

# University of Abertay Dundee

## Code of Practice on Equality and Diversity in the Preparation of Submissions for the Research Excellence Framework (REF)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The Code of Practice on Equality and Diversity in the Preparation of Submissions for the REF has been prepared to expand the University's overarching policies in Equality and Diversity and set these in the context of the REF. It will guide the work of all those involved in the preparation of submissions and the selection of staff for inclusion. It also reaffirms our commitment to equality of opportunity and to the adoption and maintenance of best practice.

The code has been developed in consultation with the University community, including consideration by the University's Equal and Diversity Committee (a sub-committee of Court) and the REF Steering Group. It has also received the approval of the Research Committee and the University Senate.

The University's Equality and Diversity Policy expressly asserts that no employee will be discriminated against on the basis of any characteristics covered by equality legislation or any other inappropriate distinction. The policy applies to the full employment cycle. There are a number of supporting policies and action plans including those addressing protected characteristics, personal harassment and fixed term employees (prevention of less favourable treatment). The University is also implementing a research concordat based on seven principles, to ensure the environment for academic staff engaged in research is supportive. Of particular relevance to the Code of Practice are the principles on career development and equality and diversity that commit the University to best practice in the sector. Further information is available from the [Human Resources section](#) of the University portal. A summary of current equality legislation can be found in appendix 1.

The Code of Practice sets out the procedures and criteria to be used in the selection of staff for inclusion in the REF submission and does not supersede the University's overarching policies on Equality and Diversity and the requirement for all staff to follow these. On any issues not covered by the Code of Practice, staff are advised to refer to the website included in the paragraph above.

### 2. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The REF exists to assess the quality of research in Higher Education Institutions (HEI's) and to inform funding allocations to HEI's by the Funding Councils. The REF is managed by the REF team, based at the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), on behalf of the four higher education funding bodies. The guidance on submissions published by the REF team encourages institutions to include all staff who are conducting excellent research. The normal expectation is that four items of excellent and relevant research output will be submitted by those selected for inclusion in the University's REF return, unless the volume of research has been limited for reasons covered by equality guidelines. REF assessment panels have been instructed to take account of equalities issues that may have a bearing on the volume of research undertaken and published (or otherwise brought into the public domain) by submitted researchers in the assessment period and the University will do the same in considering who and what is submitted. Where an individual's volume of research output has been limited for reasons covered by equality legislation or other circumstances that have significantly adversely affected their contribution to the submission, key University

staff and Committees involved in the decision-making process (see section 4, The Decision Making Process for Inclusion in REF 2014) will apply this code.

Managerial decisions regarding which staff to submit to the exercise are based on the key principle of the EXCELLENCE of their research. The framework of equality and diversity legislation and the University's current policies will be applied at each stage of the REF process to ensure quality, transparency and fairness. The Code will be applied consistently across the University, taking into account particular local circumstances and specific guidance supplied by the REF Equality and Diversity Assessment Panel (EDAP) and the Equality Challenge Unit (ECU), as appropriate. Individuals acting as external advisors or reviewers as part of the University's REF preparations will be made aware of the Code. The external advisors will not decide which staff are to be submitted to the REF nor will they be given any information relating to individual staff circumstances. Assessors will be asked to comment on the quality of an individual's research only. This will be made clear in any briefing provided to external advisors.

The University can choose to structure its submission in whatever way it thinks most appropriate and potentially beneficial to the institution. This includes setting the research excellence quality threshold for the submission at institutional level, deciding in which Units of Assessment (UoAs) to make submissions, and determining the UoAs in which individual university staff are returned. These decisions are guided by the institutional strategic plan and research strategy; inclusion of staff in submissions will depend on an appropriate fit with the research profile and strategy to be presented. Overall responsibility for decisions about the shape of the University's submission will rest with the Principal & Vice Chancellor, advised by the individuals and committees described in Section 4.

### **3. RATIONALE FOR THE CODE OF PRACTICE**

As well as our specific legal responsibilities in respect of compliance with equality legislation, the University has a commitment to the adoption of best practice. Setting out our selection process for inclusion in the REF within this Code allows responsibilities to be clearly defined and ensures the consistent application of our selection criteria and fair treatment for all staff regardless of any personal characteristics or inappropriate distinction. Personal circumstances will be considered where appropriate (see section 5). In terms of REF 2014, our legal obligations cover all legislation in force at the submission date for the REF, 29 November 2013. As well as having a duty to monitor submissions to the REF by protected characteristic (where appropriate), our internal REF selection processes will also be assessed for their impact on such groups. Fixed-term and part-time employees will not be treated any less favourably than a comparable permanent employee. The University has undertaken an Equality Impact Assessment [EIA] to ensure that the processes, policies and practices do not disadvantage people with protected characteristics. An additional EIA will be undertaken once submissions to UoAs are finalised.

### **4. THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS FOR INCLUSION IN REF2014**

*4.1 Who are the University's main administrative contact points for queries about the REF?*  
Mr Simon Bright (Research Office) is the University's REF Coordinator, Dr Jonathan Teppett (Secretariat) is the data collection contact.

*4.2 How is the process of developing the University's REF2014 submission being managed?*  
The University has established an REF Steering Group which reports directly to the Principal & Vice Chancellor and to the University's Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee. The Steering Group consists of the Vice Principal & Deputy Vice Chancellor (Chair of the Group), Heads of Schools and the Research Development Manager (REF Coordinator).

The Steering Group secretary is provided by the REIS Office, which is responsible for populating the REF data collection software. The Group will second specialist staff on to the Group as appropriate for example to provide specialist advice on equality legislation. The roles and responsibilities of the committees and staff involved in the preparation and approval of submissions for the REF are summarised in appendix 2.

#### *4.3 How does the Steering Group operate?*

Operationally the Steering Group devolves much of the day-to-day management of REF planning activities to the Schools through UoA Steering Groups. The REF Steering Group will nominate one individual (on the basis of knowledge and experience) to act as the champion for a particular UoA and to chair the UoA Steering Group; the development of the submission for each UoA is coordinated by that champion, with the assistance of a small support team chosen by the UoA champion on the basis of their knowledge and experience to make up the UoA Steering Group. Activities of UoA Steering Groups are overseen at School level by Heads of School, who report back to the full REF Steering Group. The REF Steering Group retains overall responsibility for the management of the exercise including determining the UoAs that the University submits to and review and final approval of submissions prepared by the UoA Steering Groups.

#### *4.4 How will the University know whether the University ensure that the principles of transparency, consistency, accountability and inclusivity are being applied by individual UoA?*

The REF Steering Group and the University Human Resources (HR) department, will receive regular reports from each of the UoA Steering Groups and on the basis of these reports consider whether the principles set out in the Code of Practice have been applied consistently by the UoA steering group – this will include establishing whether all UoA steering group members have completed the training described in 4.8. In the event of the REF Steering Group or Human Resources coming to a decision that an UoA steering group has not applied these principles consistently, the Chair of the relevant UoA steering group will be informed of this decision in writing, along with the Steering Group/Human Resources' recommendation for remedial action which is required to ensure the principles are applied consistently.

#### *4.5 How does the REF fit in with the management of research activities across the University?*

In addition to the external reviews of the quality of research by the Funding Council undertaken through REF and its predecessors, the University also has its own procedures for managing the research undertaken by individuals and the University as a whole. As part of its wider responsibilities for the planning and management of the University's research activities, the University's Research & Knowledge Exchange Committee (RKEC) retains oversight of REF preparations and will be required to ratify strategic decisions/approve recommendations made by the REF Steering Group. Each individual's research performance and contribution to School and University objectives is considered in the annual Career Review and Performance Management process (known as Pathways) which includes a dialogue between the individual and his/her line manager (normally the Division Leader). Where the committees described in Appendix 2 consider reports from other committees or designated staff reporting to them, the basis of the discussion must be clear, and recorded in the minutes of the relevant meeting. When individual performance is discussed and the individual is absent, committees should be made aware of all the facts relating to the individual.

#### *4.6 On what basis will the UoAs to which Abertay submits be chosen?*

The UoAs to which the University submits will be guided by the principles stated in the University's research strategy and be consistent with the objective of maximising the overall reputational and financial benefit to the University from its REF submission. The REF

Steering Group is responsible for determining the most appropriate UoAs for the University's submission and will recommend these for approval by the RKEC. The Vice Principal & Deputy Vice Chancellor under delegated authority from the Principal and Vice-Chancellor, is ultimately responsible for the REF submission and, in the unlikely event that consensus cannot be reached, will have the final say on which UoAs are chosen.

#### *4.7 On what basis will the decisions on inclusion be made?*

Decisions on which staff to select for submission to the REF are based on the key principle of the quality of the research, taking into due consideration the specific guidance supplied by the REF [Assessment Framework and Guidance on Submissions](#) and [Panel Criteria and Working Methods](#) documents. These documents set out how the REF panels will consider individual circumstances. Each UoA steering group will be required to produce a statement of intent giving information on how the UoA will carry out its selection process; members of staff will be consulted on these statements before they are submitted to the REF Steering Group for approval. The UoA Steering Groups will prepare draft submissions for their UoAs, including the details of eligible staff recommended for inclusion, provisionally included, and not selected for inclusion: for each member of staff the reasons for the recommendation must be recorded including the conditions that provisionally included staff must meet before the census date for confirmation of their inclusion. In considering staff for selection UoA Steering Groups must take account of individual staff circumstances which may have had a material impact on the individual's ability to produce the expected volume of research outputs in the assessment period (see section 5). The REF Steering Group will review and provide feedback to the UoA Steering Groups on draft submissions and will be responsible for approving final versions; in doing so it will consider the overall shape and content of the submissions, including, for example, the mix of staff (in terms of career stage), research outputs, the research environment and forward strategy, as well as other factors, and may also seek external advice, to ensure that the University optimises the presentation of its research. Where a UoA champion is (on the basis of their knowledge and experience) also a member of the REF Steering Group, the champion will not participate in the review of their own UoA by the REF Steering Group. One of the aspects of the University's research of most interest to the REF panels, the Funding Councils and ourselves is sustainability and this will be carefully considered and reviewed in the submissions to the UoAs with which we engage. The REF Steering Group may seek external advice to complement its internal reviews of submissions.

#### *4.8 How many outputs are required and at what level?*

It is expected that all staff who wish to be considered for inclusion in a UoA will have 4 outputs all of which will be of a standard not less than 2/3 star (for exact standard refer to relevant UoA statement). Staff can be considered for less than 4 outputs if they have particular individual circumstances. These include being defined as an early career researcher or having maternity leave to having a disability or having caring responsibilities for an elderly relative. Further details are outlined in appendix 3.

#### *4.9 What training on equal opportunities will be provided for those involved in the REF selection process?*

A training workshop is being developed on equality and diversity and the REF by Human Resources (HR). Key individuals involved in the planning and management of REF activities must attend the workshop. The workshop will provide information about matters covered by legislation and will also consider a series of case studies to see how the Code of Practice would be utilised under different sets of circumstances.

#### *4.9 When will the final decisions be made on who will be included in our submissions to the REF?*

On the basis of recommendations from UoA Steering Groups, the REF Steering Group aims to be in a position to make near final decisions on who will be submitted, and the choice of

research outputs to be included, by end April 2013. New starts in 2013 will be included on an ongoing basis. When the REF Steering Group is reviewing the list of staff recommended for submission to each UoA, it will take account of any individual staff circumstances brought to its attention by the UoA Steering Group which may have had a material impact on the individual's ability to produce the expected volume of research outputs in the assessment period (see section 5).

#### *4.10 What is the process for consideration of individual staff circumstances?*

If you have individual circumstances to be taken into consideration, the University has an Equality and Diversity Assessment Panel (EDAP) with responsibility to assess if those circumstances warrant a reduction in research outputs. You will need to fill in the Individual Staff Disclosure Form (see appendix 4) and provide sufficient information about how the circumstances have adversely affected your contribution. The EDAP may require evidence or permission to access information held by the University to confirm your circumstances. We will seek your consent if this is required. The EDAP will not initially look at any documentation beyond the Disclosure Form but will ask for confirmation and/or clarification. All REF EDAP members are bound by confidentiality requirements (see appendix 5) as a condition of their appointment to the role. No information relating to individual circumstances will be published by the REF team and all information will be handled in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

#### *4.11 Why does the selection have to be made so early when the submission date isn't until November 2013?*

The process of preparing all the material for a submission to a UoA takes time. As well as the numerical information, a narrative section is prepared that describes, for example, the research environment, arrangements for promoting and developing research staff and the research strategy. This text has to support the research outputs submitted and must correspond with the numerical information provided. Making near final decisions early in 2013 also allows full consideration to be made of any particular individual circumstances and will allow sufficient time to provide feedback to staff prior to the submission date. Also, the University has to provide the REF team with an indication of its submission intentions by December 2012 so we will need to have made most of our decisions by then.

#### *4.12 How will I receive feedback on whether I am being included in the University's REF submissions?*

In the period prior to the final decisions on inclusion in the University's REF submission, your research, and consideration of the quality of your research output, will have been handled through confidential communications with your Head of School and/or the relevant UoA champion and may also have involved discussion during normal appraisal, probation, or promotion procedures. During this period you will be invited to bring forward any individual circumstances, if you have not already indicated these, which may have had a material impact on your ability to produce the expected volume of research outputs in the assessment period (see section 5). Final decisions will be communicated to individual staff by their Head of School and/or UoA champion, who will also provide confidential feedback on each decision and discuss any issues arising.

#### *4.13 What can I do if am dissatisfied with the decision or want to make a complaint?*

Please refer to Section 9 of this Code which explains the procedure to be followed. All disagreements should normally be lodged in writing by 24th May 2013 or within three weeks of the decision being conveyed, if this is later than 3rd May 2013.

#### *4.12 What is the process for the Code of Practice been disseminated across the University?*

The Code of Practice is to be published in July 2012 after a process of consultation which included consideration by HR, the Equal and Diversity Committee and task groups that cover

the protected characteristics, the REF Steering Group and RKEC. The Codes of Practice are also required to be submitted and approved by the REF EDAP to ensure the University adheres to the REF Assessment framework and guidance on submissions. An e-mail, including staff who are absent from the university (a letter will be sent to those staff who are absent and cannot be contacted by email) advising them of its existence will be issued and the full document will be available from the University's portal. New staff will be provided with information about the Code through the normal staff induction processes. The Codes of practice will also be available in a variety of formats to ensure accessibility for the whole University community.

*4.13 What about work undertaken by external and internal reviewers and advisors as part of the advance planning towards REF2014?*

Individuals acting as external advisors or reviewers as part of our REF preparations will be made aware of the Code, will be expected to have participated in Equality and Diversity training related to REF and be encouraged to apply its principles in their work, particularly where this involves an advisory role beyond an assessment of the quality of research outputs alone. All University staff asked to undertake a role in the assessment of material in connection with the REF are required to apply the Code of Practice in their work.

*4.14 How will the University assess whether the principles of transparency, consistency, accountability and inclusivity have been applied when selecting staff for inclusion?*

The University has conducted an equality impact assessment on their policies and processes for selecting staff for inclusion. This will be kept under review as the submissions are prepared and will be published on the University website once the submission has been made. People who represent those with protected characteristics have and will form part of the process of review.

## **5. INDIVIDUAL STAFF CIRCUMSTANCES**

As detailed in section 2, the normal expectation is that four items of excellent and relevant research output will be provided by those selected for inclusion in the UoAs submitted. However, staff with a lower number of outputs will be considered for inclusion where it can be demonstrated that their volume of outputs has been significantly adversely affected by one or more of a range of individual circumstances detailed in appendix 3.

Academic and academic-related duties that might be expected for any staff member working in a UK HEI, including teaching and administration, are not regarded as an explanation in themselves for listing fewer than four items of research output against an individual.

The Abertay EDAP will review the information provided regarding individual circumstances and determine whether those circumstances can reasonably be considered to have affected the individual's ability to produce the expected volume of research outputs and, if so, whether and to what extent they will reduce the volume requirement in respect of that individual. The EDAP cannot comment on the quality of research outputs. The remit, membership and process of the EDAP can be found in appendix 6.

The University will not initially be required to provide the REF EDAP with information about any individual staff circumstances that have significantly adversely affected their contribution to the submission. However, the REF EDAP may request access to individual information as part of an audit to assess the efficacy of the Abertay EDAP in discharging its responsibilities. The Abertay EDAP will need to record and hold sufficient, explicit information about how the circumstances have adversely affected an individual's contribution. The University will not be asked to describe circumstances (for example, a disability) that have had no adverse effect on an individual's capacity to undertake the

required output of quality research. All REF EDAP members and secretaries are bound by confidentiality requirements, and acceptance of the confidentiality requirements is a condition of their appointment to the role. No information relating to individual circumstances will be published by the REF EDAP or the Abertay EDAP. All data collected, stored and processed by will be handled in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

## **6. FIXED-TERM, PART-TIME STAFF, DISABLED STAFF AND STAFF WITH CHILD CARE COMMITMENTS**

Staff on fixed-term, part-time contracts (including contract researchers), disabled staff and staff with child care commitments who are eligible for inclusion in the University's REF submission as defined in paragraphs 77 to 83 of Assessment [Framework](#) and guidance on submissions will not be treated any less favourably than comparable permanent employees. Selection processes will take account of individual circumstances (section 5) which can be demonstrated to have had a material impact on the individual's ability to produce the expected volume of research outputs, including consideration of the proportion of time (FTE) in post during the assessment period. The University takes full account of the needs of part-time staff, disabled staff and staff with child care commitments as part of its equality procedures, for example in deciding when to hold meetings and providing material in alternative formats, and will apply these policies consistently in the REF process for selecting staff for inclusion.

## **7. HOW THE CODE IS APPLIED – CASE STUDIES**

To help with the application of this Code, a series of case studies has been prepared by the Equality Challenge Unit (ECU). Further guidance on particular circumstances may also be obtained from Human Resources. A number of case studies can be found in Appendix 7 to assist staff with identifying how particular circumstances may be viewed. It should be noted that the case studies are illustrative.

## **8. MONITORING**

To monitor the impact of the REF and in addition to the Equality Impact Assessment described in 4.1, the University will prepare an equality profile in terms of age, disability, gender and ethnicity of staff eligible for submission, covering those who are selected and those who are not. This will be conducted at University level, although we may also undertake this at School and/or UoA level if there appear to be imbalances. We shall prepare this profile around the time we make our submission in November 2013 so that it is available, if requested, by the REF team for verification or audit purposes. The profile will be prepared by HR and considered by the University's Equality and Diversity Committee and will also be made available to staff for information.

## **9. DISAGREEMENTS WITH DECISIONS**

In the period prior to the final decisions on inclusion in the REF submission a member of staff's research performance and consideration of the quality of their research output will have been handled through confidential communications with their Head of School and/or the appropriate UoA Champion and may also have involved normal discussions during appraisal, probation, or promotion procedures. During this period staff will be invited to bring forward any individual circumstances, if not already divulged, that they wish to be taken into consideration which they feel may have had a material impact on their ability to produce the

expected volume of research outputs in the assessment period (see section 5). Near final decisions on the inclusion of staff will be made by the University REF Steering Group by the end of April 2013 and will be conveyed to staff through confidential communications with their Head of School and/or UoA Champion as soon as practicable thereafter.

Anyone who is dissatisfied with the decision should lodge an appeal in writing to the Deputy Vice Chancellor & Vice Principal, in his capacity as, Chair of the Appeals Panel, outlining the reason for the appeal. Appeals will only be considered in cases of potential discrimination on the basis of an individual's personal characteristics (e.g. race, gender, disability) or where an individual believes that any of the individual circumstances which apply to them (see section 5) have not been fully taken into account. All such appeals must be lodged by 24th May 2013 or within three weeks of the decision being conveyed, if this is later than 3rd May 2013. Appeals on the grounds of the assessment made of the quality or excellence of the research outputs will not be considered.

An Appeals Panel will be constituted to include the Deputy Vice Chancellor & Vice Principal as Chair, one Court member and one representative of Senate (none of whom shall have had involvement in the decision making process for the relevant UoA up to that point). The Administrative Officer/REIS will act as Secretary to the Panel. Should the member of staff making the appeal wish to present their case in person, they may be accompanied by a staff representative or colleague. The Appeals Panel will limit its consideration to the procedures used in reaching the decision. However, it may be important to highlight a personal characteristic (such as gender or disability) or circumstance or a work pattern/absence that is believed not to have been fully taken into account. The decision of the Appeals Panel is final and not subject to further appeal. All appeals will be heard by 7th June 2013 (or as soon as possible thereafter for appeals by new staff taking up employment by the census date of 31st October 2013). Note that any disagreement or complaint that involves wider issues than equal opportunities in the REF selection process should be addressed using the University's existing HR procedures.

## 10. KEY DATES FOR REF2014

1 January 2008 to 31 December 2013	Publication period for research outputs and outputs underpinning case studies
1 January 2008 to 31 July 2013	Assessment period for research impacts, the research environment and research doctoral degrees awarded.
31 July 2012	Deadline for submission of Codes of Practice on selection of staff
October 2012 to December 2012	Survey of HEIs' submission intentions
31 October 2013	Census date for staff eligible for selection
29 November 2013	Submission deadline
December 2013 to December 2013	Assessment by Panels
December 2014	Results published
Academic Year 2015-16	Start of funding from Funding Council

## 11. USEFUL LINKS

### Internal

[Human Resources: Equality and Diversity](#)

[Human Resources: Policies and Procedures](#)



**External**

[REF2014: Home Page](#)

[REF2014: Equality & Diversity](#)

[REF2014: Guidance on Submissions](#)

[REF2014: Expert Panels](#)

[Equality Challenge Unit: Home Page](#)

[ECU: REF Materials](#)

**11. FURTHER INFORMATION**

For further information about equality & diversity issues please contact [James Nicholson](#), Chair of the University's Equality and Diversity Committee. For information about REF2014, please contact [Mr Simon Bright](#).

## REF Code of Practice: Appendix 1

### Summary of Current Equality Legislation

#### Equality Act 2010

The Act consolidates and streamlines previous anti-discrimination legislation on Race, Disability, Gender, Sex, Sexual Orientation, Religion or Belief (or lack of one), Gender Reassignment, Maternity and Paternity, and Marriage & Civil Partnership.

The Act requires to have **due regard** to the need to:

- **Eliminate** discrimination, harassment, victimisation or any other prohibited conduct
- **Advance** equality of opportunity by
  - removing or minimising disadvantage
  - meeting the needs of particular groups that are different from the needs of others
  - encouraging participation in public life
- **Foster** good relations between people within and between those with protected characteristics

Further information can be found on the [Equality Challenge Unit](#) website

#### Part-Time Workers (prevention of less favourable treatment) Regulations 2000 (amended 2002)

These regulations make it unlawful to treat a part-time employee less favourably than a full-time employee on the grounds that they are a part-time employee unless it can be objectively justified. The regulations state that part-time employees must receive (pro-rata where appropriate) the same treatment as comparable to a full-time employee regarding; rates of pay, access to pension schemes and pension scheme benefits, access to training and development, holiday pay, entitlement to career break schemes, contractual sick pay, contractual maternity and paternity pay and treatment in the selection criteria for promotion and transfer and for redundancy.

#### Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006

These regulations make it unlawful to treat people less favourably on the grounds of their age, for example, by not offering a job to someone because of their age or by putting one age group at a disadvantage due to the selection criteria, policies or any practices/processes that an organisation may use.

## REF Code of Practice: Appendix 2

### Summary of Roles and Responsibilities of Committees and Staff Involved in the Preparation and Approval of Submissions for the REF

(This table will be updated periodically during the REF process)

Committee/Team	Terms of Reference	How committee formed	Role in REF2014 advisory and decision making process; criteria used in decision making and how these criteria are communicated to staff	Membership	Role of each member in relation to REF and the relationship between their REF role and their responsibilities within the management structure of the University	The steps taken to ensure that members are well informed about their own and the institution's legal obligations	Key dates for the committee's contributions to REF
<p>Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee (RKEC)</p> <p>- existing committee</p>	<p>To lead the development of the research culture within the University, promoting its centrality and relevance to operational activity and strategic aims</p> <p>To advise Senate on matters of research strategy, policy and planning in the context of</p>	<p>Established by Senate</p>	<p>Oversight of REF preparations as part of its wider responsibilities for the planning and management of the University's research and KE activities. RKEC will be required to ratify decisions/approve recommendations made by the REF Steering Group. The Principal is ultimately responsible for the REF submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vice-Principal &amp; Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Chair)</li> <li>• Heads of Schools</li> <li>• Academic Director of IAMCG</li> <li>• Commercialisation and IP Manager</li> <li>• Cost &amp; Management Accountant</li> <li>• Directors of Research</li> <li>• Research</li> </ul>	<p>Vice Principal and DVC will Chair of the REF appeals panel. Line management responsibility for PVC Academic Development and Heads of School &amp; Academic Director of IAMCG.</p> <p>Heads of School &amp; Academic Director of IAMCG are members of the REF Steering Group. Heads provide academic</p>	<p>All staff have undertaken University Equality and Diversity training. Where appropriate staff have also undertaken REF specific Equality and Diversity training.</p>	<p>November 2013 – final decision on staff and UoA to be submitted.</p>

	<p>the external environment, including external research assessment.</p> <p>To promote and monitor applications for research funding and to identify trends in applications and success rates</p> <p>To monitor research outputs (including those deposited in the research repository) and research impact – for example, on industry, policy or teaching - and identify trends</p> <p>To facilitate the collection and dissemination of information about research within the University</p> <p>To consider strategic -</p>			<p>Development Manager Sub-Committee Chairs (Abertay Press Sub-Committee; Cultural Development Sub-Committee; Research Degrees Sub-Committee; Research Ethics Sub-Committee)</p>	<p>and staff leadership for their School.</p> <p>Research Development Manager provides advice and guidance to the REF steering Group. The role also provides advice and guidance to the Head of REIS for research grant submissions</p> <p>Other staff do not have a role on the REF steering group or similar.</p>		
--	---	--	--	--	---	--	--

	<p>research and knowledge exchange related -reports and submissions to external bodies.</p> <p>To develop and keep under review the University's Code of Practice for Research</p> <p>To receive relevant minutes and reports from the Abertay Press Sub-Committee, the Cultural Development Sub-Committee, the Research Degrees Sub-Committee, Research Ethics Sub-Committee, and other <i>ad hoc</i> working groups established by the Committee from time to time</p> <p>To develop and keep under review the University's</p>						
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Research Ethics policies and procedures						
REF Steering Group  - Sub-Committee of RKEC. Replacement of RAE Steering Group by REF Steering Group confirmed at RKEC meeting in November 2009.	strategic overview of the University's REF submission as a whole.	Established by RKEC	Overall responsibility for managing the development of the University's submission to the REF, including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determining strategy (including UoAs to which submissions will be made)</li> <li>• Reviewing draft UoA submissions/providing feedback to UoA Steering Groups</li> <li>• Commissioning external reviews of draft submissions, where appropriate</li> <li>• Ensuring transparency and consistency in approach across the University in accordance with the Code of Practice</li> <li>• Ensuring staff</li> </ul>	Permanent members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PVC Academic Development</li> <li>• Head of School (DBS)</li> <li>• Head of School (CES)</li> <li>• Head of School (SCS)</li> <li>• Head of School (SHS)</li> <li>• Academic Director (IAMCG)</li> <li>• Research Development Manager</li> <li>• Secretary (Administrative Officer, REIS)</li> </ul> In attendance (all meetings): Chair of Equality and Diversity Committee  In attendance (by request): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directors of Research</li> </ul>	PVC (AD) – Chair of REF steering group. Responsible for academic development strategy, QA and QE.  Heads of School & Academic Director of IAMCG are members of the REF Steering Group. Heads provide academic and staff leadership for their School.  Chair of Equality and Diversity Committee will also Chair the Abertay EDAP. Provide advice and guidance to REF steering Group on E & D matters.	All staff have undertaken University Equality and Diversity training. Where appropriate staff have also undertaken REF specific Equality and Diversity training.	April 2013 – near final decision on staff and UoAs to be submitted

			<p>eligible for more than one UoA are included in the most appropriate UoA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reporting on progress to RKEC, SMG and the Principal</li> <li>• Making final recommendations on submissions to RKEC/ Principal</li> </ul> <p>Heads of School will liaise with UoA champions in their School on the preparation of submissions.</p>				
<p>UoA Steering Groups</p> <p>- UoA Champions nominated by REF Steering Group. UoA Steering Group members selected by UoA Champions.</p>	<p><b>Develop an overview of the status of the University's prospective submission to the REF in their UoA with respect to the research outputs, impact and environment elements of the submission</b></p> <p><b>Encourage</b></p>	<p>Established by REF Steering Group</p>	<p>Preparation of draft submission for their UoA, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Production of a statement of intent/REF Selection Criteria (on which staff are consulted) giving information on how the selection process will be carried out</li> <li>• Selection of staff and outputs for inclusion (in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UoA Champion</li> <li>• Other members appropriate to the UoA</li> <li>• Nominated/selected on the basis of their relevant expertise and experience, for example, through their role as Director of Research or equivalent</li> </ul>	<p>UoA Champion Chairs the UoA steering group. senior researcher based within the subject discipline of the UoA.</p>	<p>All staff have undertaken University Equality and Diversity training. Where appropriate staff have also undertaken REF specific Equality and Diversity training.</p>	<p>July 2012 – completion of Statements of Intent September 2012 – call for inclusion in UoA December 2012 – initial assessment of staff to be included</p>

	<p><b>staff with potential for inclusion in a submission from their UoA to focus on achieving the expected number* of high quality outputs within the publication period, along with demonstrating research impacts, securing research income and ensuring their research students meet deadlines for submission of theses during the assessment period</b></p> <p><b>Encourage staff to deposit their outputs in the University's repository, Abertay Research Collections</b></p>		<p>accordance with this code of practice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informing staff not selected of the reasons behind the decision, and the appeals process.</li> <li>• Drafting of the textual components of the submission (REF 3a,3b; REF5; additional information on outputs)</li> <li>• Liaison with REF administration team for collation and checking of data required for the submission</li> <li>• Liaison with the Abertay EDAP Liaison with the relevant Heads of School on the REF Steering Group</li> </ul>	<p>within their School/Division , their research expertise in the disciplines covered by the UoA and/or previous involvement in developing submissions for the RAE.</p>			
--	---	--	--	---	--	--	--



	<p><b>Develop a detailed understanding of the REF guidance on submissions, and the main panel criteria and working methods relevant to the Unit of Assessment (referring to the University's REF Manager where clarification is required)</b></p> <p><b>Form a UoA Steering Group (chaired by the UoA Champion) by selecting other members of staff appropriate for the UoA (on the basis of their knowledge and experience)</b></p> <p><b>Report the rationale for selection of each member of the UoA</b></p>						
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p><b>Steering Group to the REF Steering Group (responsible for approval of the membership of UoA Steering Groups)</b></p> <p><b>Attend REF-specific equality and diversity training organised by the University</b></p> <p><b>Ensure members of their UoA Steering Group attend REF-specific equality and diversity training organised by the University and are well-informed about the legal obligations with respect to equality</b></p>						
REF Administration Team	Not applicable	Not applicable	Coordination of the administrative and data collection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research Development Manager</li> </ul>	Not applicable	All staff have undertaken University	Not applicable – on going

<p>- covers the main administrative areas associated with the RAE submission.</p>			<p>procedures associated with the University's submission.</p>	<p>(REIS) – REF Manager</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Senior HR Officer</li> <li>• Deputy Head of Finance</li> <li>• Deputy/Senior Assistant Registrar (Registry)</li> </ul> <p>Academic Librarian (IS)</p>		<p>Equality and Diversity training. Where appropriate staff have also undertaken REF specific Equality and Diversity training.</p>	<p>support role.</p>
<p>HR, in liaison with Equal and Diversity Committee Sub-Committee (of the University Court Finance, People &amp; General Purposes Committee) and Abertay Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel</p> <p>- responsible for ensuring compliance with equality and diversity legislation.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of Code of Practice for Selection of Staff</li> <li>• Provision of REF-oriented training on equality and diversity for all staff involved in the REF selection process</li> <li>• Equality Impact Assessments</li> <li>• Provide information to support UOA Champions in completing the Environment template (REF5), e.g. in relation to the Concordat to Support the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Senior HR Officer</li> <li>• Other HR staff, as appropriate</li> <li>• Chair, University Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee (EDSC)</li> <li>• EDSC Task Groups on Race and Religion; Gender and Sexual Orientation; and Disability and Age</li> </ul>	<p>Staff identified to support development of E&amp;D, Impact assessments, etc by role within the University</p>	<p>All staff have undertaken University Equality and Diversity training. Where appropriate staff have also undertaken REF specific Equality and Diversity training.</p>	<p>Not applicable – on going support role.</p>

			<p>Career Development of Researchers</p>				
<p>Abertay Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (Abertay-EDAP)</p> <p>- operates independently of the REF Steering Group and UOA Steering Groups</p>	<p>Encourage staff to disclose any individual circumstances which have had an impact on their ability to produce four outputs or work productively between 1 January 2008 and 31 October 2013</p> <p>In liaison with HR organise REF-oriented equality and diversity training for all staff involved in the selection of staff for the REF</p> <p>In liaison with the REF Manager communicate the arrangements for promoting equality and diversity in preparation of the REF</p>	<p>Abertay EDAP - Established by REF Steering group and CoP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development and implementation of robust procedures for staff to disclose individual circumstances in confidence</li> <li>• Communication of the arrangements for promoting equality and diversity (including communication to staff who are away from the University)</li> <li>• Determining which staff can be submitted with fewer than four research outputs and informing UOA Champions</li> <li>• In liaison with HR, provision of REF-oriented training on equality and diversity for all staff involved in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Senior Academic (not on the REF Steering Group or UOA Steering Groups) - Chair</li> <li>• Chair of the University's Equality and Diversity Committee</li> <li>• HR Representative on the EDSC</li> <li>• Occupational Health Advisor</li> <li>• At least one member of a protected group</li> <li>• Secretary</li> </ul>	<p>Chair of EDAP – senior member of academic staff not involved in REF</p> <p>Other staff identified by role within the University.</p>	<p>All staff have undertaken University Equality and Diversity training. Where appropriate staff have also undertaken REF specific Equality and Diversity training.</p>	<p>On going role in assessing personal circumstances until May 2013</p>

	<p>submission, in particular in relation to the disclosure of individual circumstances of staff whose ability to produce four outputs or work productively throughout the assessment period has been constrained for reasons covered by equality legislation</p> <p>Ensure that staff who are away from the University (e.g. on maternity leave, sick leave, secondment) receive communications requesting disclosure of individual circumstances</p> <p>Ensure that staff whose circumstances change following the initial</p>		<p>the REF selection process</p>				
--	---	--	----------------------------------	--	--	--	--

	<p>request for disclosure of individual circumstances are given an opportunity to disclose their new circumstances</p> <p>Ensure that newly appointed staff are given an opportunity to disclose their circumstances</p> <p>Determine which staff can be submitted to the REF with fewer than four research outputs and inform UOA Champions (based on the definitions of individual staff circumstances published in the REF <a href="#">Panel criteria and working methods</a> (January 2012).</p> <p>Implement robust procedures to</p>						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	enable staff to disclose their individual circumstances in confidence, liaising with HR and IS to ensure that the requirements for the secure storage and handling of sensitive personal data are met.						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>Appeals Panel</p> <p>- comprising members who have had no previous involvement in the decision-making process for the relevant UoA.</p>	<p>Defined in Section 9 of the CoP</p>	<p>Established by RKEC</p>	<p>Consideration of appeals against exclusion from the REF submission on the grounds of potential discrimination, e.g. where a protected characteristic, (such as gender or disability), or a work pattern/absence, has not been fully taken into account.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deputy Vice Chancellor &amp; Vice Principal (Chair)</li> <li>• One member of Court</li> <li>• One member of Senate</li> </ul>	<p>Court and Senate members selected by the Chair on the basis of their relevant knowledge and experience.</p>	<p>All staff have undertaken University Equality and Diversity training. Where appropriate staff have also undertaken REF specific Equality and Diversity training.</p>	<p>May 2012 – decisions on appeals against non-selection.</p>
--	--	----------------------------	--	--	--	---	---



## Appendix 3

The University of Abertay Dundee is committed to ensuring that decisions about selecting staff for the Research Excellence Framework (REF) are made in a fair, transparent and consistent manner. Information on how eligible staff will be selected for submission to the REF can be found in Abertay's Code of Practice which can be found on the University's [REF2014](#) website.

To ensure that REF processes are fair, the University is collecting data on individual circumstances from all staff eligible for submission. The data will be used to identify which staff are eligible for submission with fewer than four outputs. Summary level data collected may also inform the University's monitoring of staff selection procedures at the institutional level.

The University has created an Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (EDAP) to consider individual staff circumstances. In determining whether eligible staff may be submitted to the REF with fewer than four research outputs, the Abertay EDAP will take the following circumstances into consideration:

- Early career researcher (started career as an independent researcher on or after 1 August 2009)
- Part time employment
- Career break or secondment outside of the higher education sector in which the individual did not undertake academic research
- Maternity leave, statutory adoption leave, and additional paternity leave (taken by partners of new mothers or co-adopters)
- Disability (including conditions such as cancer and chronic fatigue)
- Ill health or injury
- Mental health conditions
- Constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, breastfeeding, adoption, paternity or childcare **in addition to** periods of maternity, statutory adoption or additional paternity leave taken. This could include for example, pregnancy related illness and health and safety restrictions in laboratory and field work.
- Other caring responsibilities (including caring for an elderly or disabled relative)
- Gender reassignment
- For UoA 1-6 only, junior clinical academics and staff who are employed primarily as clinical, health or veterinary professionals.

If your research output has been affected by other circumstances, not including teaching and administration, that are not listed above, please detail them on the form on Appendix 4 as they may be considered.

**In determining the number of outputs staff are required to submit, the institution will observe the definitions of individual staff circumstances provided in the published REF 'Panel criteria and working methods' (January 2012) available at [www.ref.ac.uk](http://www.ref.ac.uk) under 'Publications'.**

### **What action do I need to take?**

If you are eligible for REF submission you are encouraged to complete the form on Appendix 4. If further information is required about any circumstances disclosed, you will be contacted by Human Resources

### **Who will see the information that I provide?**

Within the institutions, the information that you provide will be seen by the Abertay Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel.

Members of the Abertay Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel or individuals handling individual staff circumstances will observe confidentiality and information will be stored securely.

Information provided on the form may be shared externally for the purposes of evidencing any reduction in the number of research outputs:

- = For **circumstances with a clearly defined reduction in outputs**, information will be seen by the relevant REF sub-panel, the REF panel secretariat and the UK funding bodies' REF team. This will be information about early career researcher status, part-time working, career breaks or secondments, and periods of maternity, additional paternity or adoption leave taken.
- = For **more complex circumstances**, information will be seen only by the REF Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel, the REF Main Panel Chairs and the UK funding bodies' REF team. This will be information to explain the impact on your research of circumstances such as disability, ill health, injury, mental health conditions, gender reassignment, caring responsibilities or constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, breastfeeding, adoption and paternity (in addition to the period of leave taken). This information will **not** be seen by the REF sub-panel.

All REF panel members, chairs and secretaries are bound by confidentiality requirements, and acceptance of the confidentiality requirements is a condition of their appointment to the role. No information relating to identifiable individuals' circumstances will be published by the funding bodies' REF Team. All data collected, stored and processed by the UK funding bodies REF Team will be handled in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

The REF Assessment Framework and Guidance on Submissions ([www.hefce.ac.uk/research/ref/pubs/2011/02\\_11/](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/research/ref/pubs/2011/02_11/)) requires all higher education institutions participating in the REF to ensure appropriate confidentiality in handling individual staff circumstances.

#### **What if my circumstances change?**

The University of Abertay Dundee recognises that staff circumstances may change between 1 January 2008 and 31 October 2013. If your circumstances change you can download a copy of the attached form from the University's [REF2014](#) website

## Appendix 4

### Individual staff circumstances disclosure form

<b>Name</b>	
<b>Division</b>	
<b>Unit of Assessment</b>	

#### Section One:

**Please select one of the following:**

- I have no individual circumstances that I wish to be taken into consideration for the purposes of the Research Excellence Framework (REF).
- I have individual circumstances that I wish to make known but I am not seeking a reduction in outputs. (Please complete sections two and three)
- In completing this form I am seeking a reduction in research outputs. (Please complete sections two and three)

#### Section Two:

**Please select as appropriate:**

- I would like to be contacted by a member of human resources/occupational health staff to discuss my circumstances and requirements and/or the support provided by the University of Abertay Dundee. My contact details for this purpose are:

<b>Email</b>	
<b>Telephone</b>	
<b>Preferred method of communication</b>	

- I do **not** wish to be contacted by a member of human resources/occupational health staff

**Section Three:**

I wish to make the University aware of the following circumstances which have had an impact on my ability to produce four outputs or work productively between 1 January 2008 and 31 October 2013. **Please provide information required on relevant circumstance/s and continue onto a separate sheet of paper if necessary:**

<b>Circumstance</b>	<b>Information required</b>
<b>Early career researcher (started career as an independent researcher on or after 1 August 2009)</b>	Date on which you became an early career research
Information	
<b>Career break or secondment outside of the higher education sector</b>	Dates and duration in months
Information	
<b>Maternity leave, statutory adoption leave, or additional paternity leave (taken by partners of new mothers or co-adopters)</b>	For each period of leave state which type of leave was taken and the dates and duration in months
Information	
<b>Disability (including conditions such as cancer and chronic fatigue)</b>	Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months
Information	

<b>Mental health condition</b>	Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months
Information	
<b>Ill health or injury</b>	Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months
Information	
<b>Constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, breastfeeding, paternity, adoption or childcare in addition to the period of maternity, adoption or additional paternity leave taken.</b>	Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months
Information	
<b>Other caring responsibilities (including caring for an elderly or disabled relative)</b>	Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months
Information	

<b>Gender reassignment</b>	Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months
Information	
<b>Other exceptional and relevant reasons, not including teaching or administrative work</b>	Impact on ability to fulfil contractual hours and other impacts on ability to undertake research. Duration in months
Information	

### Declaration

Please select as appropriate:

- I confirm that the information provided is a true and accurate description of my circumstances.
- I recognise that the information provided will be used for REF purposes and will be seen by the appropriate UoA Champion and Abertay EDAP membership.
- I realise that it may be necessary to share information with the UK funding bodies' REF team, who may make the information available to REF panel chairs, members and secretaries and/or the Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel. Where permission is not provided the University of Abertay Dundee will be limited in the action it can take.

Signature: ..... Date: .....  
 (Staff member)

**For official use only**

Following consideration of the personal circumstances described above, the Abertay Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel:

- Will progress the staff member's inclusion in the REF submission with [insert number] of research outputs.. Rationale for the proposed number of outputs:  
*e.g. this decision is based on the tariffs outlined in the panel criteria.*
  
- Requires further information of the circumstances described as follows:  
*e.g. please provide information from your occupational health assessment on the effectiveness of reasonable adjustments provided.*
  
- Does not feel that the staff member meets the criteria outlined within the REF 'Panel criteria and working methods' for submitting fewer than four research outputs. The reason(s) for this decision are:  
*e.g. circumstances detailed are not recognised within the assessment framework and guidance on submissions.*

If [insert name of staff member] wishes to appeal against the decision of the Abertay Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel they will need to do so by [insert date] and details of the appeals process can be found at [insert web address].

Signature: ..... Date: .....  
**([insert name of person/chair of committee responsible for decision])**

Signature: ..... Date: .....  
*(REF Manager)*

## Appendix 5: EDAP - CODE OF CONFIDENTIALITY

1. The University's responsibilities under the Data Protection legislation are set out in the University's Data Protection Policy. An employee's (also known as a data subject) personal data includes practically any information about, or correspondence relating to them. Anyone working for the University whose duties include the handling of personal data are required to observe this policy. The policy applies to all media in which information is kept, on paper, computer, microfilm or in any other way. Whilst the policy does not directly address the status of *oral* information, the general provisions of the Act would still apply and certainly any written notes arising from discussion are subject to the provisions of the Data Protection Act.

2. In general, all personal information/data of a sensitive nature to the EDAP will be treated as confidential and should only be disclosed with written consent. Sensitive data for the purposes of this Code is information given in confidence concerning, for example, domestic or economic circumstances, ill-health or disabilities, including mental health difficulties. It does not include personal data which fellow University employees would require in order to carry out their normal duties.

3. In all cases where, if in the EDAP's judgement, it would be in the employee's interests for such sensitive personal information to be disclosed (eg. so that appropriate support may be provided) consent should be obtained. Oral consent will often be adequate, but in certain cases it may be that written consent is obtained.

4. If the employee chooses not to provide their consent this decision will be respected, although the implications in terms of levels of support that can be put in place will be made clear. There are occasional circumstances, however, where the employee consent is withheld – or it is impracticable to try to obtain it – when the commitment to confidentiality may be broken. These are:

- When there is health or safety is at risk
- When the employee is at risk of serious abuse or exploitation
- When the employee is infringing University regulations or disclosure is required by law
- Where there are serious grounds for concern about the mental well-being of an employee

5. The EDAP will only make decisions on the circumstances provided and whether these constitute a reduction in output for the purposes of REF 2014



## Appendix 6: Abertay Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel (Abertay EDAP)

### Introduction

This paper proposes the formation of an Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel at Abertay (Abertay EDAP) to implement robust procedures to enable staff eligible for submission to the REF to disclose their individual circumstances in confidence. The Panel will determine which staff are eligible for submission to the REF with fewer than four outputs. The reduction in the number of outputs allowed will be determined by reference to the definitions of individual staff circumstances provided in the REF [Panel criteria and working methods](#) and the guidance on complex circumstances provided by the Equality Challenge Unit and in Abertay's Code of Practice for the selection of staff (under development).

The Abertay EDAP will operate independently of the University's REF Steering Group and Unit of Assessment Steering Groups. It will inform the Chair(s) of the relevant Unit(s)<sup>1</sup> of Assessment of the number of outputs required for each member of staff for submission to the REF without disclosing details of any individual circumstances. The Panel will not consider the quality of the research outputs or make decisions on the selection of staff for the submission; this will be the responsibility of the Unit of Assessment Steering Groups and the University's REF Steering Group.

### Remit

The Abertay EDAP will:

- Encourage staff to disclose any individual circumstances which have had an impact on their ability to produce four outputs or work productively between 1 January 2008 and 31 October 2013
- In liaison with HR organise REF-oriented equality and diversity training for all staff involved in the selection of staff for the REF
- In liaison with the REF Manager communicate the arrangements for promoting equality and diversity in preparation of the REF submission, in particular in relation to the disclosure of individual circumstances of staff whose ability to produce four outputs or work productively throughout the assessment period has been constrained for reasons covered by equality legislation
- Ensure that staff who are away from the University (e.g. on maternity leave, sick leave, secondment) receive communications requesting disclosure of individual circumstances
- Ensure that staff whose circumstances change following the initial request for disclosure of individual circumstances are given an opportunity to disclose their new circumstances
- Ensure that newly appointed staff are given an opportunity to disclose their circumstances
- Determine which staff can be submitted to the REF with fewer than four research outputs and inform UOA Champions (based on the definitions of individual staff circumstances published in the REF [Panel criteria and working methods](#) (January 2012)).
- Implement robust procedures to enable staff to disclose their individual circumstances in confidence, liaising with HR and IS to ensure that the requirements for the secure storage and handling of sensitive personal data are met.

The decisions it makes will be based solely on the definitions of individual staff circumstances published in the REF [Panel criteria and working methods](#) (January 2012).

The Abertay EDAP will **not**:

- assess the quality of the research outputs of members of staff
- make decisions on selection of staff for the REF

---

<sup>1</sup> where staff are eligible for more than one Unit of Assessment

These will be the responsibility of the Unit of Assessment Steering Groups and the University's REF Steering Group.

## **Membership**

- Chair of the University's Equality and Diversity Committee (Chair of EDAP)
- Senior Academic who is not a member of the REF Steering Group or one of the UOA Steering Groups
- HR representative on the University's Equality and Diversity Committee
- Occupational Health Advisor
- At least one member of a protected group
- Secretary

## **Process (summary)**

- 1) First meeting of Abertay EDAP to be convened at the end of May 2012 (once the ECU guidance on complex circumstances has been issued) to consider, and agree amendments to, the draft remit. This remit to be incorporated in the draft Code of Practice for selection of staff (as an appendix if necessary). Will also consider timetable for inviting staff to disclose their individual circumstances and for informing staff and UoA Champions of the result.
- 2) UOAs include a statement in their 'REF Selection Criteria' that the Abertay EDAP will issue a call or calls to all members of staff eligible for inclusion in the University's REF submission encouraging them to disclose any individual circumstances which have had an impact on their ability to produce four outputs or work productively between 1 January 2008 and 31 October 2013.
- 3) Abertay EDAP issues a first call encouraging staff wishing to be considered for inclusion in the REF return to disclose any individual circumstances which have had an impact on their ability to produce four outputs or work productively between 1 January 2008 and 31 October 2013. Second or third calls will be issued as necessary (e.g. to accommodate new staff or staff whose circumstances change). EDAP takes responsibility (through HR representative) for ensuring that staff who are away from the University (e.g. on maternity leave, sick leave, secondment) receive the call. Disclosure forms are submitted to an EDAP e-mail address accessible only by members of EDAP. Meeting dates for the Abertay EDAP will be published on the REF2014 web pages.
- 4) Abertay EDAP informs each member of staff who has disclosed individual circumstances in response to a call from EDAP whether or not they qualify for a reduction in the number of outputs required for REF submission. Those who qualify for a reduction will be informed of the number of outputs required. Where the Panel requires more details of the circumstances described in order to determine whether a reduction in outputs is warranted, the member of staff will be asked to provide further information before any decision is made. Information on how to appeal against the decision will be provided including the deadline for appeals.
- 5) Staff who wish to appeal against the decision of the Abertay EDAP (either because they have received no reduction in outputs or because the reduction has been less than they expected) do so by the deadline provided. Appeals will be considered on the basis of new information which was not provided in the original disclosure.
- 6) EDAP considers appeals on the basis of the new information provided and informs each member of staff of their decision. No further appeals to EDAP will be allowed in respect of the particular circumstances considered, but should the individual circumstances of staff change subsequent to the appeal they will be encouraged to disclose the new circumstances by downloading the disclosure form from the REF2014 web page or responding to a subsequent call. Should a member of staff feel they have been treated unfairly by EDAP they may lodge an appeal

with the University Secretary, as detailed in the University's Code of Practice for the selection of staff.

7) Staff who did not disclose any individual circumstances in response to a call, but whose circumstances then change, will still be able to request that their individual circumstances are considered by the Abertay EDAP by downloading the disclosure form from the REF2014 web pages. EDAP meeting dates will be published on the REF2014 website.

8) EDAP provides each UOA Champion with a list of staff who are eligible for submission to the REF with fewer than four outputs, detailing the number of outputs required for each individual. Should the UOA Steering Group disagree with the Abertay EDAP's decision for a particular individual (e.g. where they believe an individual should be designated an early career researcher, but EDAP has indicated that the individual requires four outputs) they may refer the decision back to EDAP for reconsideration along with the appropriate evidence.

9) EDAP issues subsequent calls to restart the cycle.

Notes:

Need to create a mailbox for individual circumstances to be sent to (e.g. [EDAP@Abertay.ac.uk](mailto:EDAP@Abertay.ac.uk))

EDAP should have a shared drive (or a folder within the REF2014 shared drive) in which confidential data (i.e. information contained in disclosure forms) is stored and permission to access the drive or folder is restricted to named individuals (members of EDAP).

## Appendix 7: Complex Circumstances Case Studies

### REF2014 Panel criteria: Examples of complex circumstances

Example 1

**Staff details:** Dr Andrea Monroe  
UOA 24: Anthropology and Development Studies  
2 outputs listed

#### Description of circumstances:

##### Nature and timing of circumstances

- Dr Monroe took a period of eight months maternity leave from March 2010 to November 2010.
- In November 2010 Dr Monroe returned to work on a 0.5 FTE basis until May 2012.
- Dr Monroe continued to breastfeed her baby between November 2010 and May 2011, which was incompatible with undertaking her research.
- Dr Monroe returned to fulltime work and her research in May 2012.

##### Effect on research

In addition to the period of maternity and part-time working, during the first 6 months that Dr Monroe returned to work on a 0.5 FTE basis, she focused on her teaching commitments as breastfeeding was incompatible with her research project that requires frequent travel to South Sudan. She therefore postponed her research until May 2011 when she stopped breastfeeding her child.

##### Calculation of reduction of outputs:

- Reduction of 1 output for 1 period of maternity leave
- Reduction of 1 output for:
  - 6 months postponement of research project between November 2010 and May 2011 due to breastfeeding
  - 6 months due to working 0.5 FTE on research between May 2011 and May 2012

**Total:** 1 x period of maternity leave plus 12 months absent from research

**Proposed reduction in outputs:** 2

#### EDAP's recommendation, with rationale:

**The advisory panel recommend to the Main Panel Chair that the case for a reduction of two outputs is accepted.**

Dr Monroe is entitled to a reduction of one output for the period of maternity leave. While this tariff recognises the impact of pregnancy and maternity on women's careers it does not take into account working part-time or incompatibility of research with breastfeeding. In addition to the time spent on maternity leave, Dr Monroe's research has been affected for a period of twelve months during the REF period. This is comparable to the timeframes outlined in the 'Panel Criteria and Working Methods' and consequently the panel agree with the reduction of two outputs.

## Example 2

**Staff details:** Dr Elizabeth Price  
UOA 30: History  
2 outputs listed

### Description of circumstances:

#### Nature and timing of circumstances

- Dr Price developed pre-eclampsia (a complication of pregnancy) and was admitted to hospital on 9 September 2009.
- Dr Price was unable to conduct research while in hospital and her maternity leave commenced on 30 September 2009.
- Her child was born 10 weeks premature on 28 October 2009.
- Dr Price took nine months maternity leave returning to work on 30 June 2010.

#### Effect on research

In addition to her period of maternity leave, Dr Price took a total of 15 days pregnancy related sick leave following her admission to hospital and was unable to conduct her research during this time. Despite the difficult circumstances of her pregnancy and the premature birth of her child, Dr Price and her child were well on her return to work.

#### Calculation of reduction of outputs:

- Reduction of 1 output for 1 period of maternity leave
- Reduction of 1 output for:
  - 0.5 months pregnancy-related illness (calculation based on 30 days per month)

**Total:** 1x period of maternity leave plus 0.5 months

**Proposed reduction in outputs:** 2

### EDAP's recommendation, with rationale:

**The advisory panel recommends to the Main Panel Chair that the case for a reduction of one output is accepted, but the case for a reduction of two outputs is not accepted.**

Dr Price is entitled to a reduction of one output for the period of maternity leave. A further reduction in output would only be justifiable if the period of additional disruption to research was comparable to the tariff outlined in table 2, part 1 of the 'Panel Criteria and Working Methods'. While the panel took account of the 0.5 months and recognised the disruption caused by preeclampsia and a premature birth, the panel felt it was unlikely to be comparable to a period of 12 months.

### Example 3

**Staff details:** Dr Elise Jenkins  
UOA 9: Physics  
1 output listed

#### Description of circumstances:

##### Nature and timing of circumstances

- Dr Jenkins' first period of maternity leave was from 21 April 2010 to 31 January 2011.
- In March 2011 it became evident that Dr Jenkins was having difficulties returning to her research and in July 2011 she was diagnosed with postnatal depression.
- Following the diagnosis Dr Jenkins was signed off work for 2 weeks, referred for counselling and prescribed antidepressants.
- From 01 October 2011 Dr Jenkins started to work on a 0.6 FTE basis. Her ongoing recovery from postnatal depression meant that from this point there was minimal disruption to her research.
- Dr Jenkins took a second period of maternity leave from 21 March 2013. She is due to return to work in January 2014.

##### Effect on research

The effect on Dr Jenkins' contracted hours were 2 periods of maternity leave, 2 weeks sick leave and 17 months working on a 0.6 FTE basis. Additionally, her research was disrupted during the period by postnatal depression. Dr Jenkins was diagnosed with postnatal depression in July 2011, which caused significant disruption to her research until October 2011. The condition began causing disruption to her research from March 2011, which is supported by advice from occupational health. Occupational health advised that, as postnatal depression usually starts in the first year after birth, it is likely to have affected Dr Jenkins prior to July.

##### Calculation of reduction of outputs:

- Reduction of two outputs for two discrete periods of maternity leave
- Reduction of one output for:
  - 6.8 months due to working 0.6 FTE for 17 months
  - 0.5 months sick leave
  - Additional disruption due to postnatal depression for approximately 7 months

**Total:** 2 x periods of maternity leave, plus 7.3 months absence and 7 months disrupted research.

**Proposed reduction in outputs:** 3

#### EDAP's recommendation, with rationale:

**The advisory panel recommends to the Main Panel Chair that the case for a reduction of three outputs is accepted.**

Dr Jenkins is entitled to a reduction in two outputs for two periods of maternity leave during the REF period. The advisory panel also recognise that Dr Jenkins' should be given a further reduction in outputs due to a combination of postnatal depression and working 0.6 FTE for 17 months. The panel recognises that while Dr Jenkins was diagnosed in July 2011 with postnatal depression, the period in which her research was affected began in March 2011.

#### Example 4

**Staff details:** Dr Maria Diego  
UOA 6: Agriculture, Veterinary and Food Science  
1 output listed

#### Description of circumstances:

##### Nature and timing of circumstances

- Dr Diego is an early career researcher, and first met this definition on 4 July 2010.
- She is conducting research into the effect of pesticide use on crop production.
- She informed her Head of Department that she was pregnant in February 2011 and on the advice of the Health and Safety Adviser ceased her practical research.
- Dr Diego took eight months maternity leave from October 2011 to June 2012.
- On her return to work in June 2012 Dr Diego worked 8 months at 0.6 FTE.

##### Effect on research

In addition to her period of maternity and part time working, the period of Dr Diego's pregnancy affected her research. Dr Diego's research project was at a very early stage when she became pregnant, which prevented her from undertaking practical research. While she was able to conduct some research during her pregnancy, this primarily involved background reading. Consequently, the full findings of her 4 year research project have been delayed. This has affected her ability to publish her findings on a key research project that took place during the REF period.

##### Calculation of reduction of outputs:

- Reduction of one output based on the Early Career Researcher
- Reduction of one output for period of maternity leave
- Reduction of one output for 3.2 months absence due to working part time (0.6 FTE for 8 months) and 8 month delay to research during pregnancy

**Total:** 1 x early career researcher, 1 x maternity plus 11.2 months

**Proposed reduction in outputs:** 3

#### EDAP's recommendation, with rationale:

**The advisory panel recommends to the Main Panel Chair that the case for a reduction of three outputs is accepted.**

Dr Diego is entitled to a reduction of 2 outputs because she is an early career researcher and took a period of maternity leave during the REF period. In addition the advisory panel recognise that Dr Diego has worked on a part time basis for some of the REF period and her ability to conduct research was limited for an 8 month period due to health and safety requirements in pregnancy. Given that Dr Diego's research project was at a very early stage and she was unable to undertake practical elements of the project, the advisory panel recognise that Dr Diego would have been limited in her ability to progress her research and produce research outputs during this time.

## Example 5

**Staff details:** Professor Michael Allsop  
UOA 21: Politics and International studies  
3 outputs listed

### Description of circumstances:

#### Nature and timing of circumstances

- Professor Allsop and his partner adopted a 3 year old child in 2006.
- In May 2009, Professor Allsop's partner died following a short illness.
- Professor Allsop's partner had devoted their time to caring for their adopted son. Consequently, he had to find alternative childcare and help his son adjust to the new arrangements as well as come to terms with the loss of his parent.
- Professor Allsop collects his son from school and if possible, works from home during school holidays.

#### Effect on research

Although there has been no effect on Professor Allsop's contracted hours, he has been unable to devote as much time to his research as his peers due to his childcare commitments. The death of Professor Allsop's partner has caused disruption to his research – he has had to come to terms with his bereavement and help his child to do so as well.

#### Calculation of reduction of outputs:

- Reduction of one output for disruption to research from May 2009 onwards due to childcare and bereavement.

**Proposed reduction in outputs: 1**

### EDAP's recommendation, with rationale:

**The advisory panel recommends to the Main Panel Chair that the case for a reduction of one output is accepted.**

The panel noted that Professor Allsop has been able to conduct research throughout the duration of the REF period. However, the panel recognises that caring for an adopted child who experienced the loss of an adoptive parent not long after adoption would have had an impact on Professor Allsop's ability to produce research at a similar rate to his peers. In addition, it was noted that Professor Allsop also had to come to terms with his own loss.



## Example 6

**Staff details:** Professor Isaac Obabanjo  
UOA 8: Chemistry  
3 outputs listed

### Description of circumstances:

#### Nature and timing of circumstances

- Professor Obabanjo's partner was diagnosed with Multiple Sclerosis in December 2010.
- Following the diagnosis his partner's condition rapidly deteriorated and in October 2011 it was recognised that a 24 hour carer was required.
- Professor Obabanjo experienced considerable difficulty arranging appropriate care and he took unpaid leave for a period of six months from November 2011 to May 2012.
- On his return to work in June 2012 Professor Obabanjo worked 0.8 FTE for the remainder of the REF period.
- Since June 2012, Professor Obabanjo has received support from his local authority but he continues to accompany his partner to relatively frequent (every couple of weeks on average) hospital appointments.

#### Effect on research

- 6 months unpaid leave November 2011 to May 2012
- 0.8 FTE from June 2012 to October 2013

Professor Obabanjo also had to cope with the rapid deterioration in his partner's condition from December 2010 to October 2011 when he was undertaking his contracted hours. During this period Professor Obabanjo was unable to devote sufficient time to his research into nanoparticles, which resulted in the findings being delayed.

#### Calculation of reduction of outputs:

Reduction of 1 output for:

- 6 months unpaid leave November 2011 to May 2012
- 3.2 months absence due to working 0.8 FTE from June 2012 to October 2013
- Disruption to research for 10 months

**Total:** 9.2 months, plus disruption to research for 10 months.

**Proposed reduction in outputs:** 1

### EDAP's recommendation, with rationale:

**The advisory panel recommends to the Main Panel Chair that the case for a reduction of one output is accepted.**

The panel noted that Professor Obabanjo was absent from academic duties for a total of 9.2 months during the REF period. However, the panel recognises that Professor Obabanjo's research was also affected by the rapid deterioration in his partner's condition that occurred over a 10 month period between December 2010 and October 2011.

## Example 7

**Staff details:** Dr Xui Li Cheng  
UOA 28: Modern Languages and Linguistics  
3 outputs listed

### Description of circumstances:

#### Nature and timing of circumstances

- Dr Cheng is the primary carer of her child, who was diagnosed with Myalgic Encephalopathy (ME) in January 2009.
- Dr Cheng took September 2009 to March 2010 as a period of unpaid leave so that she could devote more time to caring for her daughter.
- Between April 2010 and August 2012 Dr Cheng continued to provide additional care for her daughter while carrying out her academic duties.
- From September 2012 Dr Cheng's daughter's ME improved sufficiently to enable her to resume school. This enabled Dr Cheng to devote more time to her research.

#### Effect on research

Dr Cheng's research was affected from January 2009 to August 2012. She took 6 months unpaid leave during this time; between April 2010 and August 2012 the time she could devote to research was restricted due to her caring commitment – Dr Cheng received help from the local authority but only for 2 hours a day and she regularly worked from home in order to ensure her daughter's requirements were met. She also frequently accompanies her daughter to medical appointments, which have now become less frequent following her daughter's improvement. During the affected period Dr Cheng has been unable to conduct research at the rate of her colleagues as she has had to ensure that her daughter's care requirements are met on a daily basis.

#### Calculation of reduction of outputs:

Reduction of one output for 6 months unpaid leave and 2 years and 4 months caring commitment

**Total:** 6 months plus additional disruption to research

**Proposed reduction in outputs:** 1

### EDAP's recommendation, with rationale:

**The advisory panel recommends to the Main Chair Panel that the case for a reduction of one output is accepted.**

The panel noted that Dr Cheng's research time was not reduced by 12 months or more during the REF period. However, the panel recognised that in addition to the 6 months unpaid leave taken by Dr Cheng to care for her daughter, Dr Cheng's research time will have been limited due to her being her disabled daughter's carer for period of 28 months or more during the REF period.

## Example 8

**Staff details:** Dr Alexa Childs  
UOA 27: Area Studies  
3 outputs listed

### Description of circumstances:

#### Nature and timing of circumstances

- Dr Childs' parents were admitted to a nursing home in January 2007. Her mother has Alzheimer's and was no longer able to care for Dr Childs' father who had a series of strokes in 2006.
- Dr Childs visits her parents regularly and liaises with the home on their care. She is the home's emergency contact and on a number of occasions has had to accompany her parents to appointments or visit the home during working hours should she need to meet with the home manager or her parents' doctor.

#### Effect on research

Dr Childs' contracted hours have not been affected. On a number of occasions Dr Childs has had to accompany her parents to appointments or visit the nursing home during working hours, which has affected her ability to devote time to research.

#### Calculation of reduction of outputs:

Reduction of 1 output for ongoing disruption to research throughout the period due to her caring responsibilities.

**Proposed reduction in outputs: 1**

### EDAP's recommendation, with rationale:

**The advisory panel recommends to the Main Chair Panel that the case for a reduction of one output is not accepted.**

The advisory panel recognises that caring for old parents can impact on research. However, throughout the REF period, no significant changes in Dr Childs' parents' condition has been reported and they have been receiving 24 hour care in a nursing home. If Dr Childs' parents had not been receiving 24 hour nursing care or if one of Dr Childs' parents' condition had become unstable, the panel may have considered this case differently. The advisory panel did not feel that Dr Child's case was substantially different from the type of circumstances faced by many academics with old parents.

## Example 9

**Staff details:** Dr Ian Woods  
UOA 29: English Language and Literature  
3 outputs listed

### Description of circumstances:

#### Nature and timing of circumstances

- Dr Woods developed symptoms of Carpal Tunnel Syndrome in both his wrists in March 2011. After taking six weeks off work, it was diagnosed in May 2011.
- Following the diagnosis a number of adjustments were made to Dr Woods' working arrangements that proved ineffective.
- Dr Woods started to use voice recognition software in June 2011 and it took him approximately four months to train the software and fully adjust to a different way of working.

#### Effect on research

Dr Woods' research was affected from March 2011 to October 2011. In addition to the 6 weeks leave, the period following his return to work was disrupted as adjustments made to his working arrangements proved ineffective. This meant his ability to conduct and write up research during this period was restricted. Further disruption occurred from June until October 2011 while he adjusted to voice recognition software as he could not undertake research at his usual rate as he adjusted to new methods of working.

#### Calculation of reduction of outputs:

Reduction of one output for a period of 7 months, due to the development of an impairment that would be considered a disability under the Equality Act 2010, and time for effective reasonable adjustments to be implemented.

**Total:** 7 months

**Proposed reduction in outputs:** 1

### EDAP's recommendation, with rationale:

**The advisory panel recommends to the Main Chair Panel that the case for a reduction of one output is not accepted.**

The advisory panel recognises that it can take time for staff to receive a diagnosis and in some cases for effective reasonable adjustments to be implemented. However, the panel felt that the total time affected was not comparable to the tariff outlined in table 2, part 1 of the 'Panel Criteria and Working Methods'.

Example 10

**Staff details:** Dr Marina Papadakis  
UOA 5: Biological Sciences  
3 outputs listed

**Description of circumstances:**

**Nature and timing of circumstances**

- Dr Papadakis has a mobility impairment, she is a wheelchair user and cannot walk up or down stairs.
- Due to severe flood damage in November 2012, the university had to temporarily close the laboratory that Dr Papadakis usually works in for a period of 4 months.
- Alternative laboratory space was made available to staff in an old listed building which is not accessible to wheelchair users. The university did try to find suitable laboratory space for Dr Papadakis but nothing appropriate was available at such short notice.
- While the laboratory was being refurbished it was agreed that Dr Papadakis would focus on her teaching responsibilities.

**Effect on research**

Dr Papadakis was unable to conduct research from November 2012 until March 2013 due to the lack of an accessible laboratory.

**Calculation of reduction of outputs:**

Reduction of one output for 4 months prevention from conducting research.

**Total:** 4 months

**Proposed reduction in outputs:**1

**EDAP's recommendation, with rationale:**

**The advisory panel recommends to the Main Chair Panel that the case for a reduction of one output is not accepted.**

The advisory panel recognises that the lack of an accessible laboratory will have disrupted Dr Papadakis' research for a period of 4 months. However, the length of time affected in relation to the REF period as a whole is minimal and the panel would normally expect research to be disrupted for a period of 12 months or more for a reduction in outputs to be accepted.