relevant committees (such as the REF Steering Group; the REF Working Group; the Ethics Task Force and Policy and Governance meetings) and unions, and saw representation from staff with all protected characteristics and career levels. There was clear indication that respondents to our consultation endorsed the processes we have established to identify staff with SRR.

5. The PVC for Research and the Associate PVC for Research conducted roadshows in each of the faculties and centrally on our approach, and had further in-depth discussions with each of our research institutes, within which all of our research-active staff are located. There was clear indication that attendees at the roadshows and meetings endorsed the processes we have established to identify staff with SRR.

As pointed out earlier, UCU have been extensively consulted, right from the inception of the RIA (in its former guise as the Individual Research Plan) in 2014. The DMU UCU branch has indicated in writing that they have been consulted, and have never raised any objections to our Code of Practice, or the use of the RIA as signifier of SRR. However, they have abstained from explicit endorsement of any aspect of the Code of Practice because they have indicated that this would be contrary to UCU's national position which opposes the Research Excellence Framework: [https://www.ucu.org.uk/REF#position](https://www.ucu.org.uk/REF#position).

By way of this letter I confirm that agreement has been received from De Montfort University academic staff on the processes established for identifying staff with SRR at our institution, as set out in our Code of Practice.

Yours sincerely

Professor Andy Collop

Interim Vice-Chancellor, De Montfort University
The Gateway, Leicester, LE1 98H, UK E: acollop@dmu.ac.uk T: +44 (0)116 207 8456