

**TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

**TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE  
EMPLOYER-JUSTIFIED RETIREMENT  
AGE (EJRA)**

**REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

**May 2022**

# TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

## Contents

Section 1: Executive Summary .....	3
Section 2: Introduction.....	5
Section 3: The <i>Aims</i> .....	9
Section 4: Whether to retain an EJRA.....	14
Section 5: The age of the EJRA .....	23
Section 6: The exceptions process .....	27
Section 7: Recommendations .....	30
Annexe A : The History of Retirement at Oxford .....	31
Annexe B: 10-year review of the Employer-Justified Retirement Age (EJRA): Terms of Reference for the Review Group .....	34
Annexe C: Conflict of Interest Record – EJRA Review Group .....	39
Annexe D: Proposed revised <i>Aims</i> .....	41
Annexe E: EJRA data summary .....	42

# TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

## Section 1: Executive Summary

### **a) Introduction**

The University's [employer-justified retirement age](#) (EJRA) requires employees in grade 8 and above to retire on the 30 September preceding their 69<sup>th</sup> birthday, in support of the [Aims](#) of the policy, which are, in brief: intergenerational fairness through maintaining opportunities for career progression, refreshment of disciplines/fields/expertise, succession planning, and diversity.

After an extended process of investigation, consultation and analysis, the [Review Group](#) established by Council in Trinity term 2021 to conduct the 10-year review of the EJRA makes the following recommendations.

### **b) Recommendations**

The Review Group recommends that:

1. The EJRA is retained for those employed as Statutory Professors, Associate Professors and RSIVs (the most senior researchers), and for the Vice-Chancellor.
2. Those in grades 8 to 10 and ALC6 (the senior administrative grade) are removed from the scope of the EJRA, together with employed Visiting Professors, the Professor of Poetry and committee members.
3. The *Aims* are retained, with some amendments to clarify the relationship with the University's Vision, Mission and Strategic Plan 2018-24.
4. Personnel Committee consider whether to recommend to Council an increase in the age of the EJRA of one year, given the benefits and drawbacks identified in this report.
5. The [exceptions process](#) be adapted to better support those whose careers have been impacted by caring responsibilities or other personal circumstances, to ensure space constraints do not prevent recruitment, and that it be communicated more effectively and transparently.
6. Transition arrangements for any changes to policy which are agreed are put in place, and the EJRA is reviewed again in five years' time, when more data are available and circumstances may have changed.
7. There should be a more strategic approach to retirement, including discussions well in advance of the EJRA and better understanding of the flexible retirement options in USS, in order to facilitate informed decision making by individuals and better departmental succession planning, together with better and more consistent support for staff who wish to remain part of the intellectual and social life of the University in order to support a dignified and phased approach to retirement.
8. Given that the EJRA contributes to vacancy creation, but cannot achieve the *Aims* in isolation, other approaches such as inclusive recruitment across all grades and divisions must continue to be pursued as a priority to accelerate progress.
9. The Group noted that the review was hampered by inadequate diversity data, particularly in relation to ethnicity and disability, and that this needs to be addressed.

### **c) Further information**

## **TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

You can find out more about the Group's work and the data that underlies its conclusions on its [webpage](#), which also includes the agendas, paper and minutes from its meetings.

# TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

## Section 2: Introduction

### **a) *The EJRA***

The University's [employer-justified retirement age](#) (EJRA) requires employees in grade 8 and above to retire no later than the 30 September preceding their 69<sup>th</sup> birthday, in support of the [Aims](#) of the policy, which are, in brief: intergenerational fairness through maintaining opportunities for career progression, refreshment of disciplines/fields/expertise, succession planning, and diversity.

The history of retirement at Oxford, including details of the establishment of the EJRA policy and its interim review in 2016-17, can be found at Annexe A.

### **b) *The ten-year review***

When the EJRA was first established, a commitment was made to review it after ten years, with an interim review after five years. The findings of the five-year review are summarised at Annexe A and the full review report can be read on the [EJRA Review webpage](#).

The ten-year review of the EJRA has now taken place. It was conducted by a Review Group appointed by Council in Trinity term 2021 and will report to Council via Personnel Committee. Council will decide whether to put any proposals to change Statute XIV, section 15 (which sets down the age and scope of the EJRA) to Congregation.

### **c) *The Review Group***

The Review Group for the ten-year review was appointed by Council and had a broad and diverse membership, representing each of the academic divisions and key constituencies, such as early career researchers, retired staff, and the UCU. It also included two representatives of the Conference of Colleges, one of the 2021/2022 proctorial team and three members of Council elected by Congregation. It was chaired by [Professor David Paterson](#).

The Group was supported by specialists in employment law, pensions, HR data analytics, and statistical analysis and modelling.

### **d) *The scope of the Review***

The purpose of the Review Group was to submit a report and recommendations on the future of the EJRA at Oxford to Council, through Personnel Committee. The Group was asked by Council to consider:

- whether the current *Aims* of the EJRA Policy remain aims the University should pursue and whether others should be articulated;

## **TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

- the extent to which the *Aims* are being met or will be met in future through the EJRA, whether alone or in conjunction with other measures;
- whether there are any alternative means by which the *Aims* could be met; and
- whether the Group's view is that the EJRA is, at the date of the review, a proportionate and necessary means of achieving the *Aims*, whether alone or in conjunction with other measures.

In so doing, the Group was asked to consider the impact of the EJRA on those at different career stages, noting that those at earlier career stages and those who are already retired are under-represented on the Review Group itself and on decision-making bodies, such as Council and Congregation.

If the Group decided to recommend the retention of an EJRA, it was asked to recommend whether there should be any changes to:

- the age at which the EJRA is set or the circumstances in which it will apply;
- the groups to which the EJRA applies;
- the measures that are taken or could be taken in conjunction with the EJRA to achieve the *Aims*; and
- the existence and operation of the extensions procedure, including the parts of the procedure that apply to second and subsequent extensions.

If the Group decided to recommend that the EJRA was discontinued entirely, it was asked to recommend:

- the date from which the policy should cease to operate and any transitional arrangements; and
- the alternative means by which those *Aims* that are considered to remain relevant and important will be achieved in future.

The full Terms of Reference, which includes the membership of the Review Group, is annexed at B.

### **e) Conflicts of interest**

The Group acknowledged that almost all members of the Group are conflicted to some extent in considering the future of the EJRA policy, as it impacts those at every career stage, directly or indirectly.

Care was taken to recognise, declare and manage all direct conflicts and some members did not take part in discussions of some aspects of the policy. In each case, this is recorded in the minutes of the meeting (available on the [EJRA Review webpage](#)).

The conflict of interest record for members of the Group and its advisers is at Annexe C.

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### f) Approach

The Review Group observed the following principles in its work, as requested by Council:

*Independence* – the Group was given no instructions or steer about the conclusions it should reach, and was asked to consider the evidence it gathered independently and objectively and to reach its conclusions without fear or favour.

*All decisions were evidence-driven* – the Group gathered data and other evidence, and based its conclusions and recommendations on that evidence.

*A broad, consultative approach* – the Group used a variety of means to gather the views of Congregation, the employees to whom the EJRA applies, and the employees that are affected by it or would be affected by its abolition (see section h, Consultation below).

In addition, the Review Group decided that it wished to observe an additional principle of *transparency*. It has published all of its papers (except those that are covered by legal privilege), its agendas and minutes, and the data sets on which it based its decisions on the [EJRA Review webpage](#).

### g) Timetable

The Review Group was asked to report to Council through Personnel Committee in Hilary term 2022 and intended to do so. However, when it began its work, it quickly became apparent that the questions it needed to answer and the data it needed to analyse were sufficiently complex that it would take longer to fulfil its task thoroughly.

The Group met 10 times during Michaelmas term 2021 and Hilary term 2022 and was satisfied that this was necessary and sufficient in order to achieve its purpose in accordance with the principles it agreed to observe.

### h) Consultation

The Review Group is grateful to those who gave their time to respond to the questionnaire hosted on the [EJRA Review webpage](#) and to share their views at the two on line Town Hall meetings (no in-person meetings were possible due to the prevalence of Covid-19 infection at the time). It is also grateful to those retired staff who responded to the postal survey and to all staff, current and emeritus, who wrote to the Chair<sup>1</sup>.

In addition, the Chair visited the Divisional Boards, the GLAM Board and the Conference of Colleges to raise awareness of the review and to gather their views.

---

<sup>1</sup> Summaries of the results of the survey and questionnaire are at EJRA(21)09 and EJRA(22)03, under the tabs for meetings 5 and 6 on the [EJRA Review webpage](#). A Q&A document in which responses are given to the questions raised at the Town Hall meetings is under [the consultation tab](#).

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

The Review Group invited senior members of four other UK HEIs, three that do not have an EJRA and one that does, to attend its meetings and explain their approaches to retirement. The notes of these discussions can be seen in the minutes of meetings [2](#) and [3](#).

### i) Structure

The Review Group adopted a structured approach to its work. It:

1. Reviewed each of the *Aims* of the policy to establish whether –
  - a. they remain important and relevant;
  - b. they are being achieved; and
  - c. other *Aims* should be articulated.
2. Agreed key grade groups as the basis for analysis and decision-making.
3. Considered, for each grade group:
  - a. the relevance of each of the *Aims*;
  - b. whether the EJRA is making a substantial difference to turnover and thus to the achievement of the *Aims*;
  - c. whether there are alternative means that would be effective in meeting the *Aims*, alone or in conjunction with other measures; and
  - d. whether to retain an EJRA for that group.
4. Considered the age at which the EJRA should be set for those grade groups to which it is recommended that an EJRA will continue to apply.
5. Considered whether to maintain an exceptions process and whether any changes should be made to that process.
6. Reviewed the *Aims* in light of its decisions at 3-5 to ensure they remained relevant and appropriate.



## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### Section 3: The Aims

#### a) Background

The *Aims* of the EJRA policy summarise what it is trying to achieve and form the basis of the justification for the existence of the policy. The *Aims* have been refined over the lifetime of the policy (see Annexe A and [EJRA\(21\)07](#)). The current *Aims* are set out below:

*In the context of the University's particular structure and procedures, the EJRA is considered to be an appropriate and necessary means of creating sufficient vacancies to meet the overarching Aim of safeguarding the high standards of the University in teaching, research and professional services, which in turn relies on the Aims set out below:*

- *promoting inter-generational fairness and maintaining opportunities for career progression for those at particular stages of a career, given the importance of having available opportunities for progression across the generations*
- *refreshing the academic, research and other professional workforce as a route to maintaining the University's position on the international stage*
- *facilitating succession planning by maintaining predictable retirement dates, especially in relation to the collegiate University's joint appointment system*
- *promoting equality and diversity, noting that recent recruits are more diverse than the composition of the existing workforce, especially amongst the older age groups of the existing workforce.*

The Review Group considered each of the *Aims* articulated within the current policy to establish whether: they remain important and relevant; they are being achieved; and other *Aims* should be articulated<sup>2</sup>. They also considered whether each *Aim* is legitimate i.e. it is legal, not discriminatory, and of a public interest or social policy nature, and is actually being pursued by the University. The paper that formed the basis for this discussion is on the EJRA Review webpage at [EJRA\(21\)11](#).

The extent to which the EJRA is contributing to the achievement of each *Aim* in each grade depends on its contribution to the creation of vacancies: see section 4.

#### b) The preamble and the over-arching *Aim*

*"In the context of the University's particular structure and procedures, the EJRA is considered to be an appropriate and necessary means of creating sufficient vacancies to meet the overarching Aim of safeguarding the high standards of the University in teaching, research and professional services, which in turn relies on the Aims."*

---

<sup>2</sup> The papers that underpinned these discussions (EJRA(21)07 and EJRA(21)10), and the minutes of them, can be read under the tabs for [meetings 4, 5 and 6](#) on the EJRA Review webpage.

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

The Group considered whether there are structures and procedures specific to the University that might mean it needs to take a different approach to retirement than many of its comparator institutions in the UK and abroad. It identified a number of ways in which Oxford is unique, or at least unusual, in comparison to its peer institutions and sought to explain them more clearly in a revised preamble (see Annexe D).

The Group agreed that the overarching *Aim* set out in the preamble i.e. safeguarding the high standards of the University, is legitimate and actually being pursued by the University, as confirmed by the [Mission](#) statement set out in the Strategic Plan 2018-2024. A number of measures demonstrate the University's success at maintaining its high standards in teaching, research and professional services, e.g. its top position in the 2022 [Times Higher Education World University Rankings](#)<sup>3</sup>.

### c) The first *Aim*: Inter-generational fairness

*Promoting inter-generational fairness and maintaining opportunities for career progression for those at particular stages of a career, given the importance of having available opportunities for progression across the generations.*

The Group decided to recommend that this *Aim* is legitimate and also that it remains relevant and important, given:

- global competition for top academic talent, and the importance of opportunities for career progression to attract and retain that talent;
- the academic structure at Oxford, with relatively small and fixed numbers of permanent academic posts, in part because of funding restraints arising from restrictions on student numbers; and
- the importance of promoting, and being seen to promote, fairness across the generations, given that the generation currently approaching retirement have benefitted from: the retirement of their predecessors at the state or default retirement age; protected and guaranteed pensions; more affordable housing; free tertiary education and local authority grants to cover living costs.

The University's commitment to these objectives and its efforts to meet them are demonstrated by the priorities in the [People Theme](#) of the Strategic Plan 2018-24, including 'to attract, recruit and retain the highest calibre staff', to 'provide a fair and open environment that allows staff to grow and flourish', and 'to ensure that Oxford remains an attractive place to work, taking into consideration the work environment, housing, childcare, visas, pensions and salary', and elsewhere in the [Strategic Plan](#).

---

<sup>3</sup> The extensive evidence for the University's global success is provided in more detail in paper [EJRA\(21\)11](#), which was considered by the Review Group.

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### d) The second *Aim*: Refreshing the workforce

*Refreshing the academic, research and other professional workforce as a route to maintaining the University's position on the international stage.*

The Review Group agreed that this *Aim* is legitimate, that it remains important and relevant, and that it is being actively pursued by the University. The continuing importance of refreshment to the University's mission to advance learning by teaching and research is demonstrated in the 2018-2024 Strategic Plan by:

- its [Vision](#) to provide world-class research and education; and
- its commitment to retain and refresh the collegiate University's rich academic environment ([Education Theme](#), Commitment 3).

It was considered important to clarify that this *Aim* does not suggest an understanding that older generations have fewer fresh ideas, but that turnover maintains the flow of those with new perspectives and expertise into the University, and enables refreshment of the workforce in terms of employing those whose work is in emerging areas.

### e) The third *Aim*: Succession planning

*Facilitating succession planning by maintaining predictable retirement dates, especially in relation to the collegiate University's joint appointment system.*

The Review Group agreed that this *Aim* is legitimate and remains relevant and important in those grades where the complexities of University systems and processes, and in particular the joint appointment system for Associate Professors, mean that predictable retirement dates are needed in order to avoid unexpected and lengthy gaps between appointments, which would have a deleterious effect on the University's ability to meet the overarching *Aim* of high standards in teaching and research.

Alternative approaches to this issue, such as longer notice periods and more proactive succession planning were discussed. It was agreed that proactive succession planning is an important objective in itself; however, for maximum impact the EJRA policy should be complemented with improved career management and succession planning processes across the University as a whole.

The Group concluded that this *Aim* should be retained.

### f) The fourth *Aim*: Diversity

*Promoting equality and diversity, noting that recent recruits are more diverse than the composition of the existing workforce, especially amongst the older age groups of the existing workforce.*

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

It was agreed that this *Aim* is legitimate, and remains important and relevant, particularly in those grades that have disproportionately low numbers of women (most notably the professorial grades including RSIVs) or a lower proportion of BME staff than the populations from which they are recruited.

The Public Sector Equality Duty<sup>4</sup> places the University under an active and legal duty to promote equality, including setting itself objectives and carrying out equality analysis of its policies, practices and decision-making. It also requires the University to have due regard, in particular, to the need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by particular groups, such as women, and to encourage participation by them in any activity in which their participation is disproportionately low. The Equality Act 2010 states expressly that compliance with the PSED may involve treating some people more favourably than others (so long as it does not breach the Act).

The University recognises that the participation of women and BME (Black and Minority Ethnic) people in certain senior roles in the University, such as Statutory Professor, Associate Professor and RSIV roles, is disproportionately low. Its commitment in this area and its ongoing efforts to improve diversity are demonstrated by:

- the [Vision](#), which states ‘We believe that a diverse staff and student body strengthens our research and enhances our students’ learning’;
- the Strategic Plan 2018-24, including Commitment 2 of the [People Theme](#), which is ‘To work towards an increasingly diverse staffing profile’;
- the University’s [equality objectives](#) to ‘increase the proportion of women in senior roles’ and ‘improve the recruitment and retention of BME (Black and Minority Ethnic) staff’;<sup>5</sup> and
- the action plans in place to structure the University’s efforts to achieve various national equality charter frameworks, including the [Race Equality Charter](#) and [Athena Swan](#).

The extent to which the University is achieving improved diversity varies by grade (see Section 4), but it was deemed vital that this *Aim* is retained (alongside other measures to improve diversity of all types) given the uneven progress and the importance of this issue and the fact that it is an *Aim* which the University is required by law to pursue.

The Group noted that the review was hampered by inadequate diversity data, particularly in relation to ethnicity and disability, and that this needs to be addressed.

### g) Conclusions

The Group considered whether any other *Aims* should be added to the existing list and decided that they should not.

---

<sup>4</sup> Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

<sup>5</sup> The [2020-21 Equality Report](#) was published in March 2022; because of the timing of publication the Review Group was not able to consider this report. The objective to increase the proportion of women in senior roles has been revised to “senior **academic** roles” but the comments here remain valid.

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

The Group agreed that the *Aims* were consistent with the University's Strategic Plan 2018-2024. It was decided to recommend that the wording of the *Aims* should be revised in order to clarify their links to the Strategic Plan (and in particular the priorities set out within the [People Theme](#)), as well as the [equality objectives](#) and commitments within the [Athena SWAN](#) and [Race Equality Charter](#) action plans.

The clarified *Aims*, with a more extensive preamble and closer references to relevant University strategic plans and objectives, can be seen at Annexe D.

# TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

## Section 4: Whether to retain an EJRA

### a) Grade groups

The Review Group recognised that the impact of the EJRA on vacancy creation and the *Aims* would be likely to vary by grade groups, in accordance with a number of other factors such as the level of other turnover in that group. Since it was not feasible to consider the relevant data by each of the University's grades, and this approach would in any event mean that the groups considered would often be too small for that data to be relied upon, it collated the grades into manageable groupings. In so doing, account was taken of consistency of terms and conditions, size of grades, role type, and seniority.

The seven groups used as the bases for analysis were:

- i) Statutory Professors
- ii) Associate Professors (including both APTFs and APNTFs)
- iii) Other academic staff
- iv) RSIVs (the most senior research grade) and clinical equivalents
- v) Grades 8 to 10 research staff
- vi) ALC6s (the most senior administrative and professional grade)
- vii) Grades 8 to 10 administrative and professional staff.

For further detail of the groups and why they have been constructed in this way, please refer to the [paper](#) considered by the Review Group, which is published under the 'Review Materials' tab on the [EJRA Review webpage](#).

### b) Alternatives

For each grade group, the Review Group considered whether there was evidence that the EJRA was contributing to the achievement of the *Aims*, and where there was, whether there were alternative means by which this contribution could be achieved.

These potential alternatives were identified through:

- i) discussions with senior representatives of other HEIs, three of which operate without an EJRA and one that has an EJRA<sup>6</sup>;
- ii) the experience of Review Group members and their knowledge of practice at other Universities; and
- iii) wider consultation across the University, including Town Hall meetings and a report and presentation prepared by Professor Sarah Harper, Clore Professor of Gerontology, Oxford Institute of Population Ageing.

---

<sup>6</sup> See paragraphs 7 to 23 of the [minutes of meeting 2](#) and paragraphs 13 to 18 of the [minutes of meeting 3](#).

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

They were, in summary:

- extended notice periods;
- a 'whole career' approach to career discussions and succession planning, to include a mid-career review at age 50 or similar;
- retirement incentives, on an ongoing basis or as occasional schemes;
- partial/phased retirement options;
- a greater range of opportunities for ongoing involvement in the social and academic life of the University after retirement;
- the creation of more posts in order to create vacancies by means other than retirement;
- converting substantive academic posts to fixed-term posts in order to generate turnover; and
- greater use of performance management.

These alternatives were not considered to be mutually exclusive, but rather to have the potential to form part of a package of measures.

### c) The data considered by the Review Group

The Review Group gathered and analysed a variety of internal staffing data relevant to the question of whether the EJRA is contributing to the creation of vacancies and thus to the achievement of the *Aims*. This has been shared under the ['Final Data Sets'](#) tab on the EJRA Review webpage, and includes:

- information on turnover, including voluntary and involuntary turnover, by grade group and division ([Final data set turnover](#));
- a summary of the EJRA population by year since 2006, by grade group; the number of staff retiring and working beyond the EJRA by year and by grade group; applications for extended employment by year, sex, division and role type; success rate of applications by year and role type; the number of applications that involved vacation of a substantive post by year; average length of extensions by year, role type and division ([Data on the Exemptions process](#));
- comparisons of the diversity by sex and ethnicity of new hires and retirees by grade group ([Diversity among joiners and leavers](#));
- diversity dashboards by age band, legal sex, disability and ethnicity; and
- information on reasons for leaving University employment by year and grade group; mean and median age on leaving by grade group; activity after leaving employment by grade group and age band ([Reason for leaving and age on leaving](#)).

There were other pieces of data, from the original data sets, included in the presentations given to the group at review group meetings; these included:

- Activity after leaving employment at the University of Oxford and the comparison of new hires to retiring staff numbers ([Meeting 6 presentation](#))
- Assumptions data on the contribution of the EJRA to create vacancies, based on the responses to staff and retired staff questionnaires on the likely age of retirement in

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

the absence of the EJRA ([Meeting 6 presentation](#) and [Assessing the impact of the EJRA on the creation of vacancies](#))

- Updates on the EJRA population grade growth (i.e. increase in the number of posts in a particular grade) between 2011- 2021 and the number of staff in each grade group nearing the EJRA (based on data from July 2021) ([EJRA Meeting 8 presentation](#))
- Percentages of fixed-term contracts by grade group as of July 2021 ([EJRA Meeting 8 presentation](#)).

These data formed the bases for two sets of analyses, intended to assist the Group in understanding the past impact of the EJRA on the creation of vacancies and its potential future impact on recruitment rates. The first approach combined information on retirements and grade growth by grade group with estimates of likely behaviour in the absence of an EJRA based on various sources (responses to the various surveys and behaviour in periods when the EJRA has not been in effect) to produce estimates of the [impact of the EJRA](#) on vacancy creation by grade group and year. The second used Little's Law of Queueing<sup>7</sup> as the basis for modelling conducted by the University's Student Data Management and Analysis Team, with assistance from the Statistics Challenge Panel, to produce estimates for the impact on recruitment rates if the EJRA were changed to a different age or removed. This latter approach relies on a steady population, so could only be applied to Statutory Professors and Associate Professors.<sup>8</sup>

The Review Group considered this internal staffing data in the context of data acquired from HESA, which provided an overview of turnover and other material factors across the [Russell Group](#).

A brief summary of the key pieces of data as they relate to each grade can be seen at Annexe E.

### **d) Statutory Professors, Associate Professors, and RSIVs and clinical equivalents**

#### *Summary*

The Group concluded that the EJRA is contributing to the *Aims* of the EJRA in these three grade groups, on the basis of a range of data and approaches to modelling. It is promoting intergenerational fairness, particularly in the context of the changing pensions landscape which is particularly detrimental to younger staff. Turnover in these grades is vital given the low levels of diversity in them, and fixed retirement dates known well in advance are particularly important where the lead times for recruitment are longer. No alternative approaches that would have a comparable impact on the *Aims* were identified.

#### *Intergenerational fairness*

---

<sup>7</sup> Little JDC (1961) A proof for the queueing formula:  $L = \lambda W$ . Oper. Res. 9(3):383–387.

<sup>8</sup> Although there was some increase in the number of posts in these two categories, and the data analysis sought to take that into account.



## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

This is the highest paid staff group at the University, and the [Aon pensions modelling](#) shows the greatest disparity in retirement benefits for this group between staff close to retirement and younger generations. Retaining the EJRA for these groups would help maintain turnover in these posts and therefore opportunity for career progression for younger staff, giving them access to permanent roles on better salaries and enabling them to better save for retirement. Those in Associate Professor roles provided consistent feedback that they consider themselves underpaid in comparison to their peers at other universities globally, and that their career structure and progression was poorly defined. Although out of scope for this review, this point should be addressed by the University.

### *Refreshment of the workforce*

Turnover in all three grade groups is relatively low, despite the high proportion of staff in fixed-term contracts in the RSIV and equivalents group. Growth in the Statutory Professor and Associate Professor grades is modest, although growth in the number of RSIVs and equivalent is notably high over the last ten years.

Approximately two fifths of leavers in the Statutory Professor and Associate Professor grades and one fifth of leavers in the RSIV and equivalents grade group have left by reason of retirement in the ten years of the EJRA.

In addition, staff in the Statutory Professor and RSIV grades have a [relatively high mean average age](#) which reflects the seniority of these roles, meaning that more than a quarter of them will reach the EJRA in the next five years. Experience demonstrates that many of those will seek to remain in employment: over a quarter of Statutory Professors and two fifths of RSIVs and equivalents have sought to extend their employment on reaching the EJRA in the last ten years (this proportion is likely to increase as changes to pension provision begin to have an impact on retirement savings) and the proportion of staff aged 60 or over in those roles has steadily increased. SPs aged 60 or over constituted 31.1% of all SPs in 2006 and this figure had increased to 48.6% by 2021, and in the RSIV group the percentage has increased from 17.9% to 26.5% (figures taken from the [dataset on population by age band](#)). The proportion of Associate Professors seeking extended employment is lower, but this is the grade with exceptionally low turnover overall (3.8%) and the lowest grade growth (8.8% in ten years), meaning that turnover is particularly problematic in this grade. The Group did not discuss what a desirable level of turnover might be.

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

Table 1: data summary for grade groups Statutory Professor, Associate Professor and RSIV and equivalents. Data drawn from the data snapshot at 19/8/21, final data sets and summary impact tables.

Grade group	No. staff covered by EJRA at 19/8/21	Turnover (mean average 2011-2021)	Growth in grade (2011-21)	% Fixed-Term Contracts in the grade	% of grade who reach EJRA 2021-2026	% of leavers who retired 2011-21	EJRA applications as a % of average population (2011- 2021)
<b>Statutory Professor</b>	251 (4.2%)	6.1%	13%	0.8%	31.1%	42.4% (64)	28% (70)
<b>Associate Professors</b>	1218 (21.3%)	3.8%	8.8%	0.4%	11.0%	39.9% (178)	2.67% (31)
<b>RSIVs and equivalents</b>	232 (4.1%)	7.1%	107.1%	36.8%	25.9%	21.5% (62)	41.34% (74)

The modelling based on these data provides a mixed picture. The estimates of the impact of the EJRA based on data over the last ten years and the responses to the questionnaire on the [Review Group webpage](#) are that 34% of Statutory Professor vacancies, 17% of Associate Professor vacancies and 7% of RSIV vacancies are associated with the EJRA<sup>9</sup>.

The modelling based on [Little's Law of Queuing](#), conducted by the Student Data Management and Analysis Team, attempted to look ahead and estimate the likely future impact on recruitment rates as a result of any changes in the EJRA. The modelling was only possible for the Statutory Professor and Associate Professor grade groups because a steady population is required. While both of these groups experienced some grade growth, their populations were considered sufficiently stable for these purposes. The modelling provides variety of potential outcomes based on different variables and different ages at which the EJRA could be set: for example, it estimates a decrease in the recruitment rate of 2% for Statutory Professors and 1% for Associate Professors if the EJRA were moved to 69 in steady state (i.e. after any transitional period of the age of the EJRA were raised). The higher the retirement age, the greater reduction in the recruitment rate. The EJRA therefore helps maintain the recruitment rate and contributes to the aim of refreshing the workforce as a route to maintaining the University's position on the international stage.

### Diversity

The Review Group reviewed [data](#) to help them understand the likely impact of the EJRA on diversity. They noted that there is no 'control group' since the University has not operated without a retirement age and those HEIs that do not have an EJRA have very different staffing data and procedures. It was agreed that it would not be possible to draw a direct line of cause and effect, given the many other approaches being taken to improve diversity e.g. in more inclusive recruitment, and supporting career progression for specific groups.

<sup>9</sup> The [other assumptions](#) used in the analysis – based on the surveys of retired staff or the change in retirement patterns in 2011-13 - produce different outcomes but following a similar patterns, with a greater impact of the EJRA in the more senior grades.

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

Nonetheless, they were clear that those other approaches will necessarily be limited in their impact if the level of turnover cannot be maintained.

The data on [Statutory Professors](#) demonstrates a slow improvement in gender diversity over the ten years of the EJRA from 10.4% women in 2011 to 20.2% in 2021, with a slight acceleration since 2013/4 when inclusive recruitment processes were introduced for this grade. The rate of improvement had been slower for the five years preceding the introduction of the EJRA. A direct link can be drawn between this improvement and turnover in the grade by looking at the [Final Data Set](#) showing diversity among joiners and leavers by grade. This shows that 32.5% of those recruited as Statutory Professors in the last five years were women, and only 3.7% of those retiring. The Review Group took the view that the two factors working together – maintained turnover, in part through the EJRA, and improved recruitment processes – were responsible for this improvement, and that it must be maintained through continued focus on these two approaches.

The data on race diversity in this grade group were less instructive, since the proportion of 'unknowns' is much larger than the number of Statutory Professors known to have minority ethnicity. The data on disability is similarly unhelpful because of the high proportion of 'unknowns'.

Progress in improving diversity among Associate Professors has been slower, with the proportion of women increasing from 26.6% to 31.3% in the last ten years. The Group considered this to be frustrating, but once more decided that maintained turnover was contributing to the increase. The very low turnover rate (3-4%) among this group means that changes in diversity will always be slow, but women comprise 38.9% of new joiners to the grade, and only 23.5% of retirees. This is why the EJRA is a means to improve diversity in this group.

Although the unknowns are high once again, the proportion of known BME Associate Professors recruited (10.2%) is higher than that retiring (1.8%). This has contributed to the improvement in the proportion of BME staff in the grade from 5.8% to 8.1% in the last ten years, with some divisional differences.

As with Associate Professors, the Review Group considered that the slow rate of improvement in diversity by legal sex among RSIVs and equivalents should be a focus for Personnel Committee to address. The proportion of women has increased only from 28.2% to 30.8% since 2011. That said, the higher proportion of women among new joiners to the grade (35.4% in the last five years) compared with retirees (26.5%) will contribute as long as other measures to address recruitment and retention are in place.

Improvements in the proportion of RSIV and equivalent staff from a minority ethnic background have also been slow – a 1.3% increase from 9.3% to 10.6% in the last ten years. The figures for ethnic diversity among new joiners (11.8% BME) compared with retirees (1.4%) in the last five years suggest the increases, small though they are, depend on maintaining turnover.

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### *Succession planning*

Recruitment to posts in these grades, particularly to Statutory Professorships and Associate Professorships, has a long lead time. There are a number of reasons for this, including the highly competitive nature of the international job market for senior academics and the complexities of the University's joint appointments system for Associate Professors. The EJRA maintains predictable retirement dates, thus avoiding long gaps in between appointments and contributing to the University's ability to meet the overarching *Aim* of high standards in teaching and research.

### *Proportionality*

The Group also considered whether the EJRA was a proportionate and necessary means of achieving the *Aims* for these grades, and concluded that it was for the reasons given above.

### *Alternatives*

The Group considered the alternative approaches that had been identified, seeking to establish whether any of them might provide a means of achieving the *Aims* for these grades without requiring staff to retire at a certain age. It was noted that the flexible retirement process within [USS](#) provides a means to reduce an individual's commitments over time and avoid the 'cliff edge'. The exceptions process and the existence of opportunities for continued involvement in University and college matters after retirement also support this: these opportunities include access to libraries, honorary research agreements to allow continued use of laboratory and other space and / or equipment, and ongoing membership of Congregation.

It was considered unlikely that offering financial incentives to more staff to retire would be effective: an incentive large enough to outweigh the benefit from further contributions to pensions and pay at the top of the salary scale would have to be substantial, which would render any scheme unaffordable.

The creation of sufficient posts to achieve the same number of vacancies each year was deemed impractical and unaffordable, because of the restrictions on student numbers, the joint appointments system, and in some cases space constraints, and the Group did not think that the application of a combination of approaches would achieve a comparable impact on turnover or on the [Aims](#).

The Group considered performance management review as an alternative to the EJRA, and noted that it was part of the framework in other Russell Group universities which did not have an EJRA. While the Group acknowledged that there was a case for strengthening the culture of effective line management in some areas of the University, they were wary of the time and effort that would be required to run a comprehensive performance management regime in a rigorous and fair way. This consideration, alongside the significance attached to the concept of academic freedom, led them to conclude that a formal performance

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

management system would not be an appropriate substitute for an EJRA in the Oxford context. In addition Congregation had previously voted against performance management.<sup>10</sup>

The Group concluded that alternative approaches would not be an appropriate means of achieving the *Aims* for these grades.

### *Conclusion*

The Review Group decided that the EJRA is contributing to the maintenance of turnover, and thus to the achievement of the *Aims* for Statutory Professors, Associate Professors, and RSIVs and equivalents. The Group concluded that alternative approaches would not achieve the same or a comparable impact. Therefore, the continued application of the EJRA to these grade groups can be justified. It was noted that it was not possible to determine a direct causal relationship between the EJRA and the achievement of the *Aims*; however, given the data it was decided that retaining the EJRA is a necessary tool, together with other initiatives, to achieve the *Aims*.

### **e) Other professorial posts**

The Review Group discussed at length whether the V-C should be treated as a member of the professorial group, or as a senior member of the administrative and professional grouping, deciding that on balance this should be deemed a post equivalent to Statutory Professors and thus retained within the coverage of the EJRA.

The Professor of Poetry, however, was deemed to be different in type, due to its largely honorary nature and short fixed-term contract (4 years, allowing for regular refreshment and opportunities for others to compete for the post). It was decided to recommend that this post should not be subject to the EJRA from its next election, due to be in 2023.

Similarly, the small number of employed Visiting Professorships in the University (only four, since most are not subject to the EJRA as it stands, as they do not involve an employment contract) have a high level of turnover because they are limited to one year, fixed-term contracts. As a result, the opportunities for refreshment and career development occur naturally without a need for an EJRA. The Group decided to recommend removing these posts from the scope of the policy.

The paper that formed the basis of the Group's discussion of these three posts and the minutes of that discussion can be found on the [EJRA Review webpage](#).

---

<sup>10</sup> *Gazette* vol. 135, 19 May 2005 p.208

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### f) Other academic staff, ALC6 staff and staff in grades 8-10 research and administrative and professional roles

In considering the contribution that the EJRA makes to turnover and thus to the achievement of the *Aims* in these groups, the Group noted that other factors ensure a steady flow of vacancies, namely comparatively high turnover (in part because of the relatively high proportion of fixed-term contracts) and grade growth. A smaller proportion of leavers in these grade groups leave by reason of retirement, and few applications for employment beyond the EJRA are made by members of these groups.

The estimates of the impact of the EJRA (based on assumption E, which is drawn from responses to the questionnaire hosted on the EJRA Review webpage) are correspondingly low, at 3% for the Other Academic grade group, and 1% for the ALC6 and grades 8 to 10.

*Table 2: data summary for grade groups Other Academic, ALC6, and grades 8 to 10. Data drawn from final data sets and summary impact tables.*

Grade group	No. staff covered by EJRA in 2021	Turnover (mean average 2011-2021)	Growth in grade (2011-21)	<a href="#">% FTCs in the grade</a>	% of grade who reach EJRA 2021-2026	% of leavers who retired 2011-21	EJRA applications as a % of average population (2011- 2021)
<b>Other academic</b>	625 (10.9%)	12.2%	65.2%	70.5%	7.3%	6.6% (10)	5.1% (26)
<b>Research grade 8-10</b>	1491 (26.0%)	15.5%	65.0%	76.6%	5.1%	5.0% (74)	0.9% (17)
<b>ALC6*</b>	93 (1.6%)	10.3%	19.0%	28.0%	16.1%	22.6% (21)	0 (0)
<b>Admin &amp; Prof G8-10</b>	1822 (31.8%)	9.8%	82.5%	24.5%	6.2%	13.0% (169)	2.0% (25)

\* NB This grade is small at 93 staff in 2021, and so the data should be treated with particular caution.

The Review Group decided that there was no evidence that the EJRA is contributing to turnover in these grades or that it is impacting the *Aims*. Opportunities for refreshment and career advancement for individuals are created by turnover and grade growth. These grades are already the more diverse with the proportion of women in them varying from 42% to 54.6% (see [Diversity dashboard by legal sex](#)), and steadily increasing proportions of BME staff (except in the Other Academic group; see [Diversity dashboard population by race](#)) and staff with disabilities (except in the ALC6 category; see [Diversity Dashboard population by disability](#)). These grades are not subject to joint appointments or generally to unusually long notice periods, which makes succession planning easier.

The Group considered whether it was likely that changes in pensions would result in a change in behaviour by staff in these grades and an increase in the proportion seeking to remain in employment beyond the EJRA. Given that the proportion of staff in these grades that will reach the EJRA in the next five years is small, except for among the ALC6 grade

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

where there is no history of staff seeking to work beyond the EJRA, it was decided that this was unlikely.

The Group considered whether weight should be given to the desirability of consistency between the most senior academic, research and administrative and professional grades, as it was during the 5-year review in 2017. However, this would mean that these grades were retained within the EJRA even though the ten year data now demonstrates that the policy is not having a significant impact on turnover or the achievement of the *Aims*. As a result, the Review Group decided that in the interests of applying its principle of being data-driven, this argument should not take priority over the conclusions that could be drawn from the data.

As a result, the Review Group recommends that all of these grade groups – ALC6s, Other Academic, grade 8 to 10 research staff, and grade 8 to 10 administrative and professional staff - are removed from the coverage of the EJRA. Given that it is not anticipated that this will result in a substantial increase in the number of staff in these grade groups choosing to stay in employment beyond the age of 68 in the next five years, no alternative measures are recommended in support of the *Aims*.

### g) Committee members

The Review Group noted that [Council Regulations 14 of 2002, clause 1.2](#) restricts membership of University committees (as defined in [section 6 \(3\) of Statute I](#)) to University staff who have not yet retired and to external members who have not yet reached the 30 September immediately preceding their 66<sup>th</sup> birthday, unless special permission is granted by the appropriate authority. It is not clear that this restriction helps achieve the *Aims*, and lifting it would provide a welcome increase in the opportunities for retired staff to continue to make a meaningful contribution to the life and work of the University. The Group therefore recommends that internal and external committee members should be removed from the coverage of the EJRA and that this clause should be removed from the Regulations.

## Section 5: The age of the EJRA

### a) The current age of the EJRA

In 2011, the age for the new EJRA was set at the 30<sup>th</sup> September before the 68<sup>th</sup> birthday. This ensured consistency across the population then subject to the EJRA, that the EJRA was higher than the pension age in USS and the state pension age, and it 'levelled up' the two different retirement ages (65 and 67) in place at the time, meaning that most staff had a two-year extension to their contractual retirement date.

In 2017, following the five-year review, the EJRA was raised by one year to the 30<sup>th</sup> September preceding the 69<sup>th</sup> birthday. A number of factors contributed to this decision, including the clear trend in longevity data, in that life expectancy at birth was increasing by one year every five years<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> The full reasoning of the five-year review group is explained at pp. 20-24 of the [five-year review report](#).



## **TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

The working group that conducted the five-year review also recommended that the ten year review result in a further increase of one year in the age of the EJRA, “provided that the ten year data confirms the trends observed in this interim review” (p.24 of the [interim review report](#)).

### **b) Factors considered by the Review Group**

In considering the age at which the EJRA should be set for those grade groups that are to be retained within it, the Review Group discussed:

- the [latest data on life expectancy from the ONS](#), which demonstrates a levelling off in life expectancy for women and a slight drop in life expectancy for men in 2018-2020, as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic;
- the feedback from current staff on when they hope to retire and on the age at which they consider the EJRA should be set, as part of the questionnaire hosted on the EJRA Review webpage and in correspondence to the Chair (see [EJRA\(22\)03](#) and [EJRA\(22\)08](#));
- the feedback from retired staff on when they would have retired in the absence of an EJRA in the survey of retired staff (see [EJRA\(22\)03](#) and [EJRA\(22\)08](#));
- information about [retirement ages elsewhere in HE and other sectors](#); and
- the application of modelling based on [Little’s Law of Queueing](#), which demonstrated the ongoing impact on vacancy creation of different ages at which the EJRA could be set;
- the pension benefits accrued by members of these grade groups nearing retirement age compared with the pension benefits being accrued by younger generations, including the modelling paper produced by [Aon](#); and
- confidential and legally privileged legal advice.

It was noted that the age at which current staff hope to retire is now considerably higher than it was in 2016/17, possibly because of decreased confidence in their pension provision.

### **c) Different approaches considered**

The Review Group considered whether it would be appropriate to set the EJRA at a different age for different groups and decided that consistency was a more desirable approach. This would provide for greater clarity and simplicity of application. In addition, the Group could not identify any evidence for different ages for any of the grade groups for which they are recommending retention of the EJRA.

The idea of linking the EJRA to length of service or to reaching a certain level of pension saving was also rejected as being too complex, potentially open to abuse, and difficult to manage. Any advantages of this approach would not outweigh these considerations.

The suggestion in the consultation that the EJRA is unfair to those who are born in the summer and so retire under the EJRA soon after their 68<sup>th</sup> birthday was rejected. There are rational, practical reasons to have a consistent retirement date that aligns with the academic



## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

year and allows the recruitment of staff to vacancies over the summer vacation, in time for the academic year.

### d) Arguments for and against a rise in age of the EJRA

There was no appetite among the Group to reduce the age of the EJRA and it was quickly decided that any increase of the EJRA above 70 would have a strong detrimental effect on the achievement of the *Aims*, both in the short term, when there would be a substantial decrease in retirements, and in the longer term, when there would be an ongoing reduction in turnover as a result of longer tenure of posts.

The Review Group identified the following advantages to *retaining an EJRA of the 30<sup>th</sup> September before the 69<sup>th</sup> birthday*:

- i) the number of applications for extended employment historically from staff in the grade groups that the Review Group recommends retaining in the EJRA ([final data set on exceptions process](#)) and the proportion of academic staff who stated a preference to retire later than the current EJRA on the questionnaire (76 out of 137 responses i.e. 55.5%) suggest that there would be a substantial reduction in retirement if the EJRA were raised to 70. This would undermine the achievement of the *Aims* which would be avoided by retaining the current EJRA;
- ii) retaining the current age would assist the University in achieving its diversity targets. Raising the age of the EJRA would mean that staff would remain in post for longer on average, causing an ongoing reduction in the recruitment rate for Statutory Professors and Associate Professors. Any reduction in the recruitment rate may impair the University's ability to meet its targets for increasing the proportion of female and BME Statutory Professors and Associated Professors, if the effect of the reduction is not mitigated by other initiatives. According to the Little's Law modelling, for Statutory Professors, increasing the EJRA age by one year is projected to decrease the current annual recruitment rate of 20.7 posts by 0.40 posts (2% of yearly recruitment); for Associate Professors, increasing the EJRA age by one year is projected to decrease the current annual recruitment rate of 68.37 posts by 0.83 posts (1% of yearly recruitment);
- iii) retaining the current age would send a strong message to all staff that the creation of career opportunities for younger generations and diversity are of paramount importance, particularly in light of the greater negative impact of pension changes upon them rather than those approaching retirement: this will have a positive impact on the University's ability to attract and retain the most talented younger academics and researchers and a diverse workforce, which will in turn have a positive impact on the achievement of the *Aims*; and
- iv) the next review would have a longer stretch of data unaffected by temporary pauses in the operation of the policy while a revised EJRA date came into effect and would therefore be able to undertake more effective analysis of its impact.

The Review Group identified the following advantages to *increasing the EJRA to the 30<sup>th</sup> September before the 70<sup>th</sup> birthday*:

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

- i) a majority of respondents to the survey in the target grade groups wish to retire at 69 or beyond so an increase in the age of the EJRA would reduce the deleterious and discriminatory impact of the policy on this group;
- ii) this would support those approaching the EJRA in the next five years by enabling them to extend their careers and make further contributions to their pension savings. It was noted that the impact of the recent changes to USS is greater for those in younger generations than for those approaching retirement<sup>12</sup>; and
- iii) the five-year review had recommended that the ten-year review consider a further increase of one year in the age of the EJRA, “provided that the ten year data confirms the trends observed in this interim review” (p.24 of the [interim review report](#)). This related mainly to trends in life expectancy where the trend has changed.

### e) Conclusions

The Group discussed the importance of making their decisions based on the data available to them rather than other considerations, but were aware that Congregation approval of any proposed revisions to the policy would be vital if the EJRA were to continue its contribution to the achievement of the *Aims*. Many members of the Group saw the continuation of the policy, and its contribution to improved diversity in senior grades in particular, as of paramount importance.

The Group were keenly aware that changes in pension provision since the five-year review have resulted in many people adjusting their plans for their own retirement and their views of the inter-generational fairness with the policy. They took extensive advice on this point from [Aon and the presentation given](#). Some members of the Group considered that a one year increase in the age now would be fairest to those nearing retirement who are concerned about the impact of recent changes in USS on their retirement income. Others argued that the impact of these changes on those due to retire soon is very small compared to the impact on those in younger generations, and so the Group’s priority in terms of inter-generational fairness should be on helping those younger generations to access permanent roles on better salaries so that they are more able to save for retirement.

After extended discussions, the Review Group decided that the decision as to whether to retain the current EJRA of the 30<sup>th</sup> September before the 69<sup>th</sup> birthday or to increase it by one year was extremely finely balanced and, although the weight of opinion within the Group leaned towards a one year rise in the age, this issue should be referred to Personnel Committee and Council, with a summary of the arguments for and against that have been identified by the Group.

---

<sup>12</sup> For an explanation of the impact of recent and anticipated changes to USS on those at different career stages, see [EJRA\(22\)04](#) and the presentation from [Aon](#).

# TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

## Section 6: The exceptions process

### a) Background

Since its inception in 2011, the EJRA policy has allowed for time-limited extensions to employment beyond the EJRA where an application has been approved by an EJRA Panel or, since 2015, the EJRA Committee. The [Procedure](#) that applies to extension applications has been refined over time, in response to experience and observations made in the course of appeals.

The current process involves:

- an application by the individual to the EJRA Committee, a standing committee of eight<sup>13</sup>, at least two years in advance of their EJRA date;
- comments on specified aspects of the application from the individual's Department or Faculty and from their Division;
- an opportunity for the applicant to provide a written response to the comments provided by the Department or Faculty and the Division;
- consideration of the application by the EJRA Committee against the factors set out at [paragraphs 36 to 39](#) of the EJRA Procedure; and
- a letter from the Secretary to the EJRA Committee setting out the Committee's decision and, where applicable, the right of appeal to a University Appeal Panel, under [Part H of Statute XII](#).

Those whose applications are approved may make a subsequent application for a further extension if they can demonstrate that unforeseeable circumstances frustrated the purpose for which the original application was intended ([Section 7](#) of the EJRA procedure).

The Secretary to the EJRA Committee is available to provide advice to individual applicants, Departments or Faculties and Divisions throughout the process.

### b) Evidence

The Review Group considered [a range of data](#) relating to the exceptions process, including application and success rates, and breakdowns by gender, division and role type.

They discussed this in the context of feedback provided by current and former staff members through the consultation process and the experience of members of the Group who were current or former members of the EJRA Committee, or who had commented on applications as part of departmental or divisional committees, or who had supported colleagues making applications.

The Group noted that:

---

<sup>13</sup> Chaired by the Chair of Personnel Committee, the EJRA Committee also comprises an external member and representatives of the four academic divisions, GLAM and UAS.

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

- there have been fewer applications since the criteria were changed in 2017 to place more emphasis on self-funding for extensions;
- it is more difficult for those in administrative and professional roles and for academic and research staff who work in areas with less availability of external grant funding to meet the expectations for extensions. This means, for example, that there have been few successful applications from the Humanities Division;
- success rates for applications overall remain high; and
- there is no evidence that women are making proportionately fewer applications than men, or that they are less likely to make successful applications.

The Group also reviewed the feedback provided through the Town Hall meetings, on the questionnaire on the Review Group webpage, and in correspondence to the Chair. This demonstrated that the exceptions process is poorly understood by some, with misconceptions including that:

- outcomes of applications are driven primarily by departments;
- there is no route to receive advice on applications; and,
- individuals cannot apply for extended employment until they have funding for their extension in place.

The feedback also revealed concerns about the transparency of the process and whether it is serving the needs of those, primarily women, whose careers have been impacted by caring responsibilities.

### **c) Whether to retain an exceptions process**

The Group considered whether the exceptions process serves the *Aims* of the EJRA and decided that it makes the policy more effective in balancing the needs of the generations, in that it:

- allows those nearing the EJRA to make best use of the last years of their employment by applying for grants and beginning strategically important projects, even where those would continue beyond their EJRA date; and
- creates an expectation that those whose employment is extended will vacate substantive posts and fund their own employment costs in order that their posts can be refilled in support of the *Aims*.

### **d) Matters to be taken into account in considering applications**

The expectation that applicants fund their own employment costs for their extension, and that the length and FTE of extensions is limited to that which can be funded (e.g. through grant income), was considered be an important factor in ensuring that there is no impediment to the refilling of substantive posts in support of the *Aims*.

It was noted that a lack of space can also prevent the refilling of posts, and examples were cited where academic posts have remained vacant because individuals have continued to

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

occupy laboratory space during their extension. The Group took the view that space should be treated in the same way as salary costs, with those applying for extensions required to vacate any space that would be needed to refill their post, to minimize the impact of extensions on the achievement of the *Aims*. It was recognised that this might necessitate a change of Department for the applicant, the renting of commercial space, or, if other ways to identify suitable space cannot be found, the refusal of an application for extended employment, in support of the *Aims*.

The Group noted that the exceptions process has the potential to mitigate the impact of the EJRA on those whose careers have been shortened by caring responsibilities or other personal circumstances, such as a disability. The consultation had demonstrated the importance of this issue to many staff, especially women. The current list of issues to be considered by the EJRA Committee includes the question:

*Are there any special personal circumstances that would properly justify exceptional treatment?*

The Group felt that this criterion could be strengthened, with the addition of specific examples to make it clearer that it is intended to be broad enough to, for example, support the careers of those who have taken family leave, or who have had their research slowed by disability<sup>14</sup>. It was recognised that the existence of these personal circumstances would not in themselves be sufficient to justify an extension: the other criteria would remain relevant.

### **e) Improving transparency**

Finally, the Review Group decided to recommend that efforts should be made to improve the transparency of the exceptions process, including by:

- publishing the names of the members of the EJRA Committee;
- clarifying in the Procedure that applications for extended employment can and should be made in advance of applying for any grant that would necessitate the applicant's employment beyond the EJRA. Any approvals will then be provisional and subject to successful application for the specified grant;
- specifying which posts should be vacated for an extension to employment; and
- making clearer where advice on the process and on making applications can be sought.

---

<sup>14</sup> The Review Group were clear that this criterion was not intended to be used by those who had chosen to enter academic life after another career, or who were born late in the academic year (noting that those who are summer born and so retire under the EJRA soon after the relevant birthday will in most cases have begun their academic lives earlier for the same reason).

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### Section 7: Recommendations

The Review Group recommends that:

1. The EJRA is retained for those employed as Statutory Professors, Associate Professors and RSIVs (the most senior researchers), and for the Vice-Chancellor.
2. Those in grades 8 to 10 and ALC6 (the senior administrative grade) are removed from the scope of the EJRA, together with employed Visiting Professors, the Professor of Poetry and committee members.
3. The *Aims* are retained, with some amendments to clarify the relationship with the University's Vision, Mission and Strategic Plan 2018-24.
4. Personnel Committee consider whether to recommend to Council an increase in the age of the EJRA of one year, given the benefits and drawbacks identified in this report.
5. The [exceptions process](#) be adapted to better support those whose careers have been impacted by caring responsibilities or other personal circumstances, to ensure space constraints do not prevent recruitment, and that it be communicated more effectively and transparently.
6. Transition arrangements for any changes to policy which are agreed are put in place, and the EJRA is reviewed again in five years' time, when more data are available and circumstances may have changed.
7. There should be a more strategic approach to retirement, including discussions well in advance of the EJRA and better understanding of the flexible retirement options in USS, in order to facilitate informed decision making by individuals and better departmental succession planning, together with better and more consistent support for staff who wish to remain part of the intellectual and social life of the University in order to support a dignified and phased approach to retirement.
8. Given that the EJRA contributes to vacancy creation, but cannot achieve the *Aims* in isolation, other approaches such as inclusive recruitment across all grades and divisions must continue to be pursued as a priority to accelerate progress.
9. The Group noted that the review was hampered by inadequate diversity data, particularly in relation to ethnicity and disability, and that this needs to be addressed.

# TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

## Annexe A : The History of Retirement at Oxford

### ***The Employer-Justified Retirement Age (EJRA)***

The University's EJRA is enshrined in [Statute XIV](#), section 15, as follows:

15. (1) Every employee of the University who holds a post on, or assessed as equivalent to, grade 8 or above, other than the holder of a professorship to which a canonry is annexed who is exempt from membership of the appropriate pension scheme referred to in section 12 of this statute, shall normally retire from employment not later than the 30th September immediately preceding his or her 69th birthday.

(2) Council may make arrangements to provide for the continued employment of employees, for a limited period and in special circumstances, as described in the EJRA policies and procedures (as amended from time to time by Council on the recommendation of Personnel Committee).

### ***Retirement before 2011***

In 1985, the retirement age for all academic and academic-related staff was set at 30 September prior to the 66<sup>th</sup> birthday. Those who already held a contract of employment retained the right to retire at the previous retirement age of 67, which had been in place since at least 1970.

Those who wished to work beyond the retirement age could apply to Personnel Committee for permission to do so. In 2006, the absolute prohibition on employment beyond age 70 was removed for all staff.

In 2006, it became unlawful to discriminate on the grounds of age, except if that discrimination can be justified in that it is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim (Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006, now incorporated in the Equality Act 2010). This in principle includes discriminating against a person by mandatory retirement at a particular age, although initially the law created an exception to this by permitting a default retirement age.

### ***The introduction of the EJRA***

The Employment Equality (Repeal of Retirement Age Provisions) Regulations 2011 abolished the default retirement age nationally from 1 October 2011. The Regulations allowed for the maintenance of an employer-justified retirement age when an employing body sought to use retirement as a proportionate means to achieve a legitimate aim. However, if an individual employer wished to retain a retirement age, they had to justify it in accordance with the statutory requirements in order to avoid it being regarded as age discrimination. The *Aims* set out in the University's EJRA Policy are specifically framed to meet the statutory requirements.

## **TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

In 2011, when the new Regulations were announced, Personnel Committee undertook two rounds of consultation with Congregation, the UCU, the Conference of Colleges and all University staff. The first consultation, from 17 February 2011 to 18 March 2011, focussed on matters of principle. The second consultation, from 9 June 2011 to 8 July 2011, made more specific recommendations.

Taking into account the feedback in those consultations, Council decided that an EJRA of 30 September preceding the 68<sup>th</sup> birthday should be established for all academic and academic-related staff (i.e. all those in grade 6 and above). The *Aims* of the policy were laid down: in broad terms, Council considered that an EJRA was necessary and proportionate to support the University's mission to sustain excellence in teaching, research and administration.

The policy was to be supported by a procedure under which individuals who wished to remain in employment beyond their EJRA date could apply to a Panel of current and former members of Personnel Committee for an extension of employment. Those whose applications were unsuccessful had the right of appeal to the University's internal Appeal Court under [Statute XII](#).

Council published the change to Regulations required to give effect to the retirement age in the *Gazette* in the normal way. No amendments or objections were received and the policy was introduced for a period of ten years, with the intention to conduct an interim review after five years.

Personnel Committee reviews a report on the operation of the exceptions process each year.

### ***Revisions to the EJRA in 2015***

In 2014, in the course of an individual appeal against a decision not to allow an application for extended employment, the University's internal Appeal Court made observations about the justification for the EJRA and the operation of the exceptions procedure. Personnel Committee had access to confidential and privileged legal advice. It set up a working group to consider whether any changes should be made to the EJRA's *Aims* or to the exceptions procedure, prior to the five-year review due in 2016-17.

That working group reviewed the observations of the internal Appeal Court and the annual reports on the operation of the exceptions procedure. They had access to specialist legal support. The working group contained several members of the EJRA Panel, who had direct experience of the exceptions procedure.

Following the review, the working group recommended to Personnel Committee some amendments to the *Aims* and to the exceptions procedure. The deadline for applications was moved to one year prior to the EJRA for all staff, the role of departments and divisions in the process was adjusted, and the EJRA Panel was replaced by a standing EJRA Committee, which would consider applications for extended employment in gathered fields every six months. Changes were made to the factors to be taken into consideration in assessing applications, partly to make clearer the expectation that individuals step out of their



## **TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

substantive posts in order that they can be refilled and that they identify funding to support their roles during their extension. The consideration relating to the applicant's academic prestige was removed, in order to avoid any appearance that the considerations include any degree of performance assessment.

These revised procedures came into effect on 30 September 2015.

### ***The five-year review in 2016-2017***

The five-year review of the EJRA took place in 2016/17 and was conducted by a Working Group chaired by [Professor Irene Tracey](#). Following a number of debates and votes in Congregation, the EJRA was retained with some changes:

- it was raised by one year to 68;
- the scope was limited to staff eligible for Congregation i.e. those in grade eight and above; and,
- an expectation that those who work beyond the EJRA vacate their substantive post and self-fund was introduced.

You can see the report of the Working Group, its annexes and documents relating to the consultation that formed part of the review on the [EJRA review webpage](#).

Council debated their proposals and decided to support them. As a result, [proposals](#) were put to Congregation and were debated, voted upon and adopted.

### ***Employment tribunals***

Two employment tribunal hearings have taken place in relation to the EJRA. In one the EJRA was found to be justified; in another, it was not.

Both decisions were appealed and upheld on the basis of the evidence presented in the individual case.

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### Annexe B: Ten-year review of the Employer-Justified Retirement Age (EJRA): Terms of Reference for the Review Group

#### Background

The University's mission is the advancement of learning by teaching and research and its dissemination by every means. The EJRA Review Group operates in support of that mission.

The Government abolished the national default retirement age in 2011 but it remained possible in all European Union countries for employers to retain a compulsory retirement age, provided that it could be justified by a legitimate aim or aims. This remains the case in the UK following Brexit.

The 'Employer-Justified Retirement Age' or 'EJRA' was established at Oxford in 2011 and reviewed in 2015 (following a decision of the University's internal Appeal Court) and in 2016-17 (the 'five-year review'). The report of the Review Group that undertook the five-year review gives further detail about the background, history and operation of the EJRA at Oxford. It can be viewed [here](#).

It was intended that a further review take place after ten years. The ten-year review will take place in Michaelmas term 2021.

The EJRA is currently set at the 30 September preceding an individual's 69th birthday (referred to as 'age 68' for short). It applies to all employees of grade 8 and above. The policy and associated procedures are available to view [here](#).

#### Membership

	<b>Role</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Means of nomination</b>
1	Chair	Professor David Paterson, Professor of Cardiovascular Physiology and Fellow of Merton College	Invited by the Vice-Chancellor
2-4	Members of Council, elected by Congregation	2. Ms Tania Boyt, Bursar, Reuben College 3. *Mr Richard Ovenden, Bodley's Librarian, Balliol College 4. Professor Diego Sanchez-Ancochea, Oxford Department of International Development, St Antony's College	Invited by the Chair of Personnel Committee
5-7	Representatives of the academic divisions	<b>Humanities:</b> Professor Catherine Schenk, Professor of Social and Economic History, St Hilda's College <b>MPLS:</b> Professor Matt Jarvis, Professor of Astrophysics, St Cross College	Nominated by Divisional Boards

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

		<b>MSD:</b> *Professor Helen McShane, Professor of Vaccinology, Harris Manchester College <b>SSD:</b> *Dr Rebecca Surender, Department of Social Policy and Intervention, Green Templeton College	
8	Representative of GLAM	Professor Mallica Kumbera Landrus, Keeper of Eastern Art, Ashmolean Museum, St Cross College	Nominated by the GLAM Board
9	Representative of UAS	Ms Kirsten Gillingham, acting Director of Finance	Nominated by Registrar's Senior Leadership Team
10-11	Two representatives of Conference of Colleges	*Dr Alisdair Rogers, Senior Tutor, Keble College Sir Jonathan Phillips, Warden, Keble College	Nominated by Conference
12	Representative of the Oxford Branch of the UCU	Dr Marc Thompson, Said Business School, Green Templeton College	Nominated by the local branch of the UCU
13-14	Representative of the Oxford Research Staff Society	Dr Liam Shaw, Department of Zoology (proposed by OxRSS) Dr Hilary Wynne, Faculty of Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics	Invited by the Chair of Personnel Committee
15	A member of the Proctorial team	Dr David Johnson, Junior Proctor	Nominated by the Proctorial team
16	A recent retiree	Professor Colin McDiarmid, Mathematical Institute	Invited by the Chair of Personnel Committee

\* Member of the five-year Review Group

The Review Group will be supported by:

- Ms Sarah Thonemann, Deputy Director of HR (Secretary to the Review Group)
- Mr Kane Burford, Senior HR Analyst
- Ms Rakiya Farah, Internal Communications
- A pensions specialist

Privileged legal advice will be provided to the Review Group and further specialist advice will be procured as necessary.

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### Purpose

The purpose of the Review Group is to submit a report and recommendations on the future of the EJRA at Oxford to Council, through Personnel Committee.

### Scope

The Group has been asked to consider:

- whether the current [Aims](#) of the EJRA Policy remain aims the University should pursue and whether others should be articulated;
- the extent to which the *Aims* are being met or will be met in future through the EJRA, whether alone or in conjunction with other measures;
- whether there are any alternative means by which the *Aims* could be met; and
- whether the Group's view is that the EJRA is, as at the date of the review, a proportionate and necessary means of achieving the aims, whether alone or in conjunction with other measures.

In so doing, the Group is asked to take into account the impact of the EJRA on those at different career stages, noting that those at earlier career stages and those who are already retired are under-represented on the Review Group itself and on decision-making bodies, such as Council and Congregation.

If the Group decides to recommend the retention of an EJRA, it is asked to recommend whether there should be any changes to:

- the age at which the EJRA is set or the circumstances in which it will apply;
- the groups to which the EJRA applies;
- the measures that are taken or could be taken in conjunction with the EJRA to achieve the aims;
- the existence and operation of the [extensions procedure](#), including the parts of the procedure that apply to second and subsequent extensions.

If the Group decides to recommend that the EJRA is discontinued entirely, it is asked to recommend:

- the date from which the policy should cease to operate and any transitional arrangements;
- the alternative means by which those *Aims* that are considered to remain relevant and important will be achieved in future.

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### Principles

The Review Group has been asked to observe the following principles in its work:

***Independence*** – the Group has been given no instructions or steer about the conclusions it should reach, and is asked to consider the evidence it gathers independently and objectively and to reach its conclusions without fear or favour.

***All decisions should be evidence-driven*** – the Group will gather data and other evidence, and base its conclusions and recommendations on that evidence.

***A broad, consultative approach*** – the Group should use a variety of means to gather the views of Congregation, the employees to whom the EJRA applies, and the employees that are affected by it or would be affected by its abolition.

### Data

The group will seek to have a thorough understanding of the context in which the EJRA operates at Oxford, including issues relating to current and future pensions provision, recruitment trends, the local economic environment, and the relevant legal framework.

Data to be collected will include:

- staffing data relevant to turnover at Oxford in all relevant grades and the extent of the EJRA's contribution to the creation of vacancies;
- diversity data;
- information on the experience of universities comparable to Oxford where compulsory retirement has been abolished, including in Europe and the USA;
- data on the allocation between generations of the benefits of employment at Oxford, including security of employment and types of working arrangements, pay, pension benefits (in the context of current discussions linked to the valuation of USS), housing and other benefits enjoyed by different age groups;
- examples of practice relating to retirement (including alternatives to compulsory retirement) at universities comparable to Oxford, in the UK and globally, and the impact of that practice on the institutions and their staff;
- information about the impact of compulsory retirement upon staff, including the availability of alternative work in Oxford and elsewhere, pension benefits, opportunities within the University and colleges, their experience of the retirement process and their relationship with the University after retirement etc;
- details of extension applications since 2011;
- information on the job market in the Higher Education sector and any areas of labour shortage or surplus for Oxford;
- statistical data on population trends, such as retirement age and longevity; and,
- information on case-law and legal aspects of the policy and possible alternatives to it.

## **TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

### **Timetable**

The Group will meet over the summer vacation and Michaelmas term of 2021 and make its report to Council, through Personnel Committee, in Hilary term 2022.

Any changes to University Statute and/or Regulation that result from Council's consideration of the report will be put to Congregation in late Hilary or early Trinity term 2022, along with an implementation schedule and details of any proposed transitional arrangements.

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### Annexe C: Conflict of Interest Record – EJRA Review Group

<b>Person</b>	<b>Conflict of Interest/ Nil</b>
Professor David Paterson (Chair)	Age 62 years. Wife (a Stat Prof) intends to apply for an EJRA given a grant application.
Mr Julian Duxfield	I declare a nil return. I leave the University in a few weeks' time and thus have no conflicts, real, potential or perceived.
Ms Kirsten Gillingham	I am a current member of USS and more than a decade away from the EJRA. I have no intention of working up to or beyond the current EJRA.
Professor Matt Jarvis	Nil return
Junior Proctor (Dr David Johnson)	Nil return
Professor Mallica Kumbera Landrus	Neither I nor any member of my family is near retirement age. This note is to record that I do not have a conflict of interest.
Professor Colin McDiarmid	I am already retired, and do not consider that I have any actual or potential conflict of interest.
Professor Helen McShane	I have no conflict other than the one everyone has as stated below.
Dr Richard Ovenden	Nil return
Sir Jonathan Phillips	Nil return
Dr Alisdair Rogers	I have no conflict of interest to declare in relation to the EJRA review group.
Professor Diego Sanchez-Ancochea	Unless you feel there may be a conflict of interest because I am managing a department and therefore the decisions we make will have an influence in who retires when, I don't have any additional conflict of interest to others.
Professor Catherine Schenk	I can confirm that I don't have a conflict of interest other than being subject to EJRA eventually.
Dr Liam Shaw	I am 30 years old and employed on a fixed-term contract (expires January 2025). I am a member of the USS pension scheme. I am serving on the Review Group as a representative of Research Staff. Additionally and separately from this role, I currently serve on the Oxford UCU Branch Committee as Environment Officer. I am also currently one of six UCU representatives on Joint Committee (the committee of consultation between the University and UCU, see <a href="#">here</a> for details). There is no need to anonymise my Col.
Professor Rebecca Surrender	Nil return
Dr Marc Thompson	Nil return

### TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

Dr Hilary Wynne	I am one of the Early Career Reps so no, I have no financial conflict or any imminent application to the EJRA. Nor any other conflicts.
Ruth Kinahan	I don't consider myself to be conflicted in that I fully intend to retire before I reach the EJRA so have no personal interest in whether it is retained or not. However as secretary to the EJRA Committee the outcome of the review group will affect my role insofar as if the EJRA is abolished that piece of work will fall out of my job description, and if the EJRA is retained in some form that work will continue.
Dr Catherine Richmond	Nil return
Sarah Thonemann	I declare that I do not consider myself to be conflicted.
Sarah Willcox-Jones	I don't have any conflict of interest, I am not near retirement age but I intend to retire before I reach the EJRA.



## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### Annexe D: Proposed revised *Aims*

The University of Oxford is a unique environment: it has a collegiate structure and complex staffing procedures, including the stringent protections for employment and academic freedom enshrined in Statute XII. It is governed by Congregation, which includes its most senior employees, and is also a charity. It has relatively low turnover in many grades, and the potential to create vacancies by growth is limited by its built environment and constraints on student numbers.

In this context, the EJRA is considered to be an appropriate and necessary means of ensuring the continued creation of sufficient vacancies to meet the overarching Aim of achieving the University's Mission:

*The advancement of learning by teaching and research and its dissemination by every means.*

The Mission is supported by the Vision, which includes commitments to provide world-class research and education, protect independent scholarship and academic freedom, and foster principles of innovation, collaboration, and equality of opportunity.

These ambitions in turn rely on the *Aims* set out below:

- promoting intra- and inter-generational fairness and maintaining the flow of opportunities that allow academics, researchers and professional staff to grow and progress their careers sector wide and to access the benefits of University employment
- refreshing the academic, research and other professional workforce to enable the University to maintain its rich academic environment, foster innovation, and provide world-class research and education
- facilitating succession planning by maintaining predictable retirement dates, especially in relation to professorial roles and also in the context of the collegiate University's joint appointment system
- promoting equality and diversity, noting that recent recruits are more diverse than the composition of the existing workforce, especially amongst the older age groups. This applies in particular to the professorial grades.

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### Annexe E: EJRA data summary

	Number of staff covered by the EJRA in 2021 <sup>15</sup>	Turnover (mean average 2011-2021) <sup>16</sup>	Growth in grade (2011-21) <sup>17</sup>	% FTCs in the grade <sup>18</sup>	% of grade who reach EJRA in next 5 years <sup>19</sup>	% of leavers who retired 2011-21 <sup>20</sup>	Number of EJRA applications as a % of average grade population (2011-2021) <sup>21</sup>	Summary impact of EJRA on vacancy creation – based on Assumption E <sup>22</sup>	Little’s Law model estimate for future steady-state effect of EJRA <sup>23</sup>
<b>Statutory Professors</b>	251 (4.4%)	6.1%	13%	0.8%	31.1%	42.4% (64)	28% (70)	34%	↑ 70 - decrease by 0.8 posts p.a. (3.9% of yearly recruitment) <sup>24</sup> Abolish EJRA <sup>25</sup> - decrease by 1.7 posts p.a. (8.2% of yearly recruitment)
<b>Associate Professors</b>	1218 (21.3%)	3.8%	8.8%	0.4%	11.0%	39.9% (178)	2.67% (31)	17%	↑ 70 - decrease by 1.6 posts p.a. (2.3% of yearly recruitment) <sup>26</sup> Abolish EJRA <sup>27</sup> - decrease by 3.6 posts p.a. (5.3% of yearly recruitment)
<b>Other academic</b>	625 (10.9%)	12.2%	65.2%	70.5%	7.3%	6.6% (10)	5.1% (26)	3%	
<b>RSIVs and equivalents</b>	232 (4.1%)	7.1%	107.1%	36.8%	25.9%	21.5% (62)	41.34% (74)	7%	
<b>ALC6</b>	93 (1.6%)	10.3%	19.0%	28.0%	16.1%	22.6% (21)	0 (0)	1%	

<sup>15</sup> (Table 2 onwards). Figure in brackets represent proportion of EJRA population.

<sup>16</sup> Includes voluntary and involuntary turnover. [Final data set turnover](#) (page 4)

<sup>17</sup> Updated [assumption tables \(EJRA\(22\)07\)](#)

<sup>18</sup> [EJRA\(21\)12 Annexe D page 5](#)

<sup>19</sup> EJRA population, [EJRA\(21\)08](#) – tables 5 and 6

<sup>20</sup> Final data set ‘[Reasons for leaving and age on leaving](#)’, p.7

<sup>21</sup> Final data set ‘[data on exceptions process](#)’ (table 4.1), includes those who may have moved grades after their initial successful application

<sup>22</sup> Based on [EJRA\(22\)07](#), using the Assumption based on the questionnaire on the Review webpage, which received 243 responses, for 2018/19-2020/21.

<sup>23</sup> Intended to estimate steady state impact looking forwards; please see [EJRA\(22\)11](#), where the methodology can be found. Sensitivity Analyses were performed which can be seen in the paper.

<sup>24</sup> Assuming total annual recruitment rate of 20.7 posts (current value).

<sup>25</sup> Assumed to be equivalent to increasing the EJRA to 72.5 years, based on responses from 101 University staff who responded to the questionnaire and felt they knew when they want to retire.

<sup>26</sup> Assuming total annual recruitment rate of 68.4 posts (current value).

<sup>27</sup> Assumed to be equivalent to increasing the EJRA to 72.5 years, based on responses from 101 University staff who responded to the questionnaire and felt they knew when they want to retire.

Orange – suggests EJRA may have had high impact  
 Yellow – suggests EJRA may have had some impact  
 Grey – suggests EJRA may have had little or no impact

## TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF THE EJRA: REVIEW GROUP REPORT

### EJRA diversity data summary<sup>28</sup>

	1	2	3	4	5		6	7	8		9	10
	% female in grade 2021	Increase in % female 2011 to 2021	% female in grade 2021 age 30-39 <sup>29</sup>	% female in grade 2021 age 65-68 <sup>30</sup>	% difference gender diversity joiners v leavers 2017-2021		% BME in grade 2021	Change in % BME 2011 to 2021	% difference race diversity joiners v leavers 2017-2021  Unknowns in brackets		% declared disability in grade 2021 <sup>31</sup>	Increase in % declared disability 2011 to 2021
					% female new hires	% female retirements			% BME new hires	% BME retirements		
<b>Statutory Professor</b>	20.2%	10.4%	33.3%	14.8%	32.5%	3.7%	5.8%	3.6% increase	5% (51.3%)	2% (10%)	4.1%	0.1%
<b>Associate Professors</b>	31.3%	8.4%	34.7%	21.6%	38.9%	23.5%	8.1%	3% increase	10.2% (34.7%)	1.8% (12.6%)	3%	0.9%
<b>Other academic</b>	42%	2%	36.8%	27.3%			8.8%	11.2% decrease			3.9%	3.9%
<b>RSIVs and equivalents</b>	30.8%	1.3%	24.5%	25.3%	35.4%	26.5%	10.6%	6.1% increase	11.8% (31%)	1.4% (14%)	4.3%	2.5%
<b>ALC6</b>	47.8%	25.8%	56.7%	0	50%	21.43%	5.4%	5.4% increase	4.7% (29.7%)	0%	2.2%	0.5%

Columns 2, 3, 4, 5: increase / gap in diversity of 10% = orange; increase / gap of 5-10% = yellow

No colour coding has been applied to the columns for race or disability due to the large proportion of unknowns.

<sup>28</sup> [Diversity among joiners and leavers](#)

<sup>29</sup> [Diversity dashboard population by legal sex](#)

<sup>30</sup> [Diversity dashboard population by legal sex](#)

<sup>31</sup> [Diversity dashboard population by disability](#)