

## Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Response
<b>1. Name of policy/funding activity/event being assessed</b>	QuantIC Industrial Partnership Fund (IPF)
<b>2. Summary of aims and objectives of the policy/funding activity/event</b>	<p>The aim of the Industrial Partnership Fund is to accelerate commercial uptake of new imaging technology.</p> <p>There are three schemes under IPF:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Proof of Concept – open to QuantIC co-investigators only</li> <li>2) Venture Fund – open to all researchers in the UK developing a new venture in quantum imaging</li> <li>3) Challenge Led – co-funded with industry and open to all researchers in the UK</li> </ol>
<b>3. What involvement and consultation has been done in relation to this policy? (e.g. with relevant groups and stakeholders)</b>	The IPF structure and calls have been developed through consultation with the QuantIC Market Opportunities Panel (industry representatives) and Management Board (academic representatives).
<b>4. Who is affected by the policy/funding activity/event?</b>	<p>Early career and established researchers applying for funding both within and outside QuantIC;</p> <p>Industrial partners/funders;</p>
<b>5. What are the arrangements for monitoring and reviewing the actual impact of the policy/funding activity/event?</b>	<p>Given the small number of applications, any data collections on protected characteristics would not be statistically relevant in assessing the EDI impact of the policy and would present considerable risk of individuals being identified given the very low sample.</p> <p>The process will be reviewed at the end of each call and feedback will be sought from applicants in the form of a voluntary survey.</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)
<b>Disability</b>	Possibly	IPF applicants might have difficulties in accessing the guidance for	IPF guidance and forms are designed to pass the “accessibility test”

		<p>applicants, in compiling forms.</p> <p>IPF awardees will be expected to attend QuantIC events and participate in activities related to the Hub network.</p>	<p>for standard word documents.</p> <p>All QuantIC scientific meetings, board meetings and workshops will always include a means of remote participation.</p> <p>We will review feedback after each round and consider if additional steps need to be taken.</p>
<b>Gender reassignment</b>	Possibly	<p>Consideration will be needed for absences as a result of medical treatment or other absences related to transition.</p>	<p>We will allow extensions to projects to take account of absences due to medical/compassionate leave, including gender reassignment.</p>
<b>Marriage or civil partnership</b>	Unlikely	<p>It is not expected that this policy will have any particular impact</p>	
<b>Pregnancy and maternity/paternity</b>	Possibly	<p>Participation in the call may be negatively affected, if potential applicants are unavailable at key assessment stages.</p> <p>Assessors may not be able to attend meetings if they have childcare responsibilities.</p>	<p>Full timeline provided of all deadlines, allowing early engagement with QuantIC on mitigations.</p> <p>Review meetings for funded projects will be in core hours (10.00 to 16.00) and will avoid school holidays.</p>
<b>Race</b>	Possibly	<p>Regarding UKRI funding: "In 2018/19, the success rate of applicants from ethnic minorities at PI level was 17% compared to 27% of white applicants. For PIs, white applicants have higher success rates than ethnic minority applicants in all years. Sensitivity analysis suggests that</p>	<p>Advertisements will be publicly posted and widely circulated through traditional channels and social media.</p> <p>We will review feedback after each round and consider if additional steps need to be taken to reach all eligible applicants.</p>

		<p>we can be confident that this difference exists. It is not the result of chance variation.</p> <p>In 2018/19, the success rate for ethnic minorities and white applicants at CI level was 22% and 27% respectively. Ethnic minority CIs had consistently lower success rates than their white counterparts in previous years.”<sup>1</sup></p>	
<b>Religion or belief</b>	Possibly	Submission and assessment activities could coincide with religious holidays.	<p>Full timeline provided of all deadlines, allowing early engagement with QuantIC on mitigations.</p> <p>Review meetings for funded projects will avoid religious festivals.</p>
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	Unlikely	It is not expected that this will have a major impact.	
<b>Sex (gender)</b>	Possibly		Assessment criteria language has been reviewed to ensure it is gender neutral.
<b>Age</b>	Unlikely	It is not expected that this policy will have any particular impact	<p>Calls are open to both ERCs and established researchers. Projects will be assessed against defined criteria to do with commercial impact and scientific rigour.</p> <p>The projects are not assessed against the career stage or academic profile of the applicant and a CV, publication list or track</p>

<sup>1</sup> <https://drive.google.com/file/d/18hMHKhZX5UIM9RKNvHj55G2iNH0QJDIV/view>

			record statement are not requested or evaluated as part of the application process.
<b>Across All Groups</b>	Assessment of applicants		<p>Applications will be assessed by the Marketing Opportunities Panel and Management Board. All those participating in assessments will have completed equality and diversity training.</p> <p>Universities will need to ensure staff are not disadvantaged and are supported to perform to their best abilities</p>

## Evaluation:

Question	Explanation / justification	
<b>Is it possible the proposed policy or activity or change in policy or activity could discriminate or unfairly disadvantage people?</b>	<p>QuantIC will review application and success rates after each round. We will work to understand and describe the composition of the applicant pool and consider if additional steps need to be taken to reach all eligible applicants.</p> <p>A number of risks have been identified and actively considered. These risks have been mitigated as far as possible. Further risks could emerge, and we will actively monitor the EDI aspects to minimise the likelihood that processes are discriminatory.</p>	
Final Decision	Tick the relevant box	Include any explanation / justification required
1. No barriers identified, therefore activity will <b>proceed</b> .		
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		
3. You can <b>adapt or change</b> the policy in a way which you think will eliminate the bias	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure the Guidance and Application Forms for ADF pass the accessibility test;</li> <li>• Equality, Diversity and Inclusion training will be a requirement for all assessors</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey Monkey to be designed and sent to all applicants from previous round</li> </ul>
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>	12 February 2021
<b>Review date (if applicable):</b>	December 2022 (reviewed December 2021)

Based on BBRC document. See <https://bbsrc.ukri.org/documents/equality-impact-assessment-guidance-template-pdf/> for guidance.