

The Courtauld REF Final Equality Impact Assessment

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) aims to ensure that The Courtauld has understood any equality impacts, both positive and negative, of the policies and procedures established to conduct our REF2021 submission and set out in our REF Code of Practice. This has been conducted in relation to declared protected characteristics and in the context of our small, specialist institution.
- 1.2 The Courtauld's Head of Research is responsible for the final EIA and is supported by the Research Manager. All data used in this document and in the interim EIAs were prepared by our HR team, with input sought from the Head of HR as appropriate.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Courtauld submitted 100% of our 'Category A'¹ staff to REF2021. We submitted to one Unit of Assessment only (32 – Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory).
- 2.2 The submission was made up of 37 members of staff (35.85 FTE). In this context, it was possible for the submission to be managed and outputs selected on the basis of close consultation with individual staff members. This approach was consistent with The Courtauld's REF2014 submission.
- 2.3 The Courtauld supports our fixed-term and part-time staff (including contract research staff) in the same way that we support all other categories of staff. The institution has transparent policies and procedures to rule out discrimination, to create an inclusive culture that recognises, respects and values difference, enables all staff to contribute and participate fully, and provides equality of opportunity to all staff. These policies and procedures are outlined in our Equal Opportunities policy.
- 2.4 All staff involved in decision-making and reviewing nominations for REF eligibility and output selection were obliged to complete Equality, Diversity and Inclusion training. This online training has also been rolled out across the wider staff body. In addition, staff engagement sessions were held across The Courtauld addressing EDI and themes covering anti-racism, class, privilege, and unconscious bias.

¹ 'Category A' eligible staff are defined as staff with a contract of employment of 0.2 FTE or greater, on the payroll of The Courtauld on the REF census date, and whose primary employment function is to undertake either 'teaching and research' or 'research-only'.

FINAL

2.5 None of the 37 members of Category A staff included in our final submission declared individual circumstances which may have constrained their ability to carry out research over the REF period. The Courtauld does not have formal expectations of how many outputs will be submitted to REF by any member of staff and no aspect of the REF submission will be used as a performance management exercise.

3. Scope

3.1 The Courtauld's REF EIA has three distinct stages. These were described in our Code of Practice and each took into account the following protected characteristics, insofar as this information has been volunteered by staff: age; disability; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; ethnicity; religion or belief; gender reassignment; sex and sexual orientation.

3.2 Two interim EIAs were carried out:

- The first analysed Category A staff against records of protected characteristics and was completed in May 2019.
- The second analysed the preliminary output pool reviewed by the Research Committee in Autumn 2020 in relation to declared protected characteristics of the cohort of staff being submitted to the REF exercise.

3.3 The results of both interim EIAs were reported to The Courtauld's Research Committee, the principal strategic and decision-making committee for our REF2021 submission.

3.4 This final EIA aims to ensure that The Courtauld has understood any equality impacts, both positive and negative, on The Courtauld's submitted outputs to REF2021 in relation to declared protected characteristics, including any proposed action to address any negative effects.

3.5 EIAs conducted for REF2014 showed that our approach to selection was unlikely to have either a positive or negative impact on those with protected characteristics; this has informed our approach to REF2021. Similarly, the results of the EIAs conducted for REF2021 is expected to inform our approach to future REF exercises. Those affected will therefore comprise all current and future Category A members of staff.

3.6 Due to the small size of The Courtauld and our submission of 100% of Category A staff, it is not possible to compare the characteristics of staff with significant responsibility for research and who are independent researchers with a comparator pool within the institution. Detailed analysis of our REF2021 Category A staff cohort consequently focuses on policies around selection of outputs.

FINAL

4. Analyses

4.1 The first interim EIA is available as Appendix A of The Courtauld's Code of Practice.

4.2 No differential impacts, positive or negative, could be discerned during this EIA on the basis of any protected characteristic. It was noted that the majority of Category A staff were white (89.58%) and that twice as many women were represented than men (68.75% vs. 31.25%). Although no differential impacts were discerned, the EIA also noted the measures built into the REF Code of Practice and wider Courtauld policies to support staff with disabilities and those with caring responsibilities.

4.3 The second interim EIA is available below as Appendix A to this document (pages 6-11).

4.4 Analysis of data contained in the second interim EIA suggests no evidence of negative impacts towards staff in our provisional output pool based on one or more protected characteristics. Key points were that:

- Gender, disability, and ethnicity showed very little change in average number of outputs between groups (a range of 0.2 or 0.3 between the highest and lowest average). This was also true of religion or belief (a range of 0.5).
- Age showed a range of 1.3 between the highest and lowest average: the 40-49 age band showed 3 outputs per person compared to 1.7 for the 50-59 band. This was unexpected and did not have an obvious explanation in the available data; the discrepancy was not reflected in the final output selection.
- Bisexual and gay members of staff had an average number of outputs 0.9 higher than heterosexual members of staff. This was however a small sample size.

4.5 It was noted that The Courtauld should particularly continue to monitor the higher average number of outputs shown for men compared to women, and the trends around declared disabilities (especially in the context of the pandemic and 'Long Covid'). It was also confirmed that women on maternity leave are supported in their research by the continued accrual of sabbatical entitlement during that period.

4.6 The final EIA is based on The Courtauld's 79 submitted outputs to REF2021, 11 of which were double weighted. The full template as prepared by HR colleagues in the same format as the second interim EIA is available below as Appendix B (pages 12-22).

4.7 The EIA shows no evidence of negative impacts towards staff linked to our final output selection and the institutional policies which this resulted from, as analysed via one or more protected characteristics.

FINAL

- 4.8 All protected characteristics analysed show only minor variation between groups. The greatest range is between women who have spent time on maternity leave during the REF period and other members of staff (0.5 difference in average outputs). Ethnicity has the next highest range at 0.4, however it is difficult to determine any statistical relationship in either protected characteristic given the unequal ratio between groups and small number of individuals represented. Disability, gender, and religion or belief show the joint lowest range at 0.1.
- 4.9 Ranges increase in all but two protected characteristics (marital status and maternity) when double weighted outputs are counted twice. This is not unexpected in these circumstances and is a more pronounced effect when groups contain few individuals. Sexual orientation shows the highest range; bisexual or gay members of staff submitted an average of 0.7 more outputs than heterosexual staff when double weighted outputs are counted twice. The range in ethnicity also increases to an average of 0.6 outputs.
- 4.10 The majority of protected characteristics show a range of 0.4 or fewer average outputs between groups when reserves outputs are taken into account. The exceptions are religion or belief (0.6) and maternity (0.8), both of which also include groups with particularly small sample sizes.

Conclusions and Next Steps

- 5.1 The Courtauld has approached the three stages of our REF EIA in line with our institutional Code of Practice and within the framework of a small, specialist institution submitting fewer than 40 members of staff. The assessment has been carried out in the most practical and robust manner possible considering our scale.
- 5.2 Based on the data presented across all three stages, no changes in output identification or selection processes set out in the Code of Practice were required. The Research Committee did however have the opportunity to discuss the interim EIAs with a view to making any changes deemed appropriate to prevent discrimination and promote equality ahead of the REF submission deadline.
- 5.3 Although no clear evidence of negative impacts on staff taking maternity leave during the REF period is available given the very small sample size, The Courtauld will continue to review its family-friendly policies. This will include the impact of the accrual of sabbatical during maternity leave referenced in 4.5, and monitoring requests for flexibility as we transition out of the Covid-19 pandemic.
- 5.4 It should be noted that future REF submissions would benefit from a further interim EIA which analyses the final output pool prior to selection based on declared protected characteristics of staff. This would allow for better comparison of the final output selection against the wider pool and also offer an opportunity for the Research Committee to review how the final output

FINAL

pool differed from that analysed earlier in the process. For the REF2021 exercise, this additional interim EIA would have allowed for further scrutiny of the unexpected fall in average outputs seen between the 40-49 and 50-59 age groups reported in 4.4.

5.5 The Research Committee will discuss the prospect of an additional interim EIA during future REF submissions in Autumn 2021; this will be informed by a wider ongoing review led by HR aimed at further embedding the use of EIAs within The Courtauld.

5.6 As a matter of good practice, we will publish our final EIA online following its submission.

FINAL

Appendix A: Second Interim EIA, 18 December 2020

The Equality Impact Analysis Form is a document which The Courtauld uses to demonstrate our commitment to good practice, including complying with the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010 when making and implementing decisions which affect the way the organisation works.

The form collates and summarises information which has been used to inform the planning and decision-making process.

Ideally, all the information needed in this form should have already been considered and incorporated in the documentation supporting the decision or initiative, e.g. business case, consultation outline etc.

Equality Impact Analyses forms may become public documents: remember to use at least 12-point Arial font and plain English.

Title of Equality Impact Analysis

Courtauld REF submission analysis, 18 December 2020

Purpose of this Equality Impact Analysis

This Equality Impact Assessment aims to ensure that The Courtauld has understood any equality impacts, both positive and negative, on the preliminary output pool for The Courtauld's REF submission in relation to declared protected characteristics, including any proposed action to address any negative effects.

Officer Responsible *(to be completed by the report author)*

Name Aaron Gibbons-Plowright	Job title HR Business Partner
Department HR	Contact details aaron.gibbons@courtauld.ac.uk

Senior Management Team (SMT) sign-off

Name Alixe Bovey
Job title Head of Research
Date 29/03/2021

FINAL

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS

In completing this impact analysis, you should where possible, refer to the main documentation related to this decision rather than trying to draft this assessment in isolation.

STEP 1 DEFINING THE ISSUE

1. Summarise why you are having to make a new decision

The Courtauld is committed to running a fair and transparent process in preparing the submission. The selection of outputs will be based on a fair and evidence-based process and informed by an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA).

The Courtauld has now finalised its preliminary pool of research outputs produced by Category A members of staff during the REF period (2014-2020). We are therefore conducting this EIA to analyse this pool of outputs in relation to the declared protected characteristics of Category A staff. This is with the aim of reviewing any possible detrimental effect on an individual's research, and thereby reducing the likelihood of their outputs being selected for The Courtauld's REF return.

To date, none of the 37 members of Category A staff included in our provisional output pool have declared individual circumstances which may have constrained their ability to carry out research over the REF period. However, they have until 15 January 2021 to submit such a request if necessary. The Courtauld does not have formal expectations of how many outputs will be submitted to REF by any member of staff.

2. Who are the main people that will be affected? Consider staff, students, visitors and any others

The 37 members of staff included as Category A staff in our provisional output pool.

STEP 2 ANALYSING THE ISSUES

3. What information and consultation have you used to inform your decision making?

The data used in this EIA, is drawn from the 37 members of Category A staff included in our REF2021 submission. The provisional output pool was drawn up on the basis of self-identification of potential REF-submissible outputs by Category A staff, follow-up conversations with individuals, and initial assessment of REF Open Access guidelines and other submission criteria. As we intend to submit all Category A eligible staff, no eligible staff are being excluded from the submission. Protected characteristics data are based on self-submitted information recorded on our HR/payroll system.

FINAL

Age

Age ranges	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
30-39	6	2.3
40-49	13	3
50-59	7	1.7
60-65	11	2.3

We have no staff below the age of 30 years submitted for REF purposes.

The age banding with the highest average research outputs is 40-49 which average 3 research outputs each. This is half an output higher than the average for all category A staff which is 2.5 and it is at least 0.7 higher than any other banding.

Whilst age could reflect a shorter period in post as an independent researcher it is unclear why there appears to be a significant drop in the 50-59 age band.

Gender

Gender identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Female	26	2.3
Male	11	2.6
Other	0	0

Analysing the data there are more than twice as many female academics at The Courtauld as male academics. However, our male academics do average a slightly higher number of research outputs.

As with our EIA in REF2014, we remain alert to working arrangements that may be needed in mitigation of any disadvantage to women. We have previously noted in developing our policies that primary caring responsibilities tend to be undertaken more by women. Our Code of Practice has flexibility to help mitigate against the disadvantage that many women carers experience trying to balance caring responsibilities with having time to carry out their research.

The higher average output from male academics is something the Courtauld should continue to monitor and track for further trends.

We clarified in November 2020 that women returners from maternity leave accrue and therefore are entitled to the same period of sabbatical leave as other employees during their absence.

FINAL

Disability

Disability identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
No known disability	34	2.5
Disability declared	3	2.3
Information refused	0	0

The Courtauld supports academics who have notified the Institute of any disabilities with a thorough and flexible approach to curriculum structures and timetables and through reasonable adjustments. Our policies and procedures for REF2021 have been designed with the same underlying principles of flexibility and support. Although we have identified that having a disability could constrain research capacity, the number of outputs does not seem to demonstrate that having a disability has had a significant impact on research outputs.

We will continue to monitor this situation given the impact of the pandemic, especially as the effects of Long Covid are still unknown at this point.

Ethnicity

Ethnicity identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
White	33	2.5
Mixed/other/Information refused/unknown	4	2.3

We note that almost 90% of category A staff identify as white. As individual ethnic groups represent a small minority of the total eligible population, it is difficult to identify any bias from this data.

Sexual orientation

Sexual orientation identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Bisexual/Gay man/Gay woman	3	3.3
Heterosexual	23	2.4
Information refused	11	2.3

Despite the higher average returns from bisexual and gay men and women, we determine that sexual orientation is unlikely to have a differential impact any of our staff in our provisional output pool. Due to the small number of employees notifying us that they are bisexual or gay, it is difficult to establish any causation between research outputs selected and sexual orientation.

We note a high proportion of non-returns for sexual orientation for this small pool, and in future, would wish to encourage staff to feel safer in disclosing this information so The Courtauld can act, if needed.

FINAL

Religion or belief

Religious belief identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Christian/ Any other religion or belief/spiritual	6	2.7
No religion	18	2.6
Prefer not to say/information refused	13	2.2

Again, due to the small number of employees notifying us that they are Christian or have any other religion or belief/spiritual, it is difficult to establish any causation between research outputs selected and religion.

Overall, at this stage, we determine that religion is unlikely to have a differential impact any of our staff in our provisional output pool.

We also note a relatively high number of no returns for this small group

Equality Impacts

4. Identifying the impacts

4 (a) What positive impact could there be overall, on different equality groups, diversity, inclusion and good relations?

As all 37 employees will be submitted for the REF return, this should be a positive impact per se as this demonstrates inclusion for all groups, regardless of number of outputs produced.

4 (b) What negative impact could there be overall, on different equality groups, diversity, inclusion and good relations?

This analysis suggests there is no evidence of negative impacts towards staff in our provisional output pool based on one or more protected characteristics. The Courtauld is submitting all Category A eligible staff, with no eligible staff being excluded from the submission.

Furthermore, we have not had any members of Category A staff indicate they have individual circumstances which may have constrained their ability to carry out research over the REF period.

FINAL

STEP 3 REACHING YOUR DECISION

5. Describe the recommended outcome

Based on the data presented in this analysis, no issues are anticipated if output identification and selection proceeds in the manner set out in The Courtauld's REF Code of Practice. All Category A staff have indicated they will be submitting at least one research output to the REF exercise.

Outcomes of this EIA will be reported to the Research Committee and used to ensure that any necessary changes to prevent discrimination and promote equality are made before the final REF submission deadline.

We should continue to review the impact of our policies and procedures, and we will analyse data pertaining to characteristics following the final submission. As a matter of good practice, once we have made our REF2021 submission, we should publish our final EIA online, including the outcomes of any actions taken to prevent discrimination or advance equality.

STEP 4 DELIVERY – MAXIMISING BENEFITS AND MANAGING RISKS

6. Equality, diversity and inclusion action planning

Currently we do not believe there are any actions required as a direct result of this EIA. Further analysis will be carried out following submission in March 2021.

FINAL

Appendix B: Courtauld REF final submission analysis, 22 July 2021

The Equality Impact Analysis Form is a document which The Courtauld uses to demonstrate our commitment to good practice, including complying with the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010 when making and implementing decisions which affect the way the organisation works.

The form collates and summarises information which has been used to inform the planning and decision-making process.

Ideally, all the information needed in this form should have already been considered and incorporated in the documentation supporting the decision or initiative, e.g. business case, consultation outline etc.

Equality Impact Analyses forms may become public documents: remember to use at least 12-point Arial font and plain English.

Title of Equality Impact Analysis

Courtauld REF final submission analysis, 22 July 2021

Purpose of this Equality Impact Analysis

This Equality Impact Assessment aims to ensure that The Courtauld has understood any equality impacts, both positive and negative, on the final output pool for The Courtauld's REF submission in relation to declared protected characteristics, including any proposed action to address any negative effects.

Officer Responsible *(to be completed by the report author)*

Name Aaron Gibbons-Plowright	Job title HR Business Partner
Department HR	Contact details aaron.gibbons@courtauld.ac.uk

Senior Management Team (SMT) sign-off

Name Alixe Bovey
Job title Head of Research
Date 22/07/2021

FINAL

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS

In completing this impact analysis, you should where possible, refer to the main documentation related to this decision rather than trying to draft this assessment in isolation.

STEP 1 DEFINING THE ISSUE

1. Summarise why you are having to make a new decision

The Courtauld is committed to running a fair and transparent process in preparing its REF submission. The selection of outputs will be based on a fair and evidence-based process and informed by an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA).

The Courtauld has now finalised its definitive submission of research outputs produced by members of staff during the REF period (2014-2020). We are therefore conducting this EIA to analyse these outputs in relation to the declared protected characteristics of staff. This is with the aim of reviewing the data for any possible detrimental effect on an individual's research, and thereby ensuring The Courtauld's policy and procedures for selecting outputs does not disadvantage staff due to protected characteristics.

None of the 37 members of staff included in our final submission declared individual circumstances which may have constrained their ability to carry out research over the REF period. The Courtauld does not have formal expectations of how many outputs will be submitted to REF by any member of staff.

2. Who are the main people that will be affected? Consider staff, students, visitors and any others

The 37 members of staff included in our final submission.

STEP 2 ANALYSING THE ISSUES

3. What information and consultation have you used to inform your decision making?

The data used in this EIA, is drawn from the 37 members of staff who have had outputs selected in our REF2021 submission. The initial output pool was drawn up on the basis of self-identification of potential REF-submissible outputs by Category A staff, follow-up conversations with individuals, and initial assessment of REF Open Access guidelines and other submission criteria. The final selection of 90 outputs (including double weighting) was led by the Head of Research and was based on research review meetings with individual Category A staff, subsequent review of the output pool, and with regular input from members of the Research Committee. The final selection was ratified by the Research Committee ahead of submission. The Courtauld submitted 79 individual outputs to REF2021, 11 of which were double weighted. These 79

FINAL

outputs form the basis of the data used to review output selection against the protected characteristics of Category A staff.

There were a further 11 outputs which were nominated as reserve submissions. These have not been included in this section of the EIA, but data including reserve outputs is available in Appendix 1. In reviewing these data, no statistically significant anomalies were found which would alter the findings of this equality impact assessment.

The 11 outputs selected for double weighting (i.e. where the scale of academic investment in the research activity and/or the intellectual scope of the research output is considered considerable) were counted singularly in this section of the EIA. Data showing average outputs across protected characteristics when double weighted items are counted twice are available in Appendix 2. The largest range in this data set relates to sexual orientation, where the grouping of bisexual or gay men and women average 0.7 outputs more than heterosexual members of staff. However, due to the small number of employees in this grouping, this is more likely to be an anomaly rather than a significant finding.

Men submitted an average of 0.4 outputs more than women when double weighted outputs are counted twice. This is higher than the difference of 0.1 when counting these outputs singularly. It should however also be noted that the analysis in Appendix 2 of the output submission including reserves shows women contributing an average of 0.1 outputs more than men.

There were no members of eligible staff who were excluded from the submission.

Protected characteristics data is based on self-submitted information recorded on our HR/payroll system. Some characteristics have been grouped together to stop individual members of staff possibly being identified from the data.

Age

Age ranges	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
30-39	6	2.2
40-49	13	2.2
50-59	7	2.3
60-65	11	2

The Courtauld have no staff below the age of 30 years had outputs submitted for REF purposes.

The data shows that there is no significant difference in the number of outputs per age range. In contrast to our EIA on the preliminary output pool, the age banding with the highest average research outputs is 50-59 with an average of 2.3 research outputs per person. Whereas, the lowest range, 60-65, only average 0.3 less outputs per person.

FINAL

Gender

Gender identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Female	26	2.1
Male	11	2.2
Other	0	0

Analysing the data, there are more than twice as many female academics at The Courtauld as male academics, but the average number of outputs is broadly the same across the two groups.

As with our EIA in REF2014, we remain alert to working arrangements that may be needed in mitigation of any disadvantage to women. We have previously noted in developing our policies that primary caring responsibilities tend to be undertaken more by women. Our Code of Practice has flexibility to help mitigate against the disadvantage that many women carers experience trying to balance caring responsibilities with having time to carry out their research.

Disability

Disability identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
No known disability	34	2.1
Disability declared	3	2
Information refused	0	0

The Courtauld supports academics who have notified The Institute of any disabilities with a thorough and flexible approach to curriculum structures and timetables and through reasonable adjustments. Our policies and procedures for REF2021 have been designed with the same underlying principles of flexibility and support. Although we have identified that having a disability could constrain research capacity, the number of outputs does not seem to demonstrate that having a disability has had a significant impact on research outputs.

We will continue to monitor this situation given the impact of the pandemic, especially as the effects of Long Covid are still unknown at this point.

Ethnicity

Ethnicity identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
White	33	2.1
Mixed/other/Information refused/unknown	4	2.5

We note that almost 90% of category A staff identify as white. Although the difference in average outputs between these staff and other ethnicities is the largest from any characteristic, it is very difficult to determine any statistical

FINAL

relationship as the 'mixed/other/information refused/unknown' group represents a small minority of the total output.

Sexual orientation

Sexual orientation identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Bisexual/Gay man/Gay woman	3	2.3
Heterosexual	23	2
Information refused	11	2.2

There is very little difference between the average number of outputs by individuals with differing sexual orientation. Due to the small number of employees notifying us that they are bisexual or gay, it would be difficult to establish any causation between research outputs selected and sexual orientation.

The Courtauld also notes the high proportion of non-returns for sexual orientation for this small pool, and in future, would wish to encourage staff to feel safer in disclosing this information so The Courtauld can act, if needed.

Religion or belief

Religious belief identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Christian/ Any other religion or belief/spiritual	6	2
No religion	18	2.1
Prefer not to say/information refused	13	2

Due to the small number of employees notifying us that they are Christian or have any other religion or belief/spiritual, it is difficult to establish any causation between research outputs selected and religion.

However, based on the available data we can see no evidence that religious belief has a differential impact on any of our staff in our provisional output pool.

We also note a relatively high percentage number of no returns for this group.

Marital Status

Marital Status	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Married	22	2
Non-Married	15	2.3

Based on the available data we can see no evidence that marital status has a differential impact on the number of outputs produced for selection by our staff in the final selection.

FINAL

Maternity

Maternity Leave during REF period	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Maternity Leave	3	1.7
No break for maternity leave	34	2.2

The number of average outputs produced by members of staff who have spent time on maternity leave during the REF period is lower than other Category A staff. Although this is a small sample size and members of staff who spent time on maternity leave did not declare individual circumstances which may have constrained their ability to carry out research over this period, the lower average output from staff in this group is something The Courtauld should continue to monitor and track for further trends.

The Courtauld clarified in November 2020 that women on maternity leave accrue and therefore are entitled to the same period of sabbatical leave as other employees during their absence.

Gender reassignment

No Category A members of staff have notified us that their gender is different to the one that they were assigned at birth. As such, no analysis of differential impacts based on this protected characteristic is possible.

Equality Impacts

4. Identifying the impacts

4 (a) What positive impact could there be overall, on different equality groups, diversity, inclusion and good relations?

As all 37 employees will be submitted for the REF return, this should be a positive impact per se as this demonstrates inclusion for all groups, regardless of number of outputs produced.

4 (b) What negative impact could there be overall, on different equality groups, diversity, inclusion and good relations?

This analysis suggests there is no evidence of negative impacts towards staff in our final output based on one or more protected characteristics. The Courtauld is submitting outputs from all Category A eligible staff, with no eligible staff being excluded from the submission.

Furthermore, we did not have any members of staff included as Category A staff in our final output indicate they have individual circumstances which may have constrained their ability to carry out research over the REF period.

FINAL

STEP 3 REACHING YOUR DECISION

5. Describe the recommended outcome

Outcomes of this EIA will be reported to the Research Committee and used to ensure that any necessary changes to prevent discrimination and promote equality can be factored into preparations for future REF exercises.

The Courtauld should continue to review the impact of our policies and procedures in all aspects regularly. As a matter of good practice, once we have made our REF 2021 submission, we should publish our final EIA online, including the outcomes of any actions taken to prevent discrimination or advance equality.

DELIVERY – MAXIMISING BENEFITS AND MANAGING RISKS

6. Equality, diversity and inclusion action planning

We do not believe there are any actions required as a direct result of this EIA but will continue to implement good practice more generally at The Courtauld to reduce and mitigate potential bias in our processes.

FINAL

Appendix 1 - Data including reserves outputs²

Age

Age ranges	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
30-39	6	2.2
40-49	13	2.5
50-59	7	2.6
60-65	11	2.5

Gender

Gender identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Female	26	2.5
Male	11	2.4
Other	0	0

Disability

Disability identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
No known disability	34	2.4
Disability declared	3	2.7
Information refused	0	0

Ethnicity

Ethnicity identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
White	33	2.4
Mixed/other/Information refused/unknown	4	2.5

Sexual orientation

Sexual orientation identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Bisexual/Gay man/Gay woman	3	2.7
Heterosexual	23	2.5
Information refused	11	2.3

² Double weighted outputs are counted singularly in Appendix 1.

FINAL

Religion or belief

Religious belief identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Christian/ Any other religion or belief/spiritual	6	2.8
No religion	18	2.5
Prefer not to say/information refused	13	2.2

Marriage

Marriage status	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Married	22	2.4
Non-married	15	2.5

Maternity

Maternity Leave during REF period	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Maternity Period	3	1.7
No break for maternity leave	34	2.5

FINAL

Appendix 2 – Data including double weighted outputs counted twice³

Age

Age ranges	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
30-39	6	2.5
40-49	13	2.5
50-59	7	2.6
60-65	11	2.2

Gender

Gender identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Female	26	2.3
Male	11	2.7
Other	0	0

Disability

Disability identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
No known disability	34	2.5
Disability declared	3	2
Information refused	0	0

Ethnicity

Ethnicity identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
White	33	2.4
Mixed/other/Information refused/unknown	4	3

Sexual orientation

Sexual orientation identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Bisexual/gay man/gay woman	3	3
Heterosexual	23	2.3
Information refused	11	2.5

³ Reserve outputs are not included in Appendix 2.

FINAL

Religion or belief

Religious belief identifier	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Christian/ Any other religion or belief/spiritual	6	2.7
No religion	18	2.4
Prefer not to say/information refused	13	2.4

Marital Status

Marital Status	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Married	22	2.4
Non-Married	15	2.5

Maternity

Maternity Leave during REF period	Number of employees	Average number of outputs
Maternity Leave	3	2
No break for maternity leave	34	2.5