



### EPSRC - Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Response
1. Name of policy/funding activity/event being assessed	NNUF Phase 2a call
2. Summary of aims and objectives of the policy/funding activity/event	To fund the procurement and installation of analytical equipment for the analysis of radioactive material.
3. What involvement and consultation has been done in relation to this policy? (e.g. with relevant groups and stakeholders)	Community consultation, nuclear sector including Academia and industry and BEIS.
4. Who is affected by the policy/funding activity/event?	Academic community. NNL. CCFE.
5. What are the arrangements for monitoring and reviewing the actual impact of the policy/funding activity/event?	Stringent and defined in the BEIS business case. Six weekly reporting, gateway reviews when appropriate, annual reports for treasury.

As a funder of research, EPSRC remains committed to attracting the best potential researchers from a diverse population into research careers. The Research Councils have together developed the ambitious [RCUK Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan](#) to outline our collective aspirations for working with the research community, and partners throughout the sector. For policy changes, funding activities and events EPSRC will aim to:

- Select venues that are accessible and where possible accommodate any specific requirement in our planning and organisation of an initiative to support wider participation. This includes for applicants, reviewers, panel members and staff. Included in the interview invitation letter is a request for any access issues to be notified.
- All participants in the process are asked to inform staff if they have any additional needs to enable attendance or participation.
- Offer support for people with caring responsibilities, further details are available [here](#).
- Clearly communicate the timeline and key milestones for funding activities, advertise these widely to reach the largest possible audience.
- Support and encourage panel members to follow best practice in taking positive steps to safeguard funding decisions. Staff will work closely with the Panel Chair(s) to agree approaches that are designed to minimize opportunities for bias and improve transparency of the decision making process. This includes managing environmental conditions, such as providing appropriate breaks.
- Support flexible working of stakeholders.
- Ensure diversity of peer review assessment and interview panels. Staff will adhere to a mixed panel policy and endeavor to achieve the minimum 30% for the underrepresented gender on the panel.

- Abide by the principles of peer review
- Provide EPSRC staff with tailored unconscious bias training for Peer Review processes and clear guidance for assessors.
- Handle personal sensitive information in compliance with General Data Protection Regulation 2018.

<b>Protected Characteristic Group</b>	<b>Is there a potential for positive or negative impact?</b>	<b>Please explain and give examples of any evidence/data used</b>	<b>Action to address negative impact (e.g. adjustment to the policy)</b>
<b>Disability</b>	No	Applications will be judged purely on national need.	
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	No	Applications will be judged purely on national need.	
<b>Marriage or civil partnership</b>	No	Applications will be judged purely on national need.	
<b>Pregnancy and maternity</b>	Possibly		BEIS rules stipulate that no extensions to expenditure may be granted. Therefore, host institutions must have a contingency plan in case of a PI having to take maternity leave.
<b>Race</b>	No	Applications will be judged purely on national need.	
<b>Religion or belief</b>	No	Applications will be judged purely on national need.	
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	No	Applications will be judged purely on national need.	
<b>Sex (gender)</b>	No	Applications will be judged purely on national need.	
<b>Age</b>	No	Applications will be judged purely on national need.	

<b>Additional aspects (not covered by a protected characteristic)</b>	None		
---	------	--	--

## Evaluation:

Question	Explanation / justification	
Is it possible the proposed change in policy, funding activity or event could discriminate or unfairly disadvantage people?	No. the call will be assessed according to standard UKRI practice; postal peer review and an ad hoc review panel will make the final recommendations.	
Final Decision:	Tick the relevant box	Include any explanation / justification required
1. No barriers identified, therefore activity will <b>proceed</b> .	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There are no identifiable barriers.
2. You can decide to <b>stop</b> the policy or practice at some point because the data shows bias towards one or more groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If bias is found then mitigating action can be taken, either by stopping the call or changing the process to eliminate bias.
3. You can <b>adapt or change</b> the policy in a way which you think will eliminate the bias	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
4. Barriers and impact identified, however having considered all available options carefully, there appear to be no other proportionate ways to achieve the aim of the policy or practice (e.g. in extreme cases or where positive action is taken). Therefore you are going to <b>proceed with caution</b> with this policy or practice knowing that it may favour some people less than others, providing justification for this decision.		

<b>Will this EIA be published* Yes/Not required</b> (*EIA's should be published alongside relevant funding activities e.g. calls and events:	Yes
<b>Date completed:</b>	10 June 2020
<b>Review date (if applicable):</b>	30 July 2020

## Change log

Name	Date	Version	Change
Neil Bateman	17 Jun 2020	1	More detail added