

Higher Education Museums and Galleries Fund: an equality impact assessment

Summary of key findings

1. Higher Education Museums and Galleries (HEMG) funding is just one component of a complex and integrated research funding system across the university sector. As was highlighted in the [EIA for formula research funding](#) published in 2020, the higher education (HE) sector, UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), the UK HE funding bodies¹ and other research funders need to work together to address equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) at a whole-system level through a collaborative and collegiate approach.
2. The HEMG equality impact assessment (EIA) did not provide evidence of any direct negative impacts of the HEMG funding award on groups of people with particular protected characteristics.² We note, however, that evidence around equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) was not specifically addressed in submissions to the last HEMG review.
3. The EIA provided evidence that the funding can be and is used to support effective practice and innovation relating to EDI within English higher education museums, galleries and collections (HEMGs). A key message was that Research England should work with the university museums sector to further support and share this effective practice.
4. It is a condition of all RE funding that recipient institutions ensure that EDI inclusion is considered and supported in the use of our funding, taking account of UKRI policies and principles. Approaches to supporting EDI are expected to exceed all relevant legal obligations, including those of the Equality Act 2010. Evidence from respondents made clear that HEMGs are acutely aware of their EDI responsibilities and are keen to tackle EDI issues, to promote equality and to diversify all their audiences.

¹ The four UK HE funding bodies are Research England, the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW), the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) and the Department for the Economy, Northern Ireland (DEFNI).

² The nine protected characteristics are: age; disability; gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation.

Summary of resulting actions

5. As part of our commitment to EDI and in line with the EIA's findings, we will:
 - a. Ensure that members of the HEMG review panel have undertaken appropriate EDI training;
 - b. Ask the HEMG review panel to consider the inclusion of a specific question or questions to elicit evidence about applicants' measures to support EDI;
 - c. Commit to the monitoring of EDI data and achievements through HEMG reporting;
 - d. Promote positive impact through good practice exchange, potentially via groups like the University Museums Group, sharing case studies about how museums, galleries and collections have used HEMG to promote positive impacts on staff, students, and external researchers with particular protected characteristics;
 - e. Encourage the use of HEMG funding to support digital access to collections, noting, however, that this needs to be balanced against considerations of digital poverty and digital literacy.

Context

6. Driving improvement in EDI is an important part of Research England's mission to create and sustain conditions for a healthy and dynamic research and knowledge exchange system in English universities. In June 2018, shortly after it was formed as a constituent body within UKRI, Research England set out its principles and approach to EDI. In accordance with these principles, we continue to undertake EIAs of our functions and policy, and where appropriate will act on the findings of these assessments.
7. Representation of, career progression for and pay gaps affecting different groups of people with protected characteristics are live issues across the HE sector.
8. The Advance HE staff statistical report 2020, which draws on data provided by the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA), suggests that there are: "lower proportions of both UK and non-UK BAME staff than white staff are on open-ended/ permanent contracts, in senior management positions, and on higher salary bands." (p,130) The report further states that: "Despite comprising the majority of staff working in UK HEIs, women remained underrepresented ... in senior management roles. A larger proportion of women than men worked in professional and support roles, worked part-time, on fixed-term contracts and in lower salary bands. Gender pay gaps remain highest among academic staff, though were still evident among professional and support staff." (p.198) According to the report, overall,

5.3% of staff working in UK HEIs disclosed as disabled in 2018/19. This compares with 19% of working-age adults reporting a disability to the Department for Work and Pensions Family Resources Survey for 2018/19.

9. HEMG funding supports museums, galleries and collections in the higher education sector that have research significance beyond their host universities and incur additional costs to provide a service to the wider research community (beyond what is required to meet the needs of the host university's researchers and students).
10. In 2016 HEFCE³ completed a review of its funding in this area, led by Diane Lees CBE, Director-General of the Imperial War Museums. HEMGs were invited to apply for funding. An independent panel of experts considered how far the submissions demonstrated activity which met the HEFCE policy aims and made funding recommendations on this basis. Research England HEMG funding is based upon the results of this review. We currently provide £10.7 million per year to 33 HEMGs across 19 universities.
11. Research England undertakes monitoring to capture quantitative and qualitative information on activities undertaken by HEMGs to serve the wider research community and to provide Research England with a better understanding of the costs of providing services to the wider research community and public. Following a pilot monitoring exercise at the end of academic year (AY) 2017/18, monitoring for AY 2018/19 included additional questions requesting any anonymised data concerning the demographics of visitors in terms of protected characteristics (where available), and information about any specific strategy or intervention aimed at further diversifying audiences.
12. The purpose of an EIA is to ensure that policies and practices are fair and do not discriminate against any group protected by the Equality Act 2010. In this EIA, Research England sought to explore whether the way in which HEMG funding is calculated or distributed may affect people differently based on their protected characteristics. Protected characteristics under the Act are: age; disability; gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; and sexual orientation. (There are intersections between some of these.) The EIA looked at evidence of the effects of the calculation and distribution of HEMG as it affects:

³ The Higher Education Funding Council for England, which distributed public money for teaching and research to universities and colleges prior to the formation of UKRI.

- a. Staff and PGRs employed directly by M&Gs
- b. Staff and PGRs internal to the host HEI accessing the resources for research purposes
- c. Staff and PGRs external to the host HEI accessing the resources for research purposes
- d. The wider research community; ie those not liaising directly with the HEMG but who may access the collection in person or online

13. The EIA was informed through evidence gathered via discussions with stakeholders and an online survey, summarised at Annex A, and exploration of literature and data as set out in Annex B.

Discussion

14. We were unable to identify any data source to show proportions of staff with particular protected characteristics specifically in university-hosted M&Gs, except for one statistic provided by the Manchester Museum, which said that: “Currently 11% of museum visitors, and 7% of staff, identify as disabled in a city where 20% of adults are disabled or have a long term health condition.” And while, for example, the Advance HE report found that: “Overall, just 9.0% of UK academics who worked in non-SET (Science, Engineering and Technology) subjects were BAME,” this cannot be assumed to map across to staffing in the M&G sector. SET disciplines are also represented across HEMGs, and SET researchers access the collections.
15. Arts Council England regularly produces data reports for the organisations that it funds, known as National Portfolio Organisations (NPOs). These are the closest equivalent to HEMGs and the data provides useful context. *Equality, Diversity and the Creative Case: A Data Report, 2019-20*, while noting that NPO data is not necessarily representative of the wider arts sector, produced some headline statistics including that:
- Among the NPOs, Museums had the lowest percentage BAME workforce at 7%, and the lowest LGBT workforce at 4%
 - Museums had the equal (with Dance and Literature) highest percentage female workforce at 55%.
 - Visual arts (that is, galleries) had the equal (with Theatre) highest percentage of disabled people in the workforce at 8%.

16. RE monitoring data has hitherto asked only how many staff are employed by the HEMG “for research, collections management and curation, outreach, engagement and other activities directly related to the HEMG’s main functions”. A breakdown of staff types and numbers has been optional. While we can look at HESA data to understand the general trends across different staff types and different disciplines, we cannot map these trends to HEMG staffing. HESA data on university staffing, even supplemented by Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and Arts Council data, does not provide sufficient detail to understand the breakdown of staff by protected characteristic across university-hosted M&Gs. There is also limited data on groups of people with protected characteristics engaging with HEMGs, whether as researchers or visitors.

17. In order to enhance our understanding and to help funded HEMGs to understand how they are doing and how they might improve, we propose to introduce questions into our HEMG monitoring to collect diversity information for our funded institutions. As one respondent wrote: “Evidence plays a pivotal role in driving our understanding of the inequalities at play in our sector... and enables both evaluation and accountability.” We will work with the UMG to understand how best to frame the request for these figures. One respondent set out some of the ways in which it is seeking to improve its diversity data collection, while another commented : “We see collecting data on protected characteristics as a project of care – it’s about trying to make museums better places for everyone - however, staff and visitors tell us that this work can feel unfriendly, even hostile. Working with inequalities data can feel cool and obstructively detached from the lived experiences it should speak to... we intend to transform our approach to EDI data and would be interested in hearing from other HEMGs working in this area.” We will aim to work with all HEMGs to discuss and share ideas for improved practice, not only explaining why the information is being requested but also the (positive) use to which it might be put, and ensuring necessary safeguards to ensure that individuals cannot be identified.

18. While HEMG funding is awarded to successful applicants on the basis that they have demonstrated additional costs required to support the wider research community, we do not set particular conditions on its use (beyond RE’s usual [terms and conditions of grant](#)). One comment in evidence summarised how HEMG funding was used: “The nature of HEMG funding is that, although predicated on the extent to which University Museums support research and the wider research community, it is treated as core funding and not allocated to any particular activity. It therefore supports all areas of the Museum’s activity.”

19. Evidence was provided to the EIA of the use of HEMG funding for positive EDI initiatives, including paid internships, targeted funding for PGRs, and translation work.

20. In discussions and in survey responses, the majority of respondents referred to digitisation of collections as a means to enhance access. While there may be many reasons to undertake digitisation of collections (such as preservation), its value as a means to enhance access can be a key motivation. Digitisation is important for those who are unable to access the physical collection, perhaps because they are unable to travel or lack the time, finance or physical capability. Some noted that it can begin to open up a collection for those who may feel that going into a museum is not for them – people who may feel intimidated or otherwise excluded. HEMG funding is certainly used to enhance digital access and this an area which RE might actively promote, while also working with HEMGS to understand and try to meet challenges around digital poverty and digital literacy. . In the words of one: “This ... collection, and information on the collection, will be shared online ... in a vastly improved and extended fashion. We regard this as fundamental to our ability to reach and engage a wide and diverse audience.” One cited anecdotal evidence that the pivot to online resulting from the pandemic had increased participation by younger age groups. Yet another reported that increasing digitisation had enabled greater collaboration with research colleagues internationally.

21. Evidence was also provided of the value of HEMG funding in supporting work to diversify audiences. As one respondent says “[A museum) can become a unique convening space where research and learning, communities and public can meet and mutually develop new knowledge and solutions.” Another wrote: “The support of HEMG has been central to our work with students and researchers, as well as the multiple faith and source communities who use the museum. This support has brought multiple benefits to the museum, to its host university, and to our diverse local and regional communities” Another suggested that: “We have to make space for authentic voices of all types to be heard in the places we identify to share and celebrate creative work.” While HEMG monitoring has asked about measures taken to diversify audiences, RE might consider whether it should go further and ask specifically what HEMGs do in their programming that reaches different groups of people with protected characteristics.

22. The EIA is set out in Table 1 below. A summary of the evidence is presented in Annex A. Annex B sets out a list of external analyses and reports consulted in the course of the EIA. Annex C sets out the criteria for submissions to the 2016 review.

Table 1: Equality impact assessment

Question	Response
1. Name of policy/funding activity/event being assessed	Research England Higher Education Museums and Galleries Fund
2. Summary of aims and objectives of the funding	This funding helps university museums, galleries and collections to serve the wider research community, where this costs them significantly more than meeting the needs of their own researchers and students.
3. What involvement and consultation has been done in relation to this funding? <i>(e.g. with relevant groups and stakeholders)</i>	The EIA was initially discussed with the committee of the University Museums Group (UMG) and with EDI advisers in UKRI. An online survey requesting evidence and comments was circulated by the UMG to its members and subsequently to some specialist groups via UUK and ARMA. RE held discussions with Advance HE, AHRC, Arts Council England, University Alliance, ARMA, the Royal Society and the Russell Group, and communicated by email with UUK, Guild HE, MillionPlus, the British Academy, the Museums Association, UCU, the National Association of Disabled Staff Networks and Museums Detox.
4. Who is affected by the policy/funding?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Staff and PGRs employed directly by M&Gs b. Staff and PGRs internal to the host HEI accessing the resources for research purposes c. Staff and PGRs external to the host HEI accessing the resources for research purposes d. The wider research community; ie those not liaising directly with the HEMG but who may access the collection in person or online



<p>5. What are the arrangements for monitoring and reviewing the impact of the policy/funding?</p>	<p>The last review of the HEMG Fund, in 2016, set priorities and funding levels from 2017-18 for five years. Exceptionally the 2017-22 funding period was extended for a year in recognition of the effects and pressures of the Covid-19 pandemic. The aim of the review is to ensure that judgements on HEMG funding are based on clear principles and evidence, providing assurance and justification for the operation of HEMG funding. Part of the function of the review is to consider which submitting university HEMGs should be funded, on the basis of a set of criteria agreed following sector consultation in 2016 (see Annex C). All applicants were asked to demonstrate that they provide a service to the wider research community at significant cost beyond that required to meet the needs of their own researchers and students. A pilot monitoring exercise took place at the end of AY 2017-18. The monitoring exercise for 2018-19 was adjusted in light of the pilot, including the addition of questions asking for any available equality and diversity data gathered about visitors, and about initiatives to widen reach in terms of diversity. There will be a further round of monitoring at end AY21-22.</p>
---	---

Protected Characteristic Group ,	Is there a potential for positive or negative impact?	Please explain and give examples of any evidence/data used	Action to address negative impact (e.g. adjustment to the policy)
	<p>We did not find evidence that there could be a negative impact. Evidence suggested that there is certainly a potential for positive impact arising from</p>	<p>Evidence was collected as set out and summarised in Annex A. Obtaining data on diversity of HEMG staff and research users is very</p>	<p>We will commit to requesting data on protected characteristics of staff and researchers to be collected and to be reported to us in future monitoring reports. We will commit to working with funded HEMGs to share effective practice in initiatives to enhance EDI and to underpin the promotion of equality.</p>

	<p>the use of HEMG funding, which can support EDI initiatives to promote diversity and equality. A number of HEMGs highlighted the use of funding to support greater digital access, which can facilitate access for researchers and audiences unable to access collections in person.</p>	<p>challenging. Staff data cannot be disaggregated from the data for the host university, while HEMGs do not currently collect EDI data about the researchers accessing collections. Evidence and data, and issues related to these, are explored in the discussion section above (paragraphs 14-24).</p>	
--	--	---	--

Evaluation:

Question	Explanation / justification
<p>Is it possible the policy or activity could discriminate or unfairly disadvantage people?</p>	<p>We did not find that the HEMG funding award of itself could unfairly disadvantage any group. The use of HEMG funding is a matter for individual institutions. As one respondent wrote: “HEMG funding is ... not ring-fenced, so hard to assess impact beyond the important additionality which it enables.” In its terms and conditions of grant RE states: “We expect higher education providers to ensure that equality, diversity and inclusion is considered and supported in the use of our funding, taking into account UK Research and Innovation policies and principles for equality, diversity and inclusion. Providers’ approaches to supporting equality, diversity and inclusion</p>



	are expected to exceed all relevant legal obligations, including but not limited to those of the Equality Act 2010.”	
Final Decision:	Tick the relevant box	Include any explanation / justification required
1. No barriers identified, therefore activity will proceed .		We have not identified any specific barriers. We have identified areas for improvement and these are reflected in the EIA action plan.
2. You can decide to stop the policy or practice at some point because the data shows bias towards one or more groups		
3. You can adapt or change the policy in a way which you think will eliminate the bias		
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 proceed with caution with this policy or practice knowing that it may favour some people less than others, providing justification for this decision.		



**Research
England**

Will this EIA be published* Yes/Not required	YES
Date completed:	30 September 2021
Review date (if applicable):	

Action Plan

- a. Ensure that members of the HEMG review panel have undertaken appropriate EDI training;
- b. Ask the HEMG review panel to consider the inclusion of a specific question or questions to elicit evidence about applicants' measures to support EDI;
- c. Commit to the monitoring of EDI data and achievements through HEMG reporting in monitoring reports;
- d. Promote positive impact through good practice exchange, potentially via groups like the University Museums Group, sharing case studies about how museums, galleries and collections have used HEMG to promote positive impacts on staff, students, and external researchers with particular protected characteristics;
- e. Encourage the use of HEMG funding to support digital access to collections, noting, however, that this needs to be balanced against considerations of digital poverty and digital literacy.

Annex A: Summary of the evidence collected

Evidence reviewed

1. Research England worked with the university museum sector and beyond to gather evidence and insights for the EIA in two ways:
 - an online survey to gather information on the potential impacts of our funding policy on protected groups. The opportunity to contribute to the survey was offered to the HEMG sector via the University Museums Group
 - online meetings and/or telephone conversations with representative organisations, listed below.

Stakeholder consultation

Approaches to representative organisations

2. RE held discussions with Advance HE, AHRC, Arts Council England, the Museums Association, University Alliance, ARMA, the Royal Society and the Russell Group, and communicated by email with UUK, Guild HE, MillionPlus, the British Academy, UCU, the National Association of Disabled Staff Networks (NADSN) and Museums Detox. In addition, we consulted with colleagues across UKRI and the Scottish Funding Council, and kept the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales and the Department for the Economy, Northern Ireland informed of our plans and our progress.

Summary of discussions

3. Questions raised and discussed in these conversations included, but were not limited to:
 - can any potential negative impacts arising from the HEMG funding award be identified?
 - can any potential positive impacts be identified?
 - should, and how can, Research England capture EDI information through its monitoring procedures?
 - what opportunities to promote equality could we consider in future?
4. The EIA was welcomed by all stakeholders. Discussions explored the relative responsibilities of Research England and of HEIs with regard to EDI.



5. There was recognition of the difficulties of identifying the specific uses of HEMG funding by M&Gs.
6. Stakeholders highlighted documents that might help to inform the EIA, and some offered to share the link to the survey with relevant groups.
7. Some noted that enhanced data in relation to EDI would raise the profile of EDI challenges, enhance the sector's understanding, clarify RE's expectations, and might highlight ways to mitigate negative effects or to promote positive impact. It was suggested that we might consider requiring recipients to collect data on the demographic of researchers and of volunteers, who may be a separate category within staff profiles.

Survey

8. Research England produced and circulated an online survey asking for views (and any evidence) on the potential impacts of HEMG funding on protected groups. The survey was open between May 2021 and a closing date of 28 July was first given, though it was made plain that later responses would be accepted and the survey did not close until September 2021. We invited responses from any organisation or individual with an interest, through the UMG and also through our stakeholders.
9. Of the 21 responses received, 18 were usable responses but with varying amounts of detail. Twenty came from universities and HEMGs, all but two of them HEMG-funded and between them representing the majority of the 19 universities in receipt of HEMG funding. One response was from a freelance consultant. In three cases respondents had skipped the questions about the potential impacts of HEMG funding, so we followed up with an email inviting them to a conversation – we were aware that the structure of the survey might inhibit the free expression of some responses. One respondent wrote further thoughts in an email. While the number of responses was relatively small, we consider the survey to have been an important part of our engagement activities and have given due weight to the evidence it provided.

Summary of survey responses

10. The survey asked about institutions' key EDI considerations, and how these inform planning and investment. More than half of respondents referred to the university or the institution's strategy or strategic plan, and/or to EDI policy. Plans included goals such as aiming to achieve greater diversity among staff through inclusive recruitment, and among staff and volunteers through initiatives such as internships and other opportunities, and working to

diversify audiences and to improve access (not only physical access, though at least one respondent mentioned a rebuilding programme to facilitate physical access). A particular focus was work with groups across the university and in the community to develop projects for diverse audiences. As one respondent wrote: “Our position as public-facing institutions within the University means we are uniquely positioned to play a convening role between our local communities, our collections, and the University’s cutting edge research.”

11. Respondents noted that HEMG funding supported all institutional priorities, including strategic priorities around EDI. One said: “The Museum’s Programme & Interpretation Policy explicitly prioritises coverage of women, Indigenous peoples and climate change in the museum’s work.”
12. Evidence to the EIA has revealed examples of EDI-related good practice and initiatives. Specific references to EDI activity funded or supported by HEMG, included: “The (museum is) delivering specific programmes of work where we are aiming to diversify the collections we research and the people with whom we are collaborating. We are taking a proactive approach to becoming more inclusive. This work would not be possible without HEMG investment.”
13. The survey asked respondents to consider whether Research England’s HEMG funding may positively or negatively affect university staff or PGR students with protected characteristics.

Eleven respondents indicated that HEMG funding may affect these groups, all suggesting that the effect was positive. Six thought it had no effect, and two skipped the question. One responded that whether or not there is any effect is: “Very much dependent on the activity the recipient museum/ gallery focuses on and how much E&I priorities are bedded into programming and staff development.” One, who thought the effect is generally positive, nonetheless queried the lack of EDI accountability in the HEMG funding criteria, while another pointed out: “Including EDI reporting in the HEMG reports would be beneficial to driving change.”

14. Where respondents suggested a positive effect, answers suggested that this was on the basis that HEMG funding could support diversity initiatives including digitisation, translation, targeted funding for PGRs, and work to identify and to try to reach underserved audiences. One respondent noted that HEMG funding is essential core funding which “directly supports the Museum’s delivery of its strategic priority to ‘create, develop and support a fair and

inclusive workplace”. Another cited a paid internship programme to support greater diversity in the museums sector. One wrote: “EDI considerations are being built into all new initiatives ... HEMG's funding provides a third of our funding without which there would be limited resource to effect change.”

15. None of the respondents suggested a negative effect.
16. The survey asked respondents to consider whether Research England’s HEMG funding may positively or negatively affect groups of staff or PGR students with different protected characteristics at other universities (outside the host university). Five thought there was no effect, and two skipped the question. Of the 13 who thought there was an effect, 12 thought the effect was generally positive. The other did not specify any negative effect from the fund as such, but suggested that greater self-awareness is needed among staff, and that the way collections are currently presented can exclude marginalised groups. Another raised concerns that there are currently no EDI requirements or any requirement to present EDI policy or action planning associated with HEMG funding. As another respondent said: “All need to be held accountable and to demonstrate how they are planning and creating change.”
17. Where the effect was thought to be positive, respondents again suggested that HEMG funding was, or could be, used to support initiatives and ongoing work that supports EDI. One mentioned improved access to stored collections, others reiterated that virtual access improved access, and that HEMG allows improved staffing levels to enable that access, while another focused on collaborations with other universities, both nationally and internationally: “The support of HEMG has been central to our international multi-national and multi-faith project work ... this support has significantly enhanced our ability to work collaboratively with multiple overseas partner organisations.” One respondent said that as an HEMG-funded institution: “we take very seriously our commitment to supporting people with protected characteristics from other universities and believe that our approach has a positive impact in attracting approaches from the wider academic community to work with us, using our collections and platforms for engagement for learning and research that relates to protected characteristics,” citing in particular research projects and exhibitions focusing on the LGBTQ+ community. Another suggested that: “Funding could enable the values and ambitions of equality and inclusion to be developed in partnership with staff and postgraduate students at other universities. This could be achieved as a set of embedded values and principles across joint work, eg publications, conferences, in any area of research.”

18. While respondents did not specify any negative effects they did suggest possible mitigation. One suggested that RE might mitigate any negative impact by increasing funding, which would mean M&Gs could offer more of the virtual service, improve access, and also enable more staff time to work more on EDI-based projects to further open up the collection. Another suggested that mitigation could include taking steps to address unconscious bias, working with community groups and groups with protected characteristics to challenge understandings and perceptions and develop new models and ways of working.

19. The survey invited other comments. One respondent suggested the fund may have a slight negative effect caused by all elements where there are not clear policies to promote EDI, though they thought the effect occurred at HEI level rather than being created by Research England's policy. Another thought RE might encourage the consideration of EDI as a priority for the use of HEMG funding. One respondent referred to work with the wider community, suggesting that it is an important part of what HEMG funding supports: "HEMG supports work with the wider community, which is most frequently aimed at underserved audiences, including those communities not co-located by important collections, or of lower socioeconomic status and therefore experiencing fewer opportunities to engage."

Annex B: Literature and useful resources

Advance HE (April 2019): 'Equality in colleges in Scotland: an analysis of the qualitative data of disabled staff experiences'.

<http://www.ecu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Equality-in-colleges-in-Scotland-Disabled-Staff-Experiences.pdf>

Advance HE (September 2019): 'Equality and higher education: staff statistical report 2019'.

<https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/equality-higher-education-statistical-report-2019>

APPG for Creative Diversity (2021): 'Creative Majority: What Works to support, encourage and improve equity, diversity and inclusion in the creative sector'.

<https://www.kcl.ac.uk/cultural/resources/reports/creative-majority-report-v1.pdf>

<https://www.kcl.ac.uk/cultural/resources/reports/creative-majority-policy-recommendations-v1.pdf>

APPG on Diversity and Inclusion in STEM (2021): 'Inquiry into equity in the STEM workforce: Final report'.

<https://www.britishecienceassociation.org/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=3d51130a-458b-4363-9b2b-d197afc8382a>

Arts Council England (2019-20): 'Equality, Diversity and the Creative Case: A Data Report'.

https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Equality_Diversity_and_the_Creative_Case_A_Data_Report_201920.pdf

Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) (no date): 'Equality impact assessment guidance and template'.

<https://bbsrc.ukri.org/documents/equality-impact-assessment-guidance-template-pdf/>

Department for Work and Pensions (2018/19): 'Family Resources Survey'

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/874507/family-resources-survey-2018-19.pdf

Equality Act 2010. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents>

Equality and Human Rights Commission (April 2019): Public Sector Equality Duty.

<https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty>

Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) (2009): 'The experience of lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans staff and students in higher education'.

<http://www.ecu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Experiences-of-LGBT-staff-and-students-in-he.pdf>



Fazackerley, A. (September 2019): 'Look at how white the academy is: why BAME students aren't doing PhDs'. *The Guardian*.
<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2019/sep/12/look-at-how-white-the-academy-is-why-bame-students-arent-doing-phds>

Guyan, K. (February 2018): 'The experiences of lesbian, gay and bisexual staff in UK higher education'. *Research Insight*, ECU.
<https://www.ecu.ac.uk/publications/research-insights-feb-2018/>

Historic England Heritage Labour Market Intelligence Toolkit.
<https://historicengland.org.uk/research/current/social-and-economic-research/heritage-labour-market-intelligence/>

Leading Routes (September 2019): 'The broken pipeline: barriers to black PhD students accessing Research Council funding'.
<https://leadingroutes.org/the-broken-pipeline>

Research England (June 2018): 'Equality, diversity and inclusion principles and approaches 2018-2019'. Research England Council, Paper C18/03.

Research England (July 2019): 'Equality impact assessment for quality-related research (QR) funding and formula research capital funding'. <https://re.ukri.org/documents/2020/eia-for-formula-research-fundng-april-2020/>

Research England (July 2019): 'Terms and conditions of Research England grant'.
<https://re.ukri.org/documents/2019/terms-and-conditions-of-research-england-grant-final-pdf/>

Research England (2019): 'How we fund higher education institutions'.
<https://re.ukri.org/documents/2019/how-we-fund-heis-pdf/>

The Royal Society (2021): 'Disability STEM data for students and academic staff in higher education 2007/08 to 2018/19'. <https://royalsociety.org/-/media/policy/topics/diversity-in-science/210118-disability-STEM-data-for-students-and-staff-in-higher-education.pdf>

The Royal Society (2021): 'Ethnicity STEM data for students and academic staff in higher education 2007/08 to 2018/19'. <https://royalsociety.org/-/media/policy/Publications/2021/trends-ethnic-minorities-stem/Ethnicity-STEM-data-for-students-and-academic-staff-in-higher-education.pdf>



The Public Sector Equality Duty and Equality Impact Assessments: House of Commons Library. No. 06591, 8 March 2018.

<https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN06591#fullreport>

University and College Union (UCU) (October 2019): 'Black academic staff face double whammy in promotion and pay stakes'.

<https://www.ucu.org.uk/article/10360/Black-academic-staff-face-double-whammy-in-promotion-and-pay-stakes>

Wellcome Collection Exploring Research (July 2021). 'Nothing about us without us'.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1z9REHogrU0>

Annex C

Review of HEFCE Museums, Galleries and Collections Fund 2016 – criteria

Gateway criteria

1. The following gateway criteria will apply and, if not satisfied, will prevent the applicant from being considered for funding. The museum, gallery and/or collection on which the submission is based must:

- a. be a 'university museum or gallery' and have a substantial and long-term financial commitment to maintaining a collection

In judging whether this is the case we will consider a number of criteria, including:

- the collection is actually owned by the HEI
- the collection is housed in the HEI's own premises (and/or on HEI-owned land) at the cost of the HEI
- the HEI is substantially involved in the governance and/or management of the museum, including ownership of the business that operates the museum
- the HEI has taken on a substantial and long-term financial commitment to maintaining the museum and its collections
- the accounts of the museum are embedded in the HEI's own accounts or a contractual obligation to fund the museum on a long-term basis
- museum staff, dedicated to providing a service to HE, are paid by the HEI.

We do not envisage requiring applications to meet all of these criteria to qualify, though equally meeting any one criterion would not be sufficient. A HEI's response in relation to all of the criteria taken together should provide sufficient information to make a clear and robust decision.

- b. incur significant reach beyond the HEI's own researchers and students and as far as possible demonstrate the additional costs associated with this

To satisfy the gateway criteria, a 200-word summary drawing on the evidence below is required. This should clearly link to quality criteria 'a'.

- Evidence of the gain to the HE sector at large from its activities, and that the costs to the host institution associated with that gain are sufficiently significant to warrant additional funding

- a best estimate of the costs incurred due to providing a service to the wider HE community outside of the host institution.

- c. make, or have the potential to make, a unique and significant contribution to research and scholarship in the HE sector

To satisfy the gateway criteria, a 200-word summary drawing on the evidence below is required. This should clearly link to quality criteria 'b'.

- evidence of a 'unique and significant contribution' may be provided through existing public documents and research outputs
- submissions are invited to provide extracts or summarise their existing forward plans, including the statement of purpose, key aims and specific objectives and review of previous forward plans, as they relate to this criteria. The 'forward plan'⁴ may be based on a university strategy or similar, or an action plan drawn from the relevant school or departmental plan.

- d. be operated in an efficient manner and demonstrate financial sustainability

- Submissions should provide evidence of financial sustainability, with evidence of solvency and sufficient funds to operate. Where appropriate, this might include management accounts, relevant to their constitutional arrangements, or equivalent final income and headline expenditure for the last one to three years.

- e. where eligible, hold Arts Council Museum Accreditation status or provide confirmation that it is working towards Accreditation status.

Only those eligible to apply for Arts Council Museum Accreditation will need to strictly adhere to this requirement.⁵ For collections ineligible for this status, the spirit of the accreditation should be evidenced in terms of equivalent good practice and standards⁶.

Quality and funding criteria

2. The review will consider to what extent the HEMG meets core HEFCE policy aims, and promote excellence in research and scholarship that warrant additional HEFCE research

⁴ The existing 'forward plan' document may be provided as an Annex to the submission.

⁵ Under exceptional circumstances, the panel may consider cases from those eligible for Arts Council Museum Accreditation but not currently formally working towards this status.

⁶ For further information please visit: <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/accreditation-scheme/about-accreditation>.

funding. The review will consider submissions in their own institutional context, drawing on evidence of past performance, potential for future performance and plans to deliver outcomes in relation to the following quality criteria.

- a. how far the HEMG is providing a service to the wider research community at significant cost beyond that required to meet the needs of its own researchers and students (beyond the normal degree of reciprocity in sharing research resources), highlighting the value added by the collection

Submissions are expected to clearly link to, and expand on, the summary provided for gateway criteria 'b'. Evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- details of the service provided to the wider research community, with evidence of the gain to the HE sector at large from these activities
- a best estimate of the costs incurred due to providing a service to the wider HE community outside of the host institution, with information to identify the total expenditure currently required to support the HEMG
- evidence of stewardship and management costs only where contribution is significant to providing a service to both the host institution and the wider sector
- information that the costs to the host institution associated with the broader gains to the HE sector are sufficiently significant to warrant additional funding.

- b. evidence that use of the HEMG has led to unique and significant contributions to research, scholarship and research impact in the UK and internationally

Submissions are expected to clearly link to, and expand on, the summary provided for gateway criteria 'c'. Evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- existing public documents and references to internationally excellent outputs of research and scholarship including, but not limited to, journal articles, monographs and practice-based research
- extract(s) from existing forward plans, as far as they relate to this criteria and as provided at gateway criteria b. This may include the statement of purpose, key aims and specific objectives, and review of previous forward plans
- REF impact case studies that detail the activity or HEMG on which the submission is based
- Arts Council Designation status, in recognition that the HEMG is, or has the potential to be, an essential research collection for its subject. Where the HEMG



does not have Arts Council Designation, the spirit of this status should be drawn on including:

- how the collection is central to advancing public understanding and scholarly knowledge of the subject that it represents
- whether the collection has benefitted from being the subject of research
- the reputation of the collection as an established resource for research and scholarship.

- c. the extent to which the HEMG is considered to offer unique and significant value to undergraduate and postgraduate students and the wider community, including the HEMGs approach to public engagement

Evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- information about the wider engagement activities undertaken and, as far as possible, the outcomes and impact of these activities
- visitor numbers and relationships with relevant stakeholder groups
- existing policies and forward plans relating to the value offered to undergraduate and postgraduate students and the wider community.

- d. the innovative practice employed by the HEMG for external benefit and in support of the open research agenda

University HEMGs should be recognised as exemplars of good practice across the wider museums and galleries sector, able to test innovative practices and push boundaries.

Evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- use of digital technologies and/or crowdsourcing to enhance access to the resources available to researchers, learners and others
- innovative and influential partnerships and collaborations
- development of research skills and training for aspiring academics, including early career researchers and postgraduate students
- the integration and link between academic study and material culture.

- e. whether HEFCE HEMG funding is an appropriate proportion of the total cost of sustaining the museum or gallery, demonstrating additionality, and not core funding

Submissions should draw on the information provided at gateway criteria 'b' and 'c' and quality criteria 'a', to address this requirement.

- Submissions may also include further information about existing core funding streams as well as evidence of the leverage capabilities of existing funding for further private or other funding sources
- submissions should explain the level of HEMG funding that is sought.

To avoid disadvantage to HEMGs that are not currently in receipt of this funding, submissions may draw on potential for future performance and plans to deliver outcomes. Where submissions are only able to evidence potential, they should explain why it has not happened to date, what the current plans are to realise it, and how HEFCE HEMG funding might help.

Contextual data

Comparable headline contextual data will be required for all submissions. This will include AY 2014/15 data on:

- number of higher education visits
- number of further education visits
- number of HEI courses drawing on the collection
- number of loans made (including number of items and whether national or international)
- percentage of collection documented
- number of website visits
- number of exhibitions
- number of pupils on school visits
- number of public events
- number of visitors