Mae'r ddogfen hon ar gael yn Gymraeg. This document is available in Welsh.

USW Equality Impact Assessment

The following provides a framework and checklist for Equality Impact Assessments (EIA). The framework and checklist will help in considering the impact of policies, procedures, strategies and decisions in relation to equality and diversity (E&D).

The value of having a consistent and transparent approach is enormous. Equality "proofing" your procedure will enable us to meet our legal obligations to both remove discrimination and actively promote equality and diversity in everything we do. Ensuring that equity and dignity will become an automatic consideration in how we develop and deliver USW practices and services. We need to make sure that our approach to this exercise is fair, transparent, legal and consistently applied.

What are Equality Impact Assessments?

An equality impact assessment is a tool to assess the impact of policies, procedures, strategies and decisions on the ability of an organisation to perform the below public sector equality duties. Public sector equality duty section 149 of the Equality Act 2010:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and to have due regard for advancing equality by:

    - Removing or minimising disadvantages experienced by people due to their protected characteristics
    - Taking steps to meet the needs of people from protected groups where these are different from the needs of other people

  Encouraging people with protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low

Section One	
Name of the area / protocol that this EIA relates to:	The development and implementation of the REF 2029 Code of Practice for USW and RWCMD preparations for submission to REF 2029.
Equality Impact Assessment Completed by:	Professor Martin Steggall, PVC-R&I / Dr Sarah Theobald, Head of Research Environment in Enterprise, Research and Commercialisation (ERC)
Date completed:	March 2026
Who is responsible for the Equality Impact Assessment?	Professor Martin Steggall, PVC-R&I

Section Two - Purpose and aims of the policy, procedure, strategy or decision required
Please provide a brief description of the policy/procedure, strategy, e-learning, guidance etc. Please include what the overall objective or purpose is, the stated aims (including who the intended beneficiaries are), a broad description of how this will be achieved, what the measure of success will be, and the time frame for achieving this. Please also include a brief description of how the purpose and aims of the policy are relevant to equality and intended beneficiaries.

Description
To be eligible to submit to Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2029, institutions must have an approved REF 2029 code of practice (CoP) in place to ensure processes and procedures for REF 2029 are conducted responsibly and adhere to the principles of the CoP. Our REF 2029 CoP outlines the process for identifying staff with a significant responsibility for research (SRR), determining research independence, allocating contracts to units of assessment (UoAs) and the identification and selection of research outputs for submission to the REF 2029.

The CoP applies to both the University of South Wales (USW) and the Royal Welsh College of Music and Drama (RWCMD), which are part of the USW Group. For this Equality Impact Assessment (EIA), references to the 'the University', 'we' or 'our' refer collectively to USW and RWCMD unless otherwise stated.

While REF 2029 represents a new assessment cycle, the approach builds on institutional experience from previous REF exercises (REF 2014 and REF 2021), for which the institution developed and implemented a CoP to guide fair, transparent and consistent processes.

The CoP sets out our approach the following:

- Part 1: Robustness, transparency and EDI, contextualisation within institutional policies and update since REF 2021.
- Part 2: Identification of staff contracts with SRR
- Part 3: Determining research independence (for 'Research-only' staff)
- Part 4: Allocating contracts to UoAs
- Part 5: Selecting outputs

A combined approach to the EIA
For the purpose of this EIA, the analysis considers the combined processes and procedures set out in Parts 2 to 5 of the CoP. These processes and procedures are closely interconnected within the REF 2029 framework and are, therefore, considered together to provide a comprehensive assessment of potential equality impacts across the REF preparation process, most notably managed by our annual Mock REF exercises.

The equality analysis primarily relates to 'Teaching and Research (T&R)' staff whose contracts are identified as having SRR and to 'Research-only (RO)', as these groups for the population relevant to the REF 2029 volume measure and institutional submission. Comparisons are made with the with the wider staff population to provide context for interpreting the data observed within the 'Mock REF core group'.

The equality monitoring data used in this EIA is based on data held by the University, including information collected through internal equality monitoring processes and datasets used to support the Mock REF exercises. The analysis is supplemented by relevant external sector evidence to provide context for interpreting patterns within the University data. In some cases, interpretation of the data has been limited by small population sizes or by staff choosing not to disclose personal information, and so some findings should, therefore, be interpreted recognising these limitations.

Purpose
There have been some key changes for REF 2029, including Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data to determine the volume measure/Full-time equivalent of each submission/UoA and breaking the link/decoupling staff from outputs. This means that the focus of REF 2029 has shifted to the assessment of institutions, rather than the assessment of individuals. The purpose of the relevant sections of the University's CoP (Parts 2 to 5) is, therefore, to establish fair, transparent and consistent institutional processes.

For REF 2029, the volume measure is derived from eligible staff contracts reported through the HESA staff record data rather than the submission of individual staff. Research outputs must demonstrate a substantive link via an eligible employment relationship. The CoP, therefore, aims to ensure that our process and procedures are conducted in a fair, transparent and consistent manner that aligns with the REF 2029 guidance and the University's CoP. These processes and procedures support the identification of research activity and outputs that best demonstrate the quality and breadth of research undertaken within the institution while ensuring that all eligible staff are treated equitably.

Beneficiaries
The intended beneficiaries of the CoP are:

- Staff whose research outputs may be considered for submission to REF 2029
- The University, through the representation of high-quality research activity.
- The wider academic community and University as whole, as the outcomes of the submission to REF 2029 provides financial (via Quality-related (QR) funding allocated by Medr) and reputational (e.g., via league tables) benefits.

Process
The process covered by this EIA covers Parts 2 to 5 of the CoP template, and so is relevant to several stages of our REF 2029 preparations:

Parts 2 and 3: The identification of staff contracts with SRR and determining research independence are embedded within existing faculty and College appraisal processes for current and newly appointed staff. For USW, this process is also aligned to our Research and Innovation Groups (RIGs) (thereby aligning to our Research and Innovation Strategy 2030), which will enable a transparent and verifiable record of evidence.

Part 4: Allocation of contracts to UoAs is undertaken in line with REF 2029 main panel descriptors (once published), RIG themes to ensure that our research activity is represented within the most appropriate UoA.

Part 5: Staff are invited to self-select outputs for consideration where they believe the output meet a minimum quality threshold of two star (internationally recognised in terms of originality, significance and rigour). This inclusive approach enables staff to engage with the process and provides opportunities for continued participation and outputs to be considered over time. Outputs are reviewed through internal peer review and supported by external peer review. Feedback is given on each of the criteria of originality, significance and rigour and overall feedback in the form of a star rating and narrative for each. Metrics such as journal impact factors are not used to determine quality in this assessment process. To that all potential eligible outputs are considered, the University will also review outputs recorded within our research information management system (Pure), including outputs of former members of staff.

Preparations for REF 2029 are supported by our annual mock REF exercises, where an update on the potential size and scope of the submission and the outcomes of the review of outputs is presented through our committee structure including to University Executive and Academic Board. Staff are also provided feedback on the review of their outputs.

Measures of success

Measures of success will include:

- A transparent and robust annual mock REF process that is understood by staff and how they can engage.
- Consistent application of procedures across the institution along with compliance with REF 2029 guidance and the University REF 2029 CoP.
- Staff confidence that our processes and procedures are fair, transparent and inclusive.
- Successful approval of the University REF 2029 CoP by Medr following submission in May 2026.
- Clear and consistent process for identifying staff contracts with SRR and determining research independence, embedded within the University processes and procedures.
- Consistent and transparent allocation of eligible contracts to appropriate UoAs in line with REF guidance and our University REF 2029 CoP.

- Ensuring that all outputs that meet the criteria for inclusion in REF 2029 authored by our staff are considered.
- Submission of the University REF 2029 submission that presents our highest quality research whilst reflecting the diversity and representativeness of outputs.

Relevance to EDI and intended beneficiaries

The purpose and aims of the CoP are closely aligned with the institutions commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI). The CoP has been developed to be inclusive by design, ensuring that processes relating to the identification of staff contracts with SRR, determining research independence, the allocation of contracts to UoAs, and selection of outputs are based on clear, transparent and consistent processes and procedures. By focussing on the institutional assessment of research activity, rather than the assessment of individual staff members, REF 2029 supports a more equitable approach to recognising research activity across the institution.

EDI is supported through:

- Clear guidance and transparent criteria for the identification of staff contracts with SRR and determining research independence.
- Transparent processes for allocating contracts to UoAs.
- Annual mock REF exercise inviting staff to self-select outputs for consideration and review.
- Consideration of all outputs known to the University for potential consideration and review via Pure.
- Structured review, feedback, and reporting process for the selection of outputs.
- Measures to mitigate potential unconscious bias in peer review and assessment processes.
- Consideration of diversity and representativeness of outputs when determining the final output pool for submission.

Equality considerations will be embedded throughout the process. The University monitors participation and outcomes where appropriate to identify potential differential impacts on staff with protected characteristics and will take steps to address any issues identified. Through these measures, the activity seeks to ensure that the identification and selection of outputs is conducted in a way that is equitable, accessible and supportive of a diverse research community across the University.

Development of the REF 2029 CoP and REF 2029 guidance

This CoP has been developed in line with the REF 2029 guidance available at the time of writing. Further guidance, including the Panel criteria and working methods and other documents outlined in the REF 2029 timetable will be published in due course. As

such, some aspects of this CoP may be subject to change. Furthermore, we will not make final decisions on the selection of outputs until near the submission deadline of November 2028, at which time further analysis and review can be undertaken.

This EIA also builds on the outcomes of the EIAs undertaken for REF 2021, which informed the development of the REF 2029 CoP and the University's ongoing approach to monitoring EDI in REF preparations. These EIAs focussed the identification of staff with SRR, determining research independence, and the final selection/attribution of outputs, and concluded that the process was generally applied fairly and transparently, with no evidence of unlawful discrimination or adverse impact in protected characteristics.

The analysis did highlight, however, areas where continued monitoring was important, particularly in relation to the representation of female staff and part-time staff in our REF process. The University have, therefore, continued to embed EDI considerations in our institutional and research culture initiatives, including Athena Swan action plans, Women Development Programme and Women in STEM, and the continued monitoring of equality monitoring data in our annual Mock REF exercises.

The REF 2029 CoP and this EIA build on the outcomes and progress since REF 2021 to ensure our preparations for REF 2029 remain fair, transparent, and inclusive, and that any potential impacts are identified and addressed where appropriate.

Section Three – Who is affected? How have you engaged and consulted stakeholders?	
Within the USW Community which specific communities are impacted i.e. Staff, Students, Wider Community?	The University REF 2029 primarily affects staff within the USW and RWCMD whose roles include research activity or whose research outputs may be considered for submission to REF 2029. This includes: - **Academic staff on T&R contracts** who may be identified as having SRR. - **RO** staff who will undergo a process to determine research independence. - **Staff whose research outputs may be considered** for inclusion in REF 2029. - **Academic and professional services staff** involved in REF preparations, governance and decision-making. The wider University community may also be indirectly affected as the University considers research, and by extension the REF, as everyone's business. They may be affected by the benefits REF attracts including QR funding, league table status and wider benefits such as collaborative opportunities and attraction of research income.
What consultation and engagement are you planning to undertake with these groups and stakeholders? (e.g. consultation with community partners, Elected Reps; Student Activities/Networks, Staff Consultancy Group, NUS, Equality and Diversity Steering Group?)	The development of the University REF 2029 CoP has involved engagement with a range of internal staff, committees and groups to ensure the processes and procedures are fair, transparent and informed by EDI considerations. Engagement has included: - Development of the CoP through the **USW REF 2029 CoP Task and Finish Group** which included representatives from Executive, the Associate Deans for Research and Innovation (ADRIs), Professional Services colleagues and academic representatives for all four main panels. The T&F Group included representation from USW and RWCMD. - **University REF Strategy Group and REF Working Group**, which provide oversight of REF 2029 preparations and support the development of institutional processes and procedures. - **ADRIs and REF Leads**, who are responsible for leading on the development of the submissions to REF 2029.

	- **Professional Services colleagues** involved in REF 2029 preparations, including those responsible for research management and monitoring equality data. - The University **EDI team** via the USW REF 2029 T&F Group, who have provided training from the outset of the development of the CoP, and advice on equality considerations and EIAs. - Consultation with **staff representative groups**, most notably the University College Union (UCU). In addition, the University will undertake an **all staff-consultation** running from the 17 March to 15 April 2026, providing an opportunity for colleagues to review our approach to submitting to REF 2029 and provide feedback before final submission of the CoP to Medr. We have also sought engagement with the following University committees/groups: - **University Executive**, which considers the strategic direction of our preparations to REF 2029 and will approve the submission of the CoP and the University's REF 2029 submission. - **Research and Innovation Committee**, which review the outcomes of the annual Mock REF exercises and CoP and recommend the submission of the CoP and the University's REF 2029 submission to Academic Board. - **Academic Board,** which provides approval for submission as the University's senior academic governance committee. Engagement with staff also happens through our **annual Mock REF exercises**, which provides opportunities for staff to propose outputs and receive feedback. The annual exercises support transparency and allow the University to monitor progress and provide strategic interventions if required. Further communication and engagement will continue throughout the University's REF 2029 preparations to ensure staff are aware of the CoP and understand how the processes and procedures may affect them. We will develop and publish **accompanying FAQs** on the USW intranet and make these available to RWCMD. They

	will be updated as necessary to reflect any queries or new guidance published by the REF team at Research England. **Welsh language considerations** The **approved CoP** will be available on the University research website, in Welsh and English, in line with Welsh Language Standards. Research outputs produced in Welsh are welcomed and will be assessed equitably through the University's internal Mock REF exercise review process. Where outputs are submitted in Welsh, appropriate reviewers with relevant disciplinary expertise and Welsh language competence will be identified to ensure fair assessment.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Section Four – Equality Impact Considerations</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Please indicate against each of the following protected characteristics, what the impact of the policy, procedure, strategies would be and actions you will take to mitigate any negative or adverse impact identified.

Individual rights under the Equality Act 2010 | EHRC (equalityhumanrights.com)</td></tr>
<tr><th>Equality Impact Considerations</th><th>Potential Impact + / -</th><th>Actions to be taken to mitigate or remove the negative or adverse impact if identified</th><th>Lead</th><th>Timeline</th></tr>
<tr><td>Age: impact upon all ages and age groups

Age groups can be quite wide (for example, ‘people under 50’ or 'under 18s'). They can also be quite specific (for example, ‘people in their mid-40s’). Terms such as ‘young person’ and ‘youthful’ or ‘elderly’ and ‘pensioner’ can also indicate an age group.

Age discrimination | EHRC equalityhumanrights.com)

What considerations are needed?</td><td>Analysis of the Mock REF exercises shows some differences in age profile of the Mock REF core group compared with the overall staff population across the three Mock REF exercises.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2023</th></tr>
<tr><th>Age</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>20 - 24</td><td>0.00%</td><td>**</td></tr>
<tr><td>25 - 29</td><td>**</td><td>2.94%</td></tr>
<tr><td>30 - 34</td><td>3.91%</td><td>7.69%</td></tr>
<tr><td>35 - 39</td><td>7.82%</td><td>10.18%</td></tr>
<tr><td>40 - 44</td><td>15.08%</td><td>13.46%</td></tr>
<tr><td>45 - 49</td><td>18.44%</td><td>15.50%</td></tr>
<tr><td>50 - 54</td><td>13.41%</td><td>15.50%</td></tr>
<tr><td>55 - 59</td><td>20.67%</td><td>16.29%</td></tr>
<tr><td>60 - 64</td><td>11.73%</td><td>12.56%</td></tr>
<tr><td>65+</td><td>7.26%</td><td>5.77%</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>The mitigation actions described below apply across all protected characteristics unless otherwise stated. Where relevant, additional initiatives relating to specific protected characteristics are also highlighted.

<u>Core mitigations:</u>

REF 2029 decouples/breaks the link between staff and outputs, reducing the</td><td>Executive, PVC-R&I and the REF 2029 Steering Group.</td><td>Ongoing monitoring throughout REF 2029 through to submission in 2028 and post REF 2029 submission analysis, with annual review through the Mock REF exercises and committee</td></tr>
</table>

	Mock REF 2024 **Age** / **Mock REF Core Group %** / **Whole population %** 20 - 24 — 0.00% — ** 25 - 29 — ** — 4.03% 30 - 34 — 4.57% — 7.02% 35 - 39 — 8.00% — 10.59% 40 - 44 — 14.29% — 13.12% 45 - 49 — 17.71% — 16.80% 50 - 54 — 13.71% — 15.54% 55 - 59 — 22.29% — 16.00% 60 - 64 — 10.86% — 11.39% 65+ — 6.86% — 5.06% **Mock REF 2025** **Age** / **Mock REF Core Group %** / **Whole population %** 20 - 24 — — ** 25 - 29 — ** — 2.28% 30 - 34 — ** — 8.19% 35 - 39 — 4.90% — 8.86% 40 - 44 — 14.22% — 14.36% 45 - 49 — 17.16% — 17.85% 50 - 54 — 14.71% — 15.03% 55 - 59 — 23.04% — 16.91% 60 - 64 — 12.25% — 10.60% 65+ — 8.82% — 5.77% The age profile of the Mock REF core group broadly reflects the overall staff population,		reliance on individual output volume. **REF 2029 does not include a minimum number of outputs per individual staff member.** This reduced potential disadvantage for staff whose research productivity may have been affected by factors such as career stage, part-time working, caring responsibilities, or other circumstances affecting research activity. REF 2029 replaces the individual staff circumstance output reduction process with a **new unit reduction process**. Once, published, this will allow institutions to		reporting structure.

	although some variations are observed across age groups. Staff in the 55-59 age group appear slightly more represented within the Mock REF core group compared with the overall staff population across the three Mock REF exercises. Conversely staff in some of the younger age groups, particularly 30-34 and 35-39, appear slightly less represented. These differences may reflect variations in career stage and research activity across age groups rather than our Mock REF processes and procedures. Early Career Researchers (ECRs) may be more likely to be represented within younger age groups and may have had less opportunity to establish a research profile during the REF 2029 period. Thus, continued monitoring of the Mock REF exercises will continue to ensure that our REF 2029 processes and procedures remain fair and inclusive across all age groups. Sector evidence has similarly highlighted that research career development and progression typically occur over time (Equality in higher education: statistical reports 2023 | Advance HE, REF 2021 Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel Final Report), with senior researchers more likely to have established research portfolios and leadership roles. The REF also recognises the importance of supporting ECRs and ensuring that assessment processes do not disadvantage staff at earlier stages of their research careers.	account for the cumulative impact of staff circumstances without requiring individuals to disclose personal information. **A recommended maximum of five outputs per substantive link** helps prevents dominance by individuals with larger publication portfolios. **Annual Mock REF exercises** allow staff to self-select outputs, providing repeated opportunities for participation and feedback. Output selection is based on **peer review** using REF 2029 indicators of quality (originality,		

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continued monitoring of participation and outcomes in the Mock REF exercises will ensure that our REF 2029 processes and procedures remain fair and inclusive across all age groups.</td>
<td rowspan="2">significance and rigour). Metrics such as impact factors are not used in the review process.

The University will review output records in Pure, including those of former staff, to ensure a comprehensive and representative output pool.

Outputs will normally demonstrate a substantive link to authors who have SRR or are determined as research independent. This approach helps to ensure that expectations relating to research outputs align with staff who receive explicit time and resource to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability:

In the Equality Act, a disability means a physical or a mental condition which has a substantial and long-term impact on your ability to do normal day to day activities.

Under the Equality Act if you have a progressive condition like HIV, cancer or multiple sclerosis, even if you are currently able to carry out normal day to day activities. You are protected as soon as you are diagnosed with a progressive condition.

You are also covered by the Equality Act if you had a disability in the past. For example, if you had a mental health condition in</td>
<td>Analysis of Mock REF exercises shows that staff declaring disability are slightly underrepresented in the Mock REF core group compared with the overall population, although the gap is small and has reduced over time.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2023</th></tr>
<tr><th>Disability</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>Disabled</td><td>5.03%</td><td>6.45%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Information not provided</td><td>75.98%</td><td>74.43%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Not available</td><td>**</td><td>**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Not disabled</td><td>16.20%</td><td>16.06%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Prefer not to say</td><td>**</td><td>2.60%</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2024</th></tr>
<tr><th>Disability</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>Disabled</td><td>5.14%</td><td>7.48%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Information not provided</td><td>11.43%</td><td>21.63%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Not available</td><td>**</td><td>**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Not disabled</td><td>79.43%</td><td>67.20%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Prefer not to say</td><td>**</td><td>3.11%</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2025</th></tr>
<tr><th>Disability</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td>Executive, PVC-R&I and the REF 2029 Steering Group.</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring throughout REF 2029 through to submission in 2028 and post REF 2029 submission analysis, with annual review through the Mock REF exercises and committee reporting structure.</td>
</tr>
</table>

the past which lasted for over 12 months, but you have now recovered, you are still protected from discrimination because of that disability. Disability discrimination | EHRC (equalityhumanrights.com) **What considerations are required?**	<table><tr><td>Disabled</td><td>6.37%</td><td>7.38%</td></tr><tr><td>Information not provided</td><td>19.12%</td><td>20.81%</td></tr><tr><td>Not available</td><td>**</td><td>**</td></tr><tr><td>Not disabled</td><td>70.10%</td><td>67.65%</td></tr><tr><td>Prefer not to say</td><td>**</td><td>2.95%</td></tr></table> Representation of disabled staff has improved slightly across the three Mock REF exercises, suggesting progress towards a greater alignment with the overall population. However, interpretation of the data is limited by the high proportion of staff who declared their disability status as 'information not provided'. Sector evidence indicated that disabled academic may face barriers in research careers, including challenges relating to workload management, disclosure of disability, and access to reasonable adjustments (Equality in higher education: statistical reports 2023 | Advance HE). The REF 2021 Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel Final Report also recognised that health conditions and disabilities may affect research productivity or career progression and highlighted the importance of institutional processes that support fairness and transparency in research assessment. The guidance in REF 2029, including breaking the link between staff and outputs and the absence of a minimum number of outputs for individuals, helps to reduce potential disadvantage where disability or	conduct research at the University. **Monitoring of participation and outcomes** in the Mock REF exercises will be undertaken to identify any differences in representation and ensure the processes remain fair and inclusive. Wider equality data, including gender equality initiatives such as Athena Swan (awarded in November 2025) may be considered where appropriate. The allocation of outputs (including to multiple UoAs) will be considered alongside the REF 2029 UoA descriptors (once published). This will		

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>health-related circumstances may affect research activity.

Continued monitoring of participation and outcomes in the Mock REF exercises will ensure that our REF 2029 processes and procedures remain fair and inclusive for disabled staff.</td>
<td rowspan="2">approach ensure a fair allocation of outputs to UoAs and ensure that interdisciplinary research is recognised and not disadvantaged.

Staff are able to indicate where their output(s) may align to more than one UoA in the self-selection process. REF and RIG Leads will also conduct their own review and recommend to the REF Strategy Group submission of outputs to multiple UoAs.

The allocation of staff contracts to UoAs will follow a clear and consistent approach, including alignment with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity: impact upon people who identify as Trans or Gender Non-Conforming, including people who have non-binary, agender, gender queer or gender fluid identities.

In the Equality Act, gender identity is called gender reassignment and means proposing to undergo, undergoing or having undergone a process to reassign your sex.

To be protected from gender reassignment discrimination, you do not need to have undergone any medical treatment or surgery to change from</td>
<td>Analysis of the Mock REF exercises shows that very small proportions of staff have provided gender identity within both the Mock REF core group and the overall staff population. A large proportion of responses across three exercises are provided as information not provided, which limits the ability to analyse the data and draw meaningful comparisons.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2023</th></tr>
<tr><th>Gender Identity</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>Gender identity is the same as the gender originally assigned at birth</td><td>3.35%</td><td>1.58%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Information not provided</td><td>96.65%</td><td>98.42%</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2024</th></tr>
<tr><th>Gender Identity</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>Gender identity is the same as the gender originally assigned at birth</td><td>96.57%</td><td>98.50%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Information not provided</td><td>3.43%</td><td>1.38%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Prefer not to say</td><td>0.00%</td><td>**</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td>Executive, PVC-R&I and the REF 2029 Steering Group.</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring throughout REF 2029 through to submission in 2028 and post REF 2029 submission analysis, with annual review through the Mock REF exercises and committee reporting structure.</td>
</tr>
</table>

your birth sex to your preferred gender. You can be at any stage in the transition process, from proposing to reassign your sex, undergoing a process of reassignment, or having completed it. It does not matter whether or not you have applied for or obtained a Gender Recognition Certificate, which is the document that confirms the change of a person's legal sex. Gender reassignment discrimination | EHRC (equalityhumanrights.com) **What considerations are required?**	**Mock REF 2025** **Gender Identity** / **Mock REF Core Group %** / **Whole population %** Gender identity is the same as the gender originally assigned at birth: ** / ** Information not provided: 98.04% / 98.66% Prefer not to say: / ** The data does not indicate any clear pattern of representation within the Mock REF core group compared with the overall staff population. The high proportion of staff recorded as information not provided means that the interpretation of data is limited and so conclusions cannot be reached. Sector evidence similarly highlights that disclosure of gender identity data in higher education is often low, with many choosing not to provide this information due to privacy concerns or the small size of the population represented in institutional datasets (Equality in higher education: statistical reports 2023 | Advance HE). The REF 2021 Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel Final Report also recognised that some protected characteristics may be underrepresented or not disclosed in equality monitoring data, which can limit the ability to identify trends. Gender identity is not considered in our REF 2029 processes and procedures for identifying staff contracts with SRR or determining research	HESA cost centres and RIG themes. **Institutional initiatives** such as the ECR network and proposed Mid-career Researcher (MCR) development programme support career progression and research development across career stages. **The identification of staff with SRR of our Teaching and Research staff and determining research independence of our Research-only staff, are embedded within existing institutional and faculty processes**, including the annual and mid-term appraisal and our Research and		

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>independence (or selecting outputs). Given the data is limited, any differences in the data are likely not created by our REF processes and procedures, rather the difference already existing in the overall staff population.</td>
<td rowspan="2">Innovation Group structure. These processes form part of the normal academic management arrangements and are not established solely for REF purposes. REF preparations, therefore, draw on data generated through these established processes, including our Research and Innovation Group structure, ensuring consistency and transparency.

Oversight of the Mock REF exercises is provided through the University committee and group governance structures, supporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage & civil partnership: people are protected from discrimination on the basis of marriage and civil partnership in relation to employment.

In the Equality Act marriage and civil partnership means someone who is legally married or in a civil partnership.
People do not have this characteristic if they are:

• single
• living with someone as a couple neither married nor civil partners
• engaged to be married but not married</td>
<td>Analysis of Mock REF exercises shows broadly similar representation across marriage and civil partnership categories between the Mock REF core group and the overall staff population.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2023</th></tr>
<tr><th>Marriage and civil partnerships</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>Civil Partnership</td><td>0.00%</td><td>1.24%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Divorced</td><td>**</td><td>3.28%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Information not provided</td><td>15.08%</td><td>12.33%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Married</td><td>53.63%</td><td>51.02%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Partner</td><td>10.06%</td><td>9.16%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Prefer not to say</td><td>3.35%</td><td>2.94%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Separated</td><td>**</td><td>1.13%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Single</td><td>14.53%</td><td>18.33%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Widowed</td><td>**</td><td>**</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2024</th></tr>
<tr><th>Marriage and civil partnerships</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>Civil Partnership</td><td>0.00%</td><td>1.15%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Divorced</td><td>**</td><td>3.57%</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td>Executive, PVC-R&I and the REF 2029 Steering Group.</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring throughout REF 2029 through to submission in 2028 and post REF 2029 submission analysis, with annual review through the Mock REF exercises and committee reporting structure.</td>
</tr>
</table>

- divorced or a person whose civil partnership has been dissolved

[Marriage and civil partnership discrimination | EHRC (equalityhumanrights.com)]

What impact considerations are required?

Information not provided	13.71%	12.20%
Married	54.86%	51.21%
Partner	10.86%	9.44%
Prefer not to say	3.43%	2.88%
Separated	**	0.92%
Single	14.29%	18.18%
Widowed	0.00%	**

Mock REF 2025

Marriage and civil partnerships	Mock REF Core Group %	Whole population %
Civil Partnership	**	**
Divorced	**	4.03%
Information not provided	13.24%	9.80%
Married	54.41%	51.68%
Partner	8.82%	9.80%
Prefer not to say	**	2.42%
Separated	**	**
Single	16.18%	19.60%
Widowed	**	**
Formally in a Civil Partnership		**

The representation of marriage and civil partnership categories within the Mock REF core group is broadly aligned with the overall staff population, with only small variations across the three exercises.

consistency and fairness in decision making. Outcomes of the annual Mock REF exercises are reported each May to support the review of progress and the identification of any strategic interventions required.

EDI training is provided to staff involved in REF 2029 preparations and decision-making to support fair, transparent and consistent processes and procedures as articulated in the CoP. This includes mandatory institutional EDI training for line managers and REF-focussed EDI training addressing

	Single staff appear slightly underrepresented un the Mock REF core group compared with the overall staff population. Marriage and civil partnership are not considered in our REF 2029 processes and procedures for identifying staff contracts with SRR or determining research independence (or selecting outputs). Any differences in the data are likely not created by our REF processes and procedures, rather the difference already existing in the overall staff population. Sector guidance similarly recognises that marriage and civil partnership relate primarily to protection from discrimination in employment rather than differences in career progression or research activity (Marriage and civil partnership discrimination | EHRC). As a result, marital status is generally not considered a direct factor in research assessment processes such as the REF. Any differences observed in the data are, therefore, more likely to reflect the composition of the overall staff population rather than the REF processes and procedures themselves.	unconscious bias and inclusive decision making in relation to SRR, determining research independence and the selection of outputs. The CoP includes details of an appeals process to ensure staff are able to challenge decisions relating to SRR and determining research independence. Appeals are considered through existing University appeals processes.		
Pregnancy & Maternity: Maternity refers to up to 26 weeks after giving birth, or when the parent returns to work in an employment context, it includes protection from	Analysis of the Mock REF exercises shows that very small numbers of staff are recorded for pregnancy and maternity with both the Mock REF core group and the overall staff population. Due to the small numbers involved, most of the data is redacted so that individual staff are not identified. This limits the ability to interpret the data and draw	**Characteristic-specific initiatives** **Disability:** The University's EDI policies, schemes and resources,	Executive, PVC-R&I and the REF 2029 Steering Group.	Ongoing monitoring throughout REF 2029 through to submission in 2028

<table>
<tr>
<td>discrimination in relation to breastfeeding.

The Equality Act says you must not be discriminated against during the protected period because:
• of your pregnancy, or
• because of illness suffered by you as a result of your pregnancy
• you are a woman on compulsory maternity leave
• you are exercising or seeking to exercise your right to ordinary or additional maternity leave

Pregnancy and maternity discrimination | EHRC (equalityhumanrights.com)

What impact considerations are required?</td>
<td>any meaningful conclusions between the Mock REF core group and overall staff population across the three Mock REF exercises.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Mock REF 2023</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">Pregnancy and Maternity</th></tr>
<tr><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>**</td><td>0.8</td></tr>
</table>
<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Mock REF 2024</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">Pregnancy and Maternity</th></tr>
<tr><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>0.0%</td><td>**</td></tr>
</table>
<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2025</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="3">Pregnancy and Maternity Core Group</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>Parental Leave</td><td>**</td><td>**</td></tr>
</table>

Sector evidence highlights that pregnancy, maternity and parental leave may affect working patterns and career progression in higher education, and that institutional datasets often contain small numbers which limits detailed analysis (Equality in higher education: statistical reports 2023 | Advance HE). The REF 2021 Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel Final Report also recognised that equality-related circumstances, including maternity and paternity leave, may affect research productivity and</td>
<td>including ‘Disability at USW’ and the ‘Workplace Reasonable Adjustment Passport’ support disabled staff including those affected by the CoP.

Sex: University gender equality initiatives including the award of the Athena Swan Bronze award in November 2025, the Women’s Development Programme and sector wide initiatives such as Wales Women in STEM, would support the development and progression of women in research careers.

Race: University race equality</td>
<td></td>
<td>and post REF 2029 submission analysis, with annual review through the Mock REF exercises and committee reporting structure.</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emphasised the importance of transparent institutional processes and procedures to ensure fairness in research assessment. Furthermore, guidance from Pregnancy and maternity: Pregnancy | EHRC confirms that pregnancy and maternity are protected characteristics within employment and individuals must not be treated unfavourably because of pregnancy or maternity leave.

Pregnancy and maternity are not considered in our REF 2029 processes and procedures for identifying staff contracts with SRR or determining research independence (or selecting outputs). Any differences in the data are likely not created by our REF processes and procedures, rather the difference already existing in the overall staff population.</td>
<td rowspan="2">initiatives, including the award of the Race Equality Charter Bronze Award in July 2025, supports institutional work to improve equality data, governance and the progression of staff from minority ethnic backgrounds. These initiatives contribute to monitoring representation in research careers and support the fair and inclusive implementation of REF-related processes and the CoP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: impact upon people in relation to their race, nationality, ethnic or national origin.

In the Equality Act, race can mean your colour, or your nationality (including your citizenship). It can also mean your ethnic or national origins, which may not be the same as your current nationality.</td>
<td>Analysis of the Mock REF exercise shows that staff who identified as Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) are slightly more represented within the Mock REF core group compared with the overall staff population across the three Mock REF exercises.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2023</th></tr>
<tr><th>Race (Summary)</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>BME</td><td>18.44%</td><td>12.22%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Information not provided</td><td>**</td><td>1.70%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Not Stated</td><td>**</td><td>2.04%</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td>Executive, PVC-R&I and the REF 2029 Steering Group.</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring throughout REF 2029 through to submission in 2028 and post REF 2029 submission analysis, with annual</td>
</tr>
</table>

For example, you may have Chinese national origins and be living in Britain with a British passport.

Race also covers ethnic and racial groups. This means a group of people who all share the same protected characteristic of ethnicity or race.

A racial group can be made up of two or more distinct racial groups, for example black Britons, British Asians, British Sikhs, British Jews, Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers.

Race discrimination | EHRC (equalityhumanrights.com)

What considerations are required?

White	78.77%	84.05%

Mock REF 2024

Race (Summary)	Mock REF Core Group %	Whole population %
BME	18.86%	12.20%
Information not provided	0.00%	2.30%
Not Stated	**	1.73%
White	79.43%	83.77%

Mock REF 2025

Race (Summary)	Mock REF Core Group %	Whole population %
BME	16.67%	13.42%
Information not provided		1.61%
Not Stated	**	1.61%
White	80.88%	83.36%

The representation of ethnic groups within the Mock REF core group is broadly comparable with the overall population, with staff identifying as BME slightly overrepresented compared with the whole staff population across the three Mock REF exercises. This suggests that participation in the Mock REF exercises reflects the diversity of the staff population and does not indicate any disadvantage to minority groups based on race with the process and procedures for identifying staff contracts with SRR, determining research independence, or selecting outputs.

review through the Mock REF exercises and committee reporting structure.

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sector evidence highlighted that minority ethnic staff are often underrepresented in senior academic and research leadership roles within higher education, which can affect representation across research career pathways (Equality in higher education: statistical reports 2023 | Advance HE). The REF 2021 Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel Final Report also emphasised the importance of institutional processes and procedures that promote fairness and transparency in research assessment and support equality of opportunity across protected characteristics.

Continued monitoring of participation and outcomes in Mock REF exercises will ensure that our REF 2029 processes and procedures in our CoP reman fair and inclusive across all ethnic groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Belief : impact upon people with different religions, beliefs or non-beliefs.

The Equality Act 2010 says you must not be discriminated against because:
• you are (or are not) of a particular religion
• you hold (or do not hold) a particular philosophical belief</td>
<td>Analysis of the Mock REF exercise shows broadly similar representation of religion and belief within the Mock REF core group compared with the overall staff population across the three Mock REF exercises.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2023</th></tr>
<tr><th>Religion and belief</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>Any other religion or belief</td><td>**</td><td>1.92%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Buddhist</td><td>**</td><td>1.13%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Christian</td><td>22.91%</td><td>27.26%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Christian - Roman Catholic</td><td>0.00%</td><td>**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Hindu</td><td>**</td><td>1.70%</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive, PVC-R&I and the REF 2029 Steering Group.</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring throughout REF 2029 through to submission in 2028 and post REF 2029 submission analysis, with annual review through</td>
</tr>
</table>

- someone thinks you are of a particular religion or hold a particular belief (this is known as discrimination by perception)
- you are connected to someone who has a religion or belief (this is known as discrimination by association)

In the Equality Act religion or belief can mean any religion, for example an organised religion like Christianity, Judaism, Islam or Buddhism, or a smaller religion like Rastafarianism or Paganism, as long as it has a clear structure and belief system. The Equality Act also covers non-belief or a lack of religion or belief.

[Religion or belief discrimination | EHRC (equalityhumanrights.com)]

Information not provided	34.64%	22.40%
Jewish	0.00%	**
Muslim	5.03%	2.71%
No religion or belief	28.49%	34.95%
Prefer not to say	4.47%	5.77%
Sikh	0.00%	**
Spiritual	**	1.70%

Mock REF 2024

Religion and belief	Mock REF Core Group %	Whole population %
Any other religion or belief	**	2.19%
Buddhist	**	1.15%
Christian	23.43%	27.04%
Christian - Roman Catholic	0.00%	**
Hindu	**	1.61%
Information not provided	33.14%	21.29%
Jewish	0.00%	**
Muslim	5.14%	2.76%
No religion or belief	29.14%	35.90%
Prefer not to say	3.43%	5.41%
Sikh	0.00%	**
Spiritual	**	2.07%

Mock REF 2025

Religion and belief	Mock REF Core Group %	Whole population %
Any other religion or belief	**	1.74%
Buddhist	**	**
Christian	23.53%	29.53%

the Mock REF exercises and committee reporting structure.

What considerations are required?

Christian - Church of Scotland		**
Christian - Roman Catholic		**
Hindu	**	2.01%
Information not provided	28.43%	18.52%
Jewish		**
Muslim	4.90%	2.95%
No religion or belief	32.35%	35.70%
Prefer not to say	**	5.23%
Sikh		**
Spiritual	**	2.28%

The representation of religion and belief categories within the Mock REF core group is broadly comparable with the overall staff population. Staff identifying as Christian or no religion or belief form the largest groups in both the Mock REF core group and the wider staff population across the three Mock REF exercises.

Staff identifying as Muslim appear slightly more represented within the Mock REF core group compared with the overall staff population across the three Mock REF exercises, However the small numbers recorded in several of the categories mean that it is difficult to interpret and draw conclusions.

Interpretation of the data is also limited by the relatively high proportion of in the information not provided category.

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sector guidance highlights that individuals should not experience discrimination in employment because of their religion and belief (religion-or-belief-guide-to-the-law.pdf). The Equality in higher education: statistical reports 2023 | Advance HE also indicates that religion and belief data may contain significant levels of non-disclosure, which can limit detailed analysis of representation across institutional datasets.

Religion or belief are not considered in our REF 2029 processes and procedures for identifying staff contracts with SRR or determining research independence (or selecting outputs). Any differences in the data are likely not created by our REF processes and procedures, rather the difference already existing in the overall staff population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex: impact upon people of different sexes.

In the Equality Act 2010, sex is understood as binary being either male or female. It can mean a group of people like men or boys, or women or girls.

Under the Act, a person’s legal sex is the sex recorded on their birth</td>
<td>Analysis of Mock REF exercises shows that female staff are underrepresented in the Mock REF core group compared with their proportion in the overall population.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Mock REF 2023</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">Mock REF Core Group %</th><th colspan="2">Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><th>Female</th><th>Male</th><th>Female</th><th>Male</th></tr>
<tr><td>35.75%</td><td>64.25%</td><td>46.27%</td><td>53.73%</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="4">Mock REF 2024</th></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">Mock REF Core Group %</th><th colspan="2">Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><th>Female</th><th>Male</th><th>Female</th><th>Male</th></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive, PVC-R&I and the REF 2029 Steering Group.</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring throughout REF 2029 through to submission in 2028 and post REF 2029 submission analysis.</td>
</tr>
</table>

certificate or their Gender Recognition Certificate. A trans person can change their legal sex by obtaining a Gender Recognition Certificate. Sex discrimination | EHRC (equalityhumanrights.com) **What considerations are required?**				

36.00%	64.00%	47.07%	52.93%
Mock REF 2025			
Mock REF Core Group %		**Whole population %**	
Female	**Male**	**Female**	**Male**
37.75%	62.25%	47.79%	52.21%

Female representation in the Mock REF core group has gradually increased over time, suggesting some improvement, although a gap of approximately 10% remains between the core group and the overall population. This may reflect wider institutional factors such as career stage distribution and/or differences in research portfolios, and institutional and sector wide financial challenges.

Sector evidence has highlighted that women remain underrepresented in senior academic and research leadership roles across higher education, which may influence representation in research assessment activities and research career progression (Equality in higher education: statistical reports 2023 | Advance HE). The REF 2021 Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel Final Report also recognised that structural inequalities may affect research careers and emphasised the importance of transparent institutional processes and procedures and equality monitoring in research assessment.

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continued monitoring of participation and outcomes in our Mock REF exercises will help ensure that our REF 2029 processes and procedures in the CoP remain fair and inclusive across all staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation: impact upon people based on their sexual orientation.

The Equality Act 2010 says you must not be discriminated against because:

you are heterosexual, gay, lesbian or bisexual someone thinks you have a particular sexual orientation (this is known as discrimination by perception)
you are connected to someone who has a particular sexual orientation (this is known as discrimination by association)

In the Equality Act, sexual orientation includes how you choose to express your sexual orientation,</td>
<td>Analysis of the Mock REF exercises shows broadly similar representation of sexual orientation within the Mock REF core group compared with the overall staff population across the three Mock REF exercises.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2023</th></tr>
<tr><th>Sexual orientation (Summary)</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>Heterosexual/straight</td><td>54.19%</td><td>63.57%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Information not provided</td><td>36.31%</td><td>24.89%</td></tr>
<tr><td>LGBTQ+</td><td>5.03%</td><td>5.43%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Prefer not to say</td><td>4.47%</td><td>6.11%</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2024</th></tr>
<tr><th>Sexual orientation (Summary)</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>Heterosexual/straight</td><td>55.43%</td><td>64.33%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Information not provided</td><td>34.86%</td><td>23.48%</td></tr>
<tr><td>LGBTQ+</td><td>4.57%</td><td>5.64%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Prefer not to say</td><td>5.14%</td><td>6.56%</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2025</th></tr>
<tr><th>Sexual orientation (Summary)</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive, PVC-R&I and the REF 2029 Steering Group.</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring throughout REF 2029 through to submission in 2028 and post REF 2029 submission analysis, with annual review through the Mock REF exercises and committee reporting structure.</td>
</tr>
</table>

such as through your appearance or the places you visit. Sexual orientation discrimination | EHRC (equalityhumanrights.com) **What considerations are required?**					

Heterosexual/straight	60.29%	66.71%
Information not provided	29.90%	20.67%
LGBTQ+	4.90%	6.17%
Prefer not to say	4.90%	6.44%

The representation of sexual orientation categories within the Mock REF core group is broadly comparable with the overall staff population. Staff identifying as heterosexual/straight form the largest group within both the Mock REF core group and the overall staff population across the three Mock REF exercises.

Staff identifying as LGBTQ+ appear slightly underrepresented within the Mock REF core group compared with the overall staff population across the three Mock REF exercises. However, the difference is relatively small. A higher proportion of staff in the Mock REF core group have their sexual orientation as information not provided, which limits the ability to interpret the data and draw conclusions.

Sector evidence indicates that LGBTQ+ staff may experience barriers to inclusion in the workplace and that sexual orientation data within higher education monitoring may include relatively high levels of non-disclosure (Equality in higher education: statistical reports 2023 \| Advance HE, LGBT in Britain - Work Report (2018) \| Stonewall UK). The REF 2021 Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel Final Report also emphasised the importance

	of institutional processes that promote fairness and transparency in research assessment across protected characteristics. Sexual orientation are not considered in our REF 2029 processes and procedures for identifying staff contracts with SRR or determining research independence (or selecting outputs). Any differences in the data are likely not created by our REF processes and procedures, rather the difference already existing in the overall staff population.			
Social economic Duty as it relates to Equality Act 1. Socio-economic disadvantage 2. Inequalities of outcome 3. Decisions of a strategic nature 4. Due regard **Socio-economic disadvantage definition:** Living in less favourable social and economic circumstances than others in the same society. **Inequalities of outcome definition:** Inequality of	Socio-economic disadvantage is not directly captured within institutional equality monitoring data but may overlap with factors such as working patterns, career stage, contract type. Analysis of institutional data, including part-time and full-time working patterns and intersectionality data was conducted as follows: - Part-time and full-time - Disability and Gender - Race and Gender - Religion/Belief and Gender - Sexual Orientation and Gender - Age and Gender The analysis did not indicate any systemic disadvantage associated with our REF processes and procedures used to identify staff contracts with SRR, determining research independence (and the selection of outputs).		Executive, PVC-R&I and the REF 2029 Steering Group.	Ongoing monitoring throughout REF 2029 through to submission in 2028 and post REF 2029 submission analysis, with annual review through the Mock REF exercises and committee

outcome relates to any measurable difference in outcome between those who have experienced socio-economic disadvantage and the rest of the population. **Decisions of a strategic nature definition**: In general, strategic decisions will be those which affect how the public body fulfils its intended statutory purpose (its functions in regards to the set of powers and duties that it uses to perform its remit) over a significant period of time and will not include routine 'day-to-day' decisions **Due regard definition**: Giving weight to a particular issue in proportion to its relevance. WG42004 A More Equal Wales The Socio-	Some variation in representation may reflect the overall staff population and differences in working pattern or career stage, rather than the way our REF 2029 processes and procedures are applied. Analysis and interpretation of some of the data was limited due to the small numbers, and redacted data. This approach aligns with Welsh Government guidance on Socio-economic Duty and with sector learning from REF 2021 Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel, which emphasised the importance of transparent and fair processes when assessing research contributions. References: - Welsh Government: A More Equal Wales: The Socio-economic Duty | GOV.WALES - REF 2021: REF 2021 Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel Final Report			reporting structure.

economic Duty Equality Act 2010 (gov.wales) **What impact considerations are required?**				
Caring responsibilities A carer is someone who helps another person, usually a relative or friend, in their day-to-day life. **Factsheet 8 The Care Bill – The law for carers** **What impact considerations are required?**	Data on caring responsibilities is not directly captured by USW. However, caring responsibilities may overlap with factors such as working patterns, flexible working arrangements, or career stage. Sector evidence from Advance HE has highlighted that caring responsibilities can influence research career development and progression in higher education, particularly where they affect working patterns or the time available for research. Analysis of the institutional data of those indicated in Socio-economic Duty above, does not indicate any systemic disadvantage associated with our REF 2029 processes and procedures used to identify SRR, determining research independence (and the selection of outputs). Some variation in representation may reflect the overall staff population and differences in working patterns or career stage, rather than the way our REF processes and procedures are applied. Analysis and interpretation of some of the data was limited due to the small numbers, and redacted data.		Executive, PVC-R&I and the REF 2029 Steering Group.	Ongoing monitoring throughout REF 2029 through to submission in 2028 and post REF 2029 submission analysis, with annual review through the Mock REF exercises and committee reporting structure.

	The approach in REF 2029, including using HESA data to determine the volume measure, decoupling/breaking the link between staff and outputs, and the absence of a minimum output requirement, helps to reduce potential disadvantages that may arise when caring responsibilities affect research activity. This approach aligns with the findings from the REF 2021 EDAP final report, which emphasised the importance of transparent and fair institutional processes in research assessment and encouraged institutions to consider structural inequalities that may affect research careers. It also reflects Welsh Government Guidance, which advises public bodies to consider how strategic decisions may contribute to or to help address potential inequalities. Monitoring of participation and outcomes in our annual Mock REF exercises and our final submissions will continue to include consideration of working patterns and other relevant institutional data to ensure that REF-related processes remain fair and inclusive. References: - Advance HE: Equality in higher education: statistical reports 2023 | Advance HE - REF 2021: REF 2021 Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel Final Report - Welsh Government: A More Equal Wales: The Socio-economic Duty | GOV.WALES			

Evidence used and considered for section 4
Your decisions must be based on robust evidence. What evidence base have you used in support? Evidence includes views and issues raised during engagement; service user or citizen journeys, case studies, or experiences; and qualitative and experience-based research, not just quantitative data and statistics. EDI Resource page. **Please list evidence below:**
The EIA for the University's REF 2029 CoP has been informed by a range of quantitative, qualitative and sector-based evidence to ensure that considerations are based on robust and relevant information. Evidence considered includes: **Institutional data and analysis:** Using equality data held by the University relating to protected characteristics, data from the annual Mock REF exercises for 2023, 2024 and 2025 in relation to protected characteristics, and analysis of working patterns (full-time and part-time), and intersectionality data. **Previous EIAs:** EIAs undertaken for REF 2021, including the analysis of the identification of staff with SRR and determining research independence, and the final selection/attribution of outputs, which have informed the development of the REF 2029 CoP and the way we approach our equality monitoring. **Consultation and engagement:** Development of the CoP via the REF 2029 T&F Group, discussion and engagement with key University groups and committees such as University Executive, REF Strategy Group, REF Working Group, Research and Innovation Committee, and Academic Board. We have also sought to engage and discuss the development of the CoP with Professional Services Colleagues from ERC, People and Organisational Development and the EDI team. We have also consulted with staff representative groups and have a planned all-staff consultation on the draft CoP. **External sector evidence:** Using relevant sector evidence from the REF 2021 EDAP, Advance HE, Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), Stonewall, and the Welsh Government (including Welsh Language Standards), as reference in section four.

REF 2029 guidance: Using the REF 2029 Section 8 – Code of Practice guidance – REF 2029 (including the REF 2029 CoP template), Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) Guidance – REF 2029, Section 3 – Volume Measure guidance – REF 2029, and Section 4 – Contributions to Knowledge and Understanding (CKU) guidance – REF 2029.

Ongoing monitoring: We will continue to review the data and evidence throughout the REF 2029 preparations and Mock REF exercises to ensure that our processes remain fair, transparent and inclusive.

Section Five - Welsh Language Considerations

Is there any evidence to indicate this policy / practice / project / procedure / function / decision will have a positive or adverse effect on the use of the Welsh language within the University, and treating the Welsh language no less favourably than the English language?

Please note the impact on Welsh-speaking colleagues and students, including the University's ability to provide a bilingual service, according to the requirements of the Welsh language Standards; the number of students studying through the medium of Welsh at the University, and the impact on the University's Welsh-medium targets, where applicable. If you require advice please email cymraeg@decymru.ac.uk .

Have you sought views of colleagues, students, potential students, visitors, general public, Welsh Unit etc. on the effects (whether positive or adverse) the policy could have on opportunities to use the language? If you require advice or data please email cymraeg@decymru.ac.uk

Welsh Impact Considerations +/-	**Impact on the number of Welsh-speaking colleagues?** Please include number and/or % Analysis of the Mock REF exercises shows that the proportion of staff able to teach through the medium of Welsh within the Mock REF core group is slightly lower than within the overall	**Impact on the number of Welsh-speaking students?** Please include number and/or % The University REF 2029 CoP relates to research rather than teaching provision or student	**Impact on the bilingual academic provision or Welsh language services?**	**Evidence** Please include any additional information or data. N/A

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staff population across the three Mock REF exercises. However, the REF 2029 CoP relates primarily to research rather than teaching, and, therefore, is not expected to have a direct impact on Welsh-medium teaching or Welsh-speaking colleagues or students.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2023</th></tr>
<tr><th>Ability to teach in Welsh</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
<tr><td>Able to teach through the medium of Welsh</td><td>3.91%</td><td>5.77%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Information not sought</td><td>5.59%</td><td>12.67%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Not able to teach through the medium of Welsh</td><td>90.50%</td><td>81.56%</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="3">Mock REF 2024</th></tr>
<tr><th>Ability to teach in Welsh</th><th>Mock REF Core Group %</th><th>Whole population %</th></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td>recruitment. As such, it is not expected to have a direct impact on the number of Welsh-speaking students studying at the University.

No quantitative change in the number or proportion of Welsh-speaking students is anticipated as a result of the process and procedures outlined in the University REF 2029 CoP.</td>
<td>Please note the specific areas, along with the impact to the course / service.

The University REF 2029 CoP relates research rather than teaching provision or services for students and is, therefore, not expected to have a direct impact on bilingual academic provision or Welsh language services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

	Able to teach through the medium of Welsh	4.00%	5.75%		Research outputs produced in Welsh are welcomed and assessed equitably within our preparations for REF 2029 which includes the annual Mock REF exercises and peer review processes. The University REF 2029 CoP will be published in both Welsh and English, and the review of outputs in Welsh will be treated no less	
	Information not sought	4.57%	14.27%			
	Not able to teach through the medium of Welsh	91.43%	79.98%			
	Mock REF 2025					
	Ability to teach in Welsh	**Mock REF Core Group %**	**Whole population %**			
	Able to teach through the medium of Welsh	**	6.71%			
	Information not sought	**	2.42%			
	Not able to teach through the	90.69%	78.79%			

		medium of Welsh				favourably than outputs in English, in line with Welsh Language Standards.	
		Information not provided	**	12.08%			
	The differences are relatively small and are likely to reflect the distribution of Welsh-medium teaching across disciplines rather than any impact arising from REF processes themselves. The process for identifying staff contracts with SRR, determining research independence, allocating staff contracts to UoAs, and selecting outputs are based on research activity and role expectations rather than the language in which teaching or research is undertaken. As such, staff who teach through the medium of Welsh are not expected to be affected by these processes and procedures outlined in the CoP. The CoP also confirms that research outputs produced in the medium of Welsh will be treated no less favourably than those published in						

	English, in line with Welsh Language Standards.			
Consider and note how the policy / practice / project / procedure / function / decision could be formulated (or how the existing policy / practice / project / procedure / function / decision could be changed) **to have a positive effect, or more positive effects,** on opportunities to use the Welsh language, and treating the Welsh language no less favourably than the English language.	Our preparations for REF 2029 are increasing opportunities to use Welsh as follows: - The University REF 2029 CoP supports opportunities to use the Welsh language by ensuring the CoP and associated documentation are published in Welsh and English, where appropriate, in line with Welsh Language Standards. - Research outputs produced in Welsh are welcomed and will be assessed no less favourably than those in English. Where outputs in Welsh are proposed, reviewers with appropriate disciplinary expertise and Welsh language competence will be identified to ensure fair assessment. - We would welcome feedback on the CoP in Welsh.			
Consider and note how the policy / practice / project / procedure / function / decision could be formulated (or how the existing policy / practice / project / procedure / function / decision could be changed) so that it **would not have adverse effects, or fewer adverse effects,** on opportunities to use the Welsh language, and treating the Welsh language	No adverse effects on opportunities to use the Welsh language have been identified. The University's REF 2029 CoP ensures that research outputs produced in Welsh are treated no less favourably than those produced in English and that appropriate reviewers with disciplinary expertise and Welsh language competence are identified where necessary. The approved University REF 2029 CoP (and associated REF documentation, where necessary) will be published in both Welsh and English on the University research website, ensuring compliance with Welsh Language Standards and supporting bilingual engagement with colleagues as the University progresses with our preparations for submission to REF 2029.			

no less favourably than the English language.	
Section Six – Monitoring and Review	
How will you monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of this measures to determine whether it has been effectively and fairly applied	The effectiveness and fairness of the University REF 2029 CoP will be monitored throughout the REF 2029 preparation period. This will include analysis of participation and outcomes from the annual Mock REF exercises, including monitoring equality data where available to identify any differences in representation cross staff groups and protected characteristics. Oversight will be provided through the REF Strategy Group which is chaired by the PVC-R&I. The EIA will also be reviewed periodically, and when new data from the Mock REF exercises becomes available. Where this identifies any potential disproportionate effects, appropriate actions will be considered.
Section Seven – EIA Sign off and Authorisation	
Name & job title of authorised person	
Date of next review, and by whom?	