

REF – 12 March 2013

# Equality Impact Assessment Template



Queen Margaret University

EDINBURGH

## Equality Impact Assessment Template

**Once completed, please email to the Secretary of the Equal Opportunity Committee.**

This template uses the term 'policy' to apply refer to a policy, strategy, service – the initiative that is being assessed. It is a Word document to enable the table to be expanded to fit your text.

Section 1 - Background Information	
Sessions 1 & 2 aim to provide a frame for the policy.	
Name of School or Department	Research and KE Unit
Name of Person Responsible for the EQIA (normally the lead for the policy design/review)	Kim Gilchrist
Names of Members of EQIA group (if applicable)	Kim Gilchrist, Jim Scobbie, Angela Gentle

Section 2 - Policy Detail	
Name of policy to be assessed.	REF Equality Code of Practice – Policy and Procedure for Selection of Staff to REF 2014 12 March 2013 - Update
Is this a new or an existing policy?	Existing but we have changed the way it is implemented. The monthly REF Strategy Group has been replaced by one:one meetings with the REF Strategy Group Chair and the REF Manager. Formal meetings of all UoA Leads and the Deans and Deputy Principal have been set up between now and the submission date.
If this is an existing policy, is there any existing data available about the policy that can be used in this assessment, such as user feedback?	Positive update from staff and feedback. Number of staff submitting self disclosure forms.
Does this policy have an impact on people?	Yes
Briefly outline the aim and objectives of the policy.	Review of Implementation of REF process to date and Staff Selection Decisions.
Who is intended to benefit from the policy and in what way?	Note the change in the implementation of the policy as detailed above is intended to improve support for more focused submission development in line with individual panel criteria. This also allows us

	to monitor implementation of the Equality Code of Practice at a more local level and report back any concerns to the Deputy Principal.
What outcomes are wanted by this policy?	<p>The intention of the policy is to secure the following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the processes concerned with the selection of staff for inclusion in REF submissions are transparent..</li> <li>• That the policy in respect of staff selection is consistent and applied uniformly across QMU.</li> <li>• That responsibilities are clearly defined, and the individuals and bodies that are involved in selecting staff for REF submissions are accountable by name or role.</li> <li>• That eligible individuals are selected for inclusion on the basis of the quality of their research taking into account the main and sub-panels published criteria for research quality.</li> <li>• That consideration is given to any personal circumstances which may apply to an individual as detailed in in the code of practice.</li> <li>• That QMU demonstrates its commitment to and its obligations as an employer under equality, confidentiality and data handling legislation.</li> </ul>
Who is responsible for the policy?	Executive Board
Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?	Academic Staff and Senior Management.

**Section 3 - Projected Equality Groups**

This session aims to look at what the policy impact may be on each of the groups.

Have you included stakeholders in this EQIA? If yes, please detail.

Yes  
Professor Jim Scobbie – researcher, UoA Lead and Chair of the QMU REF Strategy Group

In which of the following equality areas are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact?

**Assessment**

- If you tick 'yes', what concerns do you have that the policy may create a differential impact on protected groups? What existing evidence (presumed or otherwise) do you have to support this?
- If you ticked 'no impact' - what evidence do you have to make this decision?

Noted positive response to race – performance above norm.

**Yes      No      No  
   Impact**

Gender

We are monitoring to keep under continuous review. – concern noted – more male staff likely to be included in REF.  
Continue to note more female staff requesting one:one support for eResearch updates.  
Established monthly one:one support via meetings with the UoA Lead, REF Manager and REF Strategy Group Chair to monitor implementation of the Equality Code of Practice at a local level and in line with individual panel criteria.

Disability

We are monitoring to keep under continuous review.  
Established monthly one:one support via meetings with the UoA Lead, REF Manager and REF Strategy Group Chair to monitor implementation of the Equality Code of Practice at a local level and in line with individual panel criteria.

Race	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>We continue to acknowledge that we have under representation for disability – we are undertaking a staff survey in an attempt to address this.</p> <p>We are monitoring to keep under continuous review. Established monthly one:one support via meetings with the UoA Lead, REF Manager and REF Strategy Group Chair to monitor implementation of the Equality Code of Practice at a local level and in line with individual panel criteria.</p>
Carers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>We don't routinely collect data on Sexual Orientation, Religion or Carers. Data will be monitored via staff disclosure/complex circumstances forms.</p> <p>We are monitoring to keep under continuous review. Established monthly one:one support via meetings with the UoA Lead, REF Manager and REF Strategy Group Chair to monitor implementation of the Equality Code of Practice at a local level and in line with individual panel criteria.</p>
Age	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>We are monitoring to keep under continuous review. Established monthly one:one support via meetings with the UoA Lead, REF Manager and REF Strategy Group Chair to monitor implementation of the Equality Code of Practice at a local level and in line with individual panel criteria.</p>
Sexual Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>We are monitoring to keep under continuous review. Established monthly one:one support via meetings with the UoA Lead, REF Manager and REF Strategy Group Chair to monitor implementation of the Equality Code of Practice at a local level and in line with individual panel criteria.</p>
Religion, Belief	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>We are monitoring to keep under continuous review. Established monthly one:one support via meetings with the UoA Lead, REF Manager and REF Strategy Group Chair to monitor implementation of the Equality Code of Practice at a local level and in line with individual panel criteria.</p>
Transgender, Transsexual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>We are monitoring to keep under continuous review. Established monthly one:one support via meetings with the UoA Lead, REF Manager and REF Strategy Group Chair to monitor implementation of the Equality Code of Practice at a local level and in line with individual panel criteria.</p>

Additional Notes

Meeting scheduled to review protected characteristics – 18 April 13  
Paper on Equality in Research Careers discussed at RSC 20 April 13.  
REF Equality Training flagged as a priority requirement.

**Section 4 – Outcome and sign off**

	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Additional Notes</b>
Are there any risks associated with the policy (that may create a differential impact?)	Same issues remain but no specific concerns have emerged.	Risk adverse impact refers to what could happen if the adverse impact happened. What could happen if the differential impact of the policy is left unaddressed.
If so, could the differential impact amount to an adverse impact on a protected group/s?	Yes but we are actively managing risk.	If the policy's differential impact suggests an adverse impact, which equality group does this refer to?
Can this adverse impact be justified, for example: on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one protected groups or any other reason?	No we are specifically targeting some groups.	Is the adverse impact acceptable in terms of the promotion of specific duties? ie there may be acceptable business reasons for the adverse impact.
Date EQIA completed	12 March 2013	
Date for future review	May 2013.	This is normally 3 years.
Name of person responsible for EQIA	Kim Gilchrist	
Signature (can be electronic)	<i>Kim Gilchrist</i>	
Date	17 April 2013	