

ULSTER UNIVERSITY POLICY SCREENING PRO-FORMA

Part 1

Information about the policy

Note: 'Policy' includes any strategy, policy (proposed/amended/existing) or practice and/or decision, whether written or unwritten.

Name of the policy

Research & Impact Strategy 2017-2022

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?

New Strategy

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes)

To empower our people to undertake interdisciplinary research in a supportive environment to produce internationally excellent and world leading outputs and transformative impact.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

If so, explain how.

All: the strategy offers a consistent approach to supporting all researchers, regardless of their Section 75 category.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

Mr Tim Brundle, Director of Research & Impact

Who owns and who implements the policy?

Professor Cathy Gormley Heenan, PVC (Research & Impact)

ULSTER UNIVERSITY POLICY SCREENING PRO-FORMA

Part 1

Implementation factors

Are there any factors which could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the policy/decision? (Please select one answer)

Yes

If yes, are they

financial? (Department for the Economy funding, departure of UK from the EU, availability of research funding)

legislative? (National legislation and policies relating to research governance and ethics)

other? (Ulster University's Five & Fifty Strategic Plan)

Main stakeholders affected

Who are the internal and external stakeholders (actual or potential) that the policy will impact upon?

Staff

Students

Other service users (e.g. prospective students, conference delegates)

Other public sector organisations

Voluntary/community/trade unions

Other, please specify _____

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

Policy Name	Policy Owner
Teaching & Learning Strategy	PVC (Education)
Internationalisation Strategy	PVC (Global Engagement)
Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy	University Secretary

ULSTER UNIVERSITY POLICY SCREENING PRO-FORMA

Part 1

Available evidence

What evidence/information (both qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered to inform this policy? (Please specify details for each of the Section 75 categories)

Note: evidence can come from many sources. Examples include the University's management information systems, internal or external research, surveys or consultation exercises. Anecdotal evidence such as feedback from service users may also be used.

The following evidence was considered in the development of this strategy:

- Ulster University Staff Equal Opportunities Data 2016, by Staff Category, with a particular focus on research staff;
- Ulster University's Equality Impact Assessment on the Research Exercise Framework 2014;
- HEFCE's Selection of staff for inclusion in REF 2014 report; and
- The University's Ninth Article 55 Report.

Section 75 category	Details of evidence/information
Religious belief	A considerable number of staff (129, 35%) were submitted to REF 2014 for whom a community background is 'not determined', representing 68% of staff in the eligible pool. 47% of eligible staff from the Catholic community were submitted compared with 52% of Protestant staff. This is in line with the University's workforce, as described in the University's Article 55 Review (of those who declared Community Background in 2016, [46%] were from the Catholic community and [54%] were from the Protestant community).
Political opinion	N/A. The University does not collect information on political opinion.
Racial group	<p>The Equality Impact Assessment on the Research Exercise Framework 2014 established that out of an eligible pool of 922 staff for whom ethnicity was known, 63 were of Black/Minority Ethnic (BME) origin (7%). Of these, 43 (68%) were submitted. The proportion of staff submitted from BME origin (9%) is higher than the proportion within the eligible pool of staff (7%), showing a better than average return for this group.</p> <p>According to HEFCE's Selection of staff for inclusion in REF 2014 report, 11.8% of staff selected for REF were of</p>

ULSTER UNIVERSITY POLICY SCREENING PRO-FORMA

Part 1

	<p>Black/Minority Ethnic (BME) origin, compared with 11.4% of all eligible staff being of BME Origin.</p> <p>According to Ulster University's EO data for 2016, 19% of research staff, 5% of academics and 3.7% of all staff at Ulster are of Black/Minority Ethnic origin. BME representation declines dramatically as you move up the levels of seniority, particularly for those in academic roles.</p>
Age	<p>Staff submitted to REF 2014 were represented in all five age brackets, with the majority aged 40-49 (36%). The proportion of staff submitted in the 30-39, 40-49, 50-59 and over 60 age bands reflected the pool of eligible staff for these age bands. The majority of early career researchers were in 30–39 age group (57 out of 79 staff submitted, 72%).</p>
Marital status	<p>The proportion of staff who are married (63%) is similar to the eligible pool (62%). A slightly lower proportion of single staff were submitted (19%) compared with the eligible pool (23%). An analysis by gender show a slightly lower proportion of married and single women submitted compared to the eligible pool.</p>
Sexual orientation	<p>From the cohort of staff selected from the REF 2014 and the eligible pool for whom sexual orientation is known, the proportions of staff submitted is similar to the eligible pool.</p>
Men and women generally	<p>The gender profile of the eligible pool is 55% male and 45% female. Of the 500 staff submitted, 312 (62%) were male and 188 (38%) were female. These figures represent 60% of male staff and 44% of female staff submitted from the eligible pool.</p> <p>According to HEFCE's Selection of staff for inclusion in REF 2014 report, 67% of men were selected for REF compared with 51% of women.</p> <p>Women make up 56.4% of the undergraduate population, 53.8% of the sector workforce and occupy 45% of academic jobs. Yet women's representation declines dramatically as you move up the levels of seniority, particularly for those in academic roles. Across the sector, only 27.5% of academic managers and 20.5% of professors are women. In vice-chancellor and principal roles, this is even lower with only 17% of women holding the top job. In 2013/14, women lead 29 of 166 institutions.</p>
Disability	<p>The number of staff who declared a disability is small, with only 33 staff in the eligible pool; of these 14 were submitted to REF 2014 (42%). The proportion of submitted staff who declared a disability (3%) was slightly below the proportion in the eligible pool (3.5%).</p> <p>According to HEFCE's Selection of staff for inclusion in REF</p>

ULSTER UNIVERSITY POLICY SCREENING PRO-FORMA

Part 1

	<p>2014 report 2.6% of those submitted to REF specified a disability compared with 3.5% of all eligible staff who specified a disability according to HEFCE's Selection of staff for inclusion in REF 2014 report.</p> <p>According to Ulster University's own equality data Breakdown by Staff by Employment Category on 6 February 2016, 4.77% of research staff, 3.52% of academics and 4.6% of all staff at Ulster are Declared disabled/has a long term health condition.</p>
Dependants	<p>The proportion of staff submitted with or without dependants to REF 2014 is similar to the eligible pool, at 46% and 45% respectively.</p>

ULSTER UNIVERSITY POLICY SCREENING PRO-FORMA

Part 1

Needs, experiences and priorities

Taking into account the information referred to above, what are the different needs, experiences and priorities of each of the following categories, in relation to the particular policy/decision? (Please specify details for each of the Section 75 categories)

Section 75 category	Details of needs/experiences/priorities
Religious belief	None identified.
Political opinion	None identified.
Racial group	BME representation declines dramatically as you move up the levels of seniority, particularly for those in academic roles. Removing barriers can ensure BME researcher careers are able to advance in the same way as their White colleagues.
Age	None identified, however, researcher development training is provided targeted at different career stages. Anecdotally, early career researchers may require additional support and development compared with more established researchers; however, the correlates only indirectly with 'age'.
Marital status	None identified.
Sexual orientation	None identified.
Men and women generally	<p>The Equality Impact Assessment on the Research Exercise Framework 2014 identified a lower selection rate for women compared to men. It highlighted the aim to improve on the selection of women in any future research assessment exercises.</p> <p>Women's representation declines dramatically as you move up the levels of seniority, particularly for those in academic roles. Removing barriers can ensure women's careers are able to advance in the same way as men's, for example, to accommodate maternity leave and/or caring responsibilities.</p>
Disability	Disabled people may require reasonable adjustments to support them to carry out research.
Dependants	See 'Men and women generally'. Removing barriers can ensure people with dependents can advance in the same way as those who are without.

ULSTER UNIVERSITY POLICY SCREENING PRO-FORMA

Part 1

Consultation

Consultation with relevant groups, organisations or individuals about the policy can provide useful information about issues/opportunities which are specifically related to them (i.e. evidence to inform the policy). Please indicate whether you carried out (or intend to carry out¹) any consultation exercises prior to equality screening?

Full consultation took place between university staff.

Focussed consultation was undertaken with the following groups: SLT Members, Executive Deans, Ulster's REF Panellists, Research Institute Directors, Unit of Assessment Coordinators, the Heads of the Research Graduate Schools and colleagues from Research & Impact.

A webinar was delivered to PhD students and ECRs to enable them to provide feedback on the strategy.

¹ Please contact equality staff in the Policy Implementation Unit (PIU) if you intend to carry out a consultation exercise prior to equality screening your policy. The PIU will assist you to align some of the consultation questions with the screening pro-forma, so that you receive more meaningful responses.

Screening

Introduction

The answers to the following screening questions will assist the University in making a decision whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment on the policy. The following information is provided to help you to identify and comment on the level of likely impact of the policy in questions 1-4:

Select 'major' impact if:

- a) The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance;
- b) Potential equality impacts are unknown, because, for example, there are insufficient data upon which to make an assessment or because they are complex, and it would be appropriate to conduct an equality impact assessment in order to better assess them;
- c) Potential equality and/or good relations impacts are likely to be adverse or are likely to be experienced disproportionately by groups of people including those who are marginalised or disadvantaged;
- d) Further assessment offers a valuable way to examine the evidence and develop recommendations in respect of a policy about which there are concerns amongst affected individuals and representative groups, for example in respect of multiple identities;
- e) The policy is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review;
- f) The policy is significant in terms of expenditure.

Select 'minor' impact if:

- a) The policy is not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential impacts on people are judged to be negligible;
- b) The policy, or certain proposals within it, are potentially unlawfully discriminatory, but this possibility can readily and easily be eliminated by making appropriate changes to the policy or by adopting appropriate mitigating measures;
- c) Any asymmetrical equality impacts caused by the policy are intentional because they are specifically designed to promote equality of opportunity for particular groups of disadvantaged people;
- d) By amending the policy there are better opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations;
- e) Differential impact observed and opportunities exist to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

Part 2

Select 'none' if:

- a) The policy has no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations.
- b) The policy is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations for people within the equality and good relations categories.

Taking into account the evidence presented in Part 1, please complete the screening questions (Questions 1-4).

Screening questions

1 What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories? (Please provide details)		
Section 75 category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact? (minor/major/none)
Religious belief	The Research & Impact Strategy is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.	None
Political opinion	The Research & Impact Strategy is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.	None
Racial group	The Research & Impact Strategy is likely to have a positive impact on equality of opportunity for this category.	Minor (+)
Age	The Research & Impact Strategy is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.	None
Marital status	The Research & Impact Strategy is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.	None
Sexual orientation	The Research & Impact Strategy is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.	None
Men and women generally	The Research & Impact Strategy is likely to have positive impact on equality of opportunity for this category.	Minor (+)

Part 2

Disability	The Research & Impact Strategy is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.	None
Dependants	The Research & Impact Strategy is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.	None

Part 2

2 Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories?		
Section 75 category	If Yes , provide details	If No , provide reasons
Religious belief		The Strategy aims to provide equality of opportunity in research and impact to all Section 75 categories.
Political opinion		The Strategy aims to provide equality of opportunity in research and impact to all Section 75 categories.
Racial group	The University will continue to progress the Race Equality Charter agenda, to improve the representation, progression and success of BME researchers.	
Age		The Strategy aims to provide equality of opportunity in research and impact to all Section 75 categories.
Marital status		The Strategy aims to provide equality of opportunity in research and impact to all Section 75 categories.
Sexual orientation		The Strategy aims to provide equality of opportunity in research and impact to all Section 75 categories.
Men and women generally	The University will continue to progress the Athena SWAN agenda to encourage and support the involvement and promotion of women in research.	

Part 2

Disability		The Strategy aims to provide equality of opportunity in research and impact to all Section 75 categories.
Dependants		The Strategy aims to provide equality of opportunity in research and impact to all Section 75 categories.

Part 2

3 To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? (Please provide details)		
Good relations category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact (minor/major/none)
Religious belief	The Research & Impact Strategy is unlikely to impact on good relations between people of different religious beliefs.	None
Political opinion	The Research & Impact Strategy is unlikely to impact on good relations between people of different political opinion.	None
Racial group	The Research & Impact Strategy is unlikely to impact on good relations between people of different racial groups.	None

4 Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?		
Good relations category	If Yes , provide details	If No , provide reasons
Religious belief		The Strategy has no relevance to good relations.
Political opinion		The Strategy has no relevance to good relations.
Racial group		The Strategy has no relevance to good relations.

Additional considerations

Multiple identity

<p>5 Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, please provide details of any potential impacts of the policy/decision on people with multiple identities? (<i>For example; disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people</i>). Please include details of any data which you have used to determine/identify this impact</p>	
<p>Section 75 categories (please specify)</p>	<p>Details of policy impact and details of data which describes the policy impact</p>
<p>All categories</p>	<p>The Strategy aims to provide equality of opportunity in research to all Section 75 categories.</p>

Disability Duties

<p>6. Does the policy provide an opportunity to encourage disabled people to participate in University life?</p>	
<p>If Yes, provide details</p>	<p>If No, provide reasons</p>
<p>Yes, the Strategy is inclusive and applies to all researchers.</p>	

Part 2

7. Does the policy provide an opportunity to promote positive attitudes towards disabled people?	
If Yes, provide details	If No, provide reasons
	No, the Strategy aims to provide equality of opportunity to all.

Part 3

Screening decision

Based on the evidence considered and outlined in Part 1 and the responses to the screening questions (Part 2), please indicate the screening decision for this policy:

Note: The University should take particular care not to screen out policies that have a procurement aspect if there is potential to promote equality of opportunity through the procurement of services.

-
- Screen in** the policy (subject the policy to an Equality Impact Assessment)
i.e. the likely impact is 'major' in respect of one, or more of the equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories
-
- Screen out** the policy without mitigation or an alternative policy proposed to be adopted (no Equality Impact Assessment)
i.e. the likely impact is 'none' in respect of all of the equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories
-
- Screen out** the policy and **mitigate the impacts on equality by amending or changing the policy, or by developing an alternative policy or action** (no Equality Impact Assessment)
i.e. the likely impact is 'minor' in respect of one, or more of the equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories
-

Part 3

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment (i.e. 'screen out' the policy) and mitigate the impacts on equality by amending or changing the policy, or by developing an alternative policy or action, please provide reasons to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy:

The likely impact is 'minor' in respect of one, or more of the equality of opportunity and/or good relations categories.

The Strategy is likely to have positive impact on women and black and minority ethnic groups, consistent with the Athena SWAN and Race Equality Charters.

The Strategy will be reviewed annually following implementation and, if necessary, amended.

Timetabling and prioritising

If the policy has been ‘**screened in**’ for equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.

On a scale of 1-3, with 1 being the lowest priority and 3 being the highest, assess the policy in terms of its priority for equality impact assessment.

Priority criterion	Rating (1-3)
Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations	
Social need	
Effect on people’s daily lives	
Relevance to the University’s functions	

Note: The Total Rating Score will be used to prioritise the policy in rank order with other policies screened in for equality impact assessment. This list of priorities will assist the University in timetabling. Details of the University’s Equality Impact Assessment Timetable will be included in its quarterly Screening Reports.



Is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities?

Yes

No

If yes, please provide details:

Approval and authorisation

	Position/Job Title	Date
Screened by:  Professor Cathy Gormley-Heenan	PVC (Research & Impact)	23/3/17
Approved by: 	University Secretary	31/3/17

Note: Following approval by Senior Executive Team/Senate, the policy owner must inform the University Secretary that the policy has been approved. Once the Council of the University has been informed of the policy (either directly or through an appropriate Committee), the policy owner can then promulgate the policy and develop appropriate training or awareness raising material in relation to the policy.

A copy of the screening pro-forma will be made available on the University's website and be made available on request.

Review

Note: Policies must be reviewed at least every two years, but sooner if changes in legislation or other variables require review.

This policy is due for review (in terms of its impact on equality of opportunity and good relations) by the policy owner on:

(Insert date)