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Formula-based research funding policy

Steven Hill, Research England
Equality impact assessments

Charlotte Lester Research England (Manchester)
Janet Storey, UKRI (London)
Equality Act 2010 and Public Sector Equality Duty

- What is the Public Sector Equality duty and how does it relate to the Equality Act?
- Who does the duty apply to?
- The protected characteristics: Age, Disability, Pregnancy and maternity, Religion or belief, Race, Sex, Sexual orientation, Gender reassignment, Marriage and civil partnership
- What are the PSED impact assessment requirements?
The Public Sector Equality Duty

Under the Equality Act 2010, in the exercise of their functions, public authorities in England, Scotland and Wales must have due regard to the need to:

• Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other unlawful conduct

• Advance equality of opportunity between people who do and do not share a protected characteristic

• Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not share a protected characteristic.

This is known as the Public Sector Equality Duty.
Equality Impact Assessments are a Tool

• Equality impact assessments should focus on understanding the effect of activities on different people, by using good evidence and analysis.
• Assessment should be timely and part and parcel of the decision-making process.
Initial analysis

Helen Snaith, Research England
QR and formula research capital funding

The QR funding elements ‘in-scope’ for this EIA represent the elements of RE’s core research funding distributed on the basis of research quality and taking into account the volume and relative cost of research in different areas:

• In 2019-20 we will distribute:
  • almost £1.7 billion QR funding;
  • £183m of capital research funding.
QR funding

In 2019-20 we will distribute almost £1.7 billion quality-related research (QR) funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation (£ millions)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream quality-related research (QR) including London weighting</td>
<td>1,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR Research Degree Programme (RDP) supervision</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR charity support fund</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR business research element</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR funding for National Research Libraries</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,698</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2019-20 we will distribute £183m of capital research funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation (£ millions)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEI Research Capital England</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Research Capital (HERC)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sector-wide distribution of QR (2018-19)

One institution
Scope

- QR is not allocated according to any protected characteristics
- However it may be allocated with indirect discrimination
- QR is not hypothecated, and so can be spent in any way an institution chooses
- Allocations of individual QR streams are highly correlated
  - E.g. if an institution receives a lot of mainstream QR, it is likely to receive a lot of QR charity support element (see next slides)
Summary of data used

- QR allocations for 2018-19 academic year
- HESA Staff record 2017-18
  - All staff, both academic and non-academic
  - Excluding atypical contracts (e.g. less than 4 weeks)
- HESA Student record 2017-18
  - PGR students only
  - In the standard registration population (e.g. not dormant)
- Sufficient HESA data quality to look at age, disability, ethnicity and sex.
Groups, by quartiles of sector QR received (£)
Age by QR group

Source: HESA, 2017-18 student and staff records
Staff age and contract type by QR group

Academic staff

Professional services and support staff

Source: HESA, 2017-18 staff record
Disability by QR group

Source: HESA, 2017-18 student and staff records

Staff

PGR students
Ethnicity by QR group

Source: HESA, 2017-18 student and staff records

Staff

Proportion of staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QR group</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PGR students

Proportion of PGR students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QR group</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff ethnicity and nationality by QR group

**UK national staff**

- **A**
  - White: 60%
  - Asian: 10%
  - Black: 5%
  - Mixed: 5%
  - Other: 20%

- **B**
  - White: 60%
  - Asian: 10%
  - Black: 5%
  - Mixed: 5%
  - Other: 20%

- **C**
  - White: 60%
  - Asian: 10%
  - Black: 5%
  - Mixed: 5%
  - Other: 20%

- **D**
  - White: 60%
  - Asian: 10%
  - Black: 5%
  - Mixed: 5%
  - Other: 20%

**Non-UK national staff**

- **A**
  - White: 70%
  - Asian: 10%
  - Black: 5%
  - Mixed: 5%
  - Other: 10%

- **B**
  - White: 70%
  - Asian: 10%
  - Black: 5%
  - Mixed: 5%
  - Other: 10%

- **C**
  - White: 70%
  - Asian: 10%
  - Black: 5%
  - Mixed: 5%
  - Other: 10%

- **D**
  - White: 70%
  - Asian: 10%
  - Black: 5%
  - Mixed: 5%
  - Other: 10%

Source: HESA, 2017-18 staff record
Sex by QR group

Staff

- QR group A: Female (50%), Male (50%), Other (0%)
- QR group B: Female (50%), Male (50%), Other (0%)
- QR group C: Female (50%), Male (50%), Other (0%)
- QR group D: Female (50%), Male (50%), Other (0%)

PGR students

- QR group A: Female (60%), Male (40%), Other (0%)
- QR group B: Female (60%), Male (40%), Other (0%)
- QR group C: Female (60%), Male (40%), Other (0%)
- QR group D: Female (60%), Male (40%), Other (0%)

Source: HESA, 2017-18 student and staff records
Sex of academic staff across main panels

Source: HESA, 2017-18 staff record
Any questions?
13.45 Break-out discussion 1:

Participants to discuss the issues in their table groups:
• Does the QR funding policy affect some groups (or some types of research or research beneficiaries) differently?
• Is there evidence to indicate the funding policy may result in less favourable treatment for some groups?
• What should RE be looking at through the EIA?
• Where might there be some potential for disadvantage to occur?
• What action might be considered to mitigate that?

Each table to nominate a scribe to record key points (flipchart paper provided) and a spokesperson.

14.30 Feedback session and wider discussion
13.45 **Break-out discussion 1:**

Participants to discuss the issues in their table groups:

- Does the way in which QR is calculated affect some groups (or some types of research or research beneficiaries) differently? Think about
  - Volume of research (based on numbers of research-active staff as returned to the REF)
  - Subject cost weighting
  - Quality of research as measured in the REF
  - The different elements of QR and how they are calculated.
- How can RE capture information on other protected characteristics? Should we (can we?) consider socio-economic characteristics?
- What is the role of the HEI and what is the role of RE?

Each table to nominate a scribe to record key points (flipchart paper provided) and a spokesperson.

14.30 **Feedback session and wider discussion**
Questions put to Manchester workshop:

15.10 Breakout discussion 2:

Thinking about RE’s role, and the funding elements being assessed by this EIA:
• What potential positive impacts can be identified?
• What might be the opportunities to promote equality that we could consider in future?
• Any other comments or reflections?

Each table to nominate a scribe to record key points (flipchart paper provided) and a spokesperson.

15.50 Feedback session and wider discussion
15.10 Breakout discussion 2:

Thinking about RE’s role, and the funding elements being assessed by this EIA:
• What potential positive impacts can be identified?
• What might be the opportunities to promote equality that we could consider in future? What is the role of the university, of RE and of UKRI?

Each table to nominate a scribe to record key points (flipchart paper provided) and a spokesperson.

15.50 Feedback session and wider discussion
Final thoughts
Next steps

- Presentation will be available on the Research England web site shortly
- Meetings with stakeholders across the HE sector including the Royal Society, AdvanceHE, UKRI EDI External Advisory group, Russell Group, MillionPlus, GuildHE, AMRC and more…
- Online survey open until noon on **Wednesday 11 September 2019**
- EIA published by the end of 2019.

Message EIA-engagement-2019@re.ukri.org
Survey questions

Section 1 - Respondent details

Section 2 - Approach to funding allocation

Does your organisation receive formula-based research funding from Research England?

If yes, what are your institution’s key equality, diversity and inclusion considerations when allocating or distributing QR or formula research capital funding? Do you take the different elements of the Research England allocation into account when you distribute the funding? (max 300 words)
Survey questions continued….

Section 3 - University staff (those who support or conduct research funded by the funding streams) and postgraduate students

QR and formula research capital funding can be used to support university staff (researchers and Professional Services staff) and postgraduate students. Please consider how different groups of people with protected characteristics* might be affected differently by the way each funding element is calculated or allocated. Do you consider that staff in these groups may be affected positively or negatively by the funding streams? (Strongly negative to strongly positive)

If you consider that staff and/or postgraduate students with protected characteristics may be affected in a positive or a negative way by Research England’s QR and formula research capital funding policy, please explain how you think they may be affected. Please reference specific protected characteristics in your response. (max 300 words)

If you have suggested there may be negative impact what action might Research England take to avoid or mitigate this? Alternatively, how might we promote positive impact? (max 300 words)
Survey questions continued....

Section 4 - Subjects and participants of research (individuals upon and with whom funded research is conducted) and beneficiaries of research

Please think about the research that the QR and formula research capital funding elements supports (you may like to think about your own institution as an example). You may like to consider subjects and participants of research, as well as beneficiaries of research in your response. Do you believe, and do you have evidence to show, that different groups of people with protected characteristics* may benefit from the research, or might they be affected in a negative way? (Strongly negative to strongly positive)

Please explain how you think they may be affected. Please reference specific protected characteristics in your response.

If you have suggested there may be negative impact what action might Research England take to avoid or mitigate this? Alternatively, how might we promote positive impact?
Survey questions continued....

Section 5 - Additional information

Research England welcomes additional evidence to inform the EIA. Any documents and/or data submitted as part of the survey response should be relevant to Research England’s formula-based research funding policy. Respondents may:

- Provide documents, or links to documents that may inform the evidence review;
- Provide data, or links to data that may inform the evidence review;
- Provide evidence that demonstrates the potential for positive and/or negative impacts through quality-related research funding;
- Provide evidence that addresses how positive impacts may be further explored;
- Provide evidence that addresses how potential negative impacts may be removed or mitigated.
For more information

- Visit: https://re.ukri.org/research/how-we-fund-research/
- Email: EIA-engagement-2019@re.ukri.org
Relationships between QR streams (2018-19)
Relationships between QR streams (2018-19)
Relationship between research and capital funding (2018-19)

![Graph showing the relationship between total recurrent capital funding and total recurrent research funding. The graph includes a trend line with an R² value of 0.9851.]