Reporting on equality:

Assessment of higher education institutions’ performance of the Scottish specific equality duties requirements in 2017
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Introduction

This report summarises Scottish higher education institutions’ (HEIs) performance of the Scottish specific equality duties reporting requirements for April 2015. It focuses on whether HEIs met the publication requirements and demonstrated the progress towards meeting the duties since the last round of reporting. It shares areas for improvement and effective approaches to reporting.

The report contains our opinions on how well HEIs have met the specific duties. It includes our views on what works, with examples from both colleges and HEIs that reflect this, and recommendations for improvement.

What were the 2015 reporting requirements?

Equality Act 2010: Public Sector Equality Duties

Equality is underpinned by legislation. The Equality Act 2010 requires all public authorities to fulfil the requirements set out by the Act in the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED). HEIs in Scotland are listed as ‘public authorities’ in schedule 19 of the Act.

The Act covers nine ‘protected characteristics’:

+ age
+ disability
+ gender reassignment
+ marriage and civil partnership (in employment)
+ pregnancy and maternity
+ race (includes nationality)
+ religion and belief (includes no religion or belief)
+ sex
+ sexual orientation

The PSED is made up of general and specific duties. The general duty consists of three main requirements. These are underpinned by specific duties (set out in the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2012 that accompanies the Act). The specific duties are intended to assist public bodies to meet the general duty.

General duties

The general duty requires HEIs, in the exercise of their functions, to have ‘due regard’ to the need to:

+ eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010
+ advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups considering the need to:
  — remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics
  — meet the needs of people with protected characteristics
  — encourage people with protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is low
+ foster good relations between people from different protected characteristic groups, tackling prejudice and promoting understanding between people from different groups
Specific duties
The specific duties aim to help HEIs to better meet the general duty. Both the general duty and the specific duties must be met.

To meet the specific duties, HEIs were required to:

+ report on progress on mainstreaming the general duty into all functions every two years
+ publish and deliver a set of equality outcomes that cover all protected characteristics every four years
+ assess the impact of new and revised policies and practices against the needs of the general duty on an ongoing basis
+ gather and publish information on the protected characteristics of employees to inform progress and action towards the mainstreaming duty every two years
+ publish the gender composition of the governing body and the steps taken towards diversity among the governing body members as part of the mainstreaming duty every two years
+ publish gender pay gap information every two years
+ publish statements on equal pay for gender, race and disability every four years
+ publish the above information in a manner that is accessible

HEIs last reported on the specific duties in 2017.

Research approach
Following on from the most recent publication date in April 2017, every report produced by HEIs under the specific duties regulations has been analysed.

We considered how well HEIs reported on the duties to:

+ report on progress on mainstreaming the general duty into all functions every two years
+ publish and deliver a set of equality outcomes that cover all protected characteristics every four years
+ gather and publish information on the protected characteristics of employees to inform progress and action towards the mainstreaming duty every two years
+ publish the gender composition of the governing body and the steps taken towards diversity among the governing body members as part of the mainstreaming duty every two years
+ publish gender pay gap information every two years
+ publish statements on equal pay for gender, race and disability every four years
+ publish the above information in a manner that is accessible

Note: the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) is the legal regulator. The Scottish Funding Council provides funding to support Scottish institutions to improve their equality work through guidance, advice and enhancement projects.


This report does not replicate Measuring Up? 7. Rather, it considers how well HEIs report on and evidence progress on, and impact of, the work carried out to achieve the changes expected within the duties. It is not a comment on any HEI’s overall equality and diversity work.
Duty to report progress on mainstreaming the equality duty

Mainstreaming reports were both separate reports and sections within combined reports and there were many different ways of identifying and explaining the approaches to mainstreaming. In the combined reports it was difficult to assess evidence of mainstreaming where it was not explicitly reported on.

Overall, the focus of many reports was on qualitative data. The reports made heavy use of narrative and case studies to evidence progress towards mainstreaming with the majority of case studies revolving around activities developed or undertaken that supported equality. There was little use of quantitative data to show a rationale for the activity or to show progress.

While reports gave many examples and case studies of activities or changes that had taken place, such as a review of the recruitment process, there was a lack of analysis of how this activity progressed mainstreaming of equality within the university’s functions.

For a majority of reports there was a reliance on work carried out as part of Athena SWAN as evidence of progress.

Where it worked well

There were some creative approaches to describing mainstreaming, with the use of case studies, infographics, story boards, good news stories, campaign successes and life stories. In some cases, this was underpinned by qualitative data that demonstrated a need for the activity or action and allowed the institution to measure progress and identify impact.

North East Scotland College’s report includes a range of statistics and graphs and comparisons with benchmarks from previous years. It also uses qualitative data such as quotes from staff and student surveys and case studies to demonstrate impact. For example, it was able to demonstrate a range of activities aimed at staff (such as enhanced parental leave, disability confident, staff disability initiative) that had a positive impact. As a consequence of targeted actions, the number of staff indicating that they have a disability increased from 4.7% to 7.5%.

Some reports described how equality and diversity are considered in functions, policies and strategies. This better addresses the requirement to report on progress towards mainstreaming across functions. Where it worked well, the mainstreaming report was narratively linked to other strategic documents, ie Outcome Agreements and strategic planning documents, with outcomes and measurements across documents.

Glasgow Caledonian University includes sections on each part of the PSED with sub-sections in each on the university’s functions. There is also a section on mainstreaming into operations. Examples and case studies are used throughout. Reorganisation of student services and new policies designed and implemented are highlighted. Comparisons are made, for example, progress in increasing the proportion of female professors, ensuring positive outcomes for female academics in the promotion process and reducing the gender pay gap.

Glasgow School of Art’s mainstreaming report provides a good example of understanding and demonstrating the impact of equality mainstreaming. It structures its mainstreaming approach around equality impact assessment. The report is broken down by function, including case studies, and it provides a qualitative assessment of progress and impact.
Recommendations

+ There is a need for benchmarking that should include both qualitative and quantitative data in order to show impact since the last report.

+ Report on progress over the previous two years (in this case 2015–17). Current reports should build on previous reports to show progress in each reporting round, in comparison to previous qualitative and quantitative data.

+ Focus on the work and activities that contribute towards mainstreaming equality across HEI functions.

+ Narratively connect the mainstreaming report and activities to other strategic documents and high-level operational and action plans.

+ Focus on identifying the impact of activities and actions for groups that are underrepresented or experiencing disadvantage and provide evidence of the impact this has had, or evidence of it having taken place (eg dates, participants/reach, some examples of results of a change made).
Use of member information

A majority of HEIs provided data on the gender composition of their boards, while a small number published data on more protected characteristics, predominantly disability and race. Fewer provided a narrative on current diversity with very few describing what actions are planned to improve board diversity.

The majority of HEIs showed an increase in women board members since 2015.

Where it worked well

Good examples discussed current board diversity in light of the local context and went on to provide a plan as to how diversity would be improved.

**Glasgow School of Art** provides a gender breakdown of both lay members and the whole board since 2012 to show progress. In addition, data across all protected characteristics is gathered and published showing a significant decrease in ‘no response’ between 2015/16 and 2016/17.

**Robert Gordon University** uses the same equality monitoring form for its board as for students and receives responses across all questions with no ‘prefer not to say’ responses.

**University of Edinburgh** has developed a plan to improve board diversity and the mainstreaming report provides data on gender and some narrative, with a list of succession planning activities.

Recommendations

+ Consider gathering equality data across protected characteristics. While only gender is currently required, it will begin to familiarise board members with a broader process and may provide useful evidence.
+ Include context showing how the information has been used, and how it is proposed to use the information to increase board diversity.
+ Develop a succession plan with SMART actions.
Duty to publish equality outcomes

The new equality outcomes covered a mix of students, staff, and staff and students.

Many equality outcomes were by default across all protected characteristics, ie stating that all staff and students will benefit from an inclusive environment. Where protected characteristics are explicitly mentioned, there was a focus on gender and disability, followed by race. Age, marriage and civil partnership status, and gender reassignment were least likely to be explicitly covered, followed by religion or belief. Outcomes often did not meet SMART criteria, more resembling aims, but were often accompanied by actions that did meet the criteria.

Where it worked well

There are two aspects to this: the equality outcome itself, and how it is portrayed in the report.

Clear outcomes were protected characteristic specific and focused on a specific need, ie increasing underrepresentation (in comparison to many outcomes which stated, for example, a welcoming and inclusive environment for all). Outcomes also showed an evidence base and rationale for their inclusion. The best examples utilised SMART criteria.

**Edinburgh College** clearly identifies equality outcomes based on consultation with students, staff and external partners through focus groups, events and conversations, considers national policy initiatives, aligns these outcomes with work already being planned/carried out in the college, and uses evidence, research and external information. Outcomes are protected characteristic specific and SMART, based on local evidence, with connections to the PSED and national policy. All protected characteristics are addressed, either in an equality outcome or with an explanation as to why they are not addressed.

A clear layout helped to demonstrate the rationale and context for the outcome. Some reports showed, for example, internal qualitative and quantitative data used to identify a need, a connection to the HEI’s strategy and national policy agenda, and how the outcome meets the general equality duties.

**University of Stirling** provides a rationale section for each individual outcome which includes evidence used in developing each one and the process used. It references progress made against original outcomes, consideration of sector-wide development changes and analysis and guidance issues by external organisations. Each outcome is shown to align with the university’s strategic plan.
Description of report preparation

A description of how the report was prepared, ie review of previous outcomes, and development and consultation of new outcomes, was not common across all reports. Where it was discussed there was evidence of a wide range of methods used. Many used focus groups and consultation with external stakeholders, for example, and the use of internal committees and staff groups was common. In terms of using data already available through existing information gathering processes, many institutions also used external references. Despite this, there was little reference to baseline data in developing the outcome or narrative around benchmarking. The focus was more on consultation on the new equality outcomes rather than evidencing the rationale for them. An extension of this was a lack of detail around setting priorities for outcomes, ie why and how the new outcomes were chosen over possibly other competing priorities.

Where it worked well

Good examples used a wide and creative range of techniques for both gathering data and consultation on it, such as utilising existing surveys and feedback mechanisms, consulting widely across staff and student groups, and creating focus groups and protected characteristic groups to discuss new equality outcomes. Some also made explicit connections to institutional strategy and national policy drivers as well as local context.

Glasgow Caledonian University provides an extensive description of equality outcome development. The outcomes were developed with a range of stakeholders, finalised with the input of leaders from across the university, and endorsed and approved by key fora. The setting of equality outcomes was based around a three-stage process of gathering evidence, identifying priority issues and gaining approval.

Heriot Watt University provides an infographic on how the outcomes were developed. Student engagement activities were undertaken with liberation groups and the sports union, through a mapping exercise with protected characteristic/target groups and focused discussion sessions. Staff attended specific workshop sessions, supplemented by correspondence with some staff groups and face-to-face meetings. The university’s Athena SWAN Bronze Award renewal process also provided information to assist in the development of actions.
How will progress be measured?

Several reports included clear measurement frameworks, containing actions, outputs and timescales. There was often good use of action planning, targets, outputs and activities built in that could be measured over time, with the use of a traffic-light system of assessment or a numerical approach common. However, there was a consistent lack of baseline measurement to assess progress, even in some of the best examples, which will make use of the measurement frameworks difficult over time.

Where it worked well

The best examples used current data as a baseline, which allows for measurement of progress. Some included a progress plan with publication dates which should support accountability and transparency of the process. Finally, some included action plans with clear lists of measurements and impacts, with identified responsibilities and a way of tracking progress.

Glasgow Clyde College uses a comprehensive range of baseline data at local, sectoral and national level for comparison. The report includes a regional aligned equality outcome framework and progress plan reporting structure. The progress plan, which will be presented and published separately details:

+ regional strategic equality outcome themes, which are long term and aspirational in nature
+ specific equality outcomes, the changes or results which support meeting each of these strategic outcomes; these are more short- and mid-term and operational in nature: hard outcomes can be quantified and measured numerically; soft outcomes, whilst not counted, are still measurable
+ context and narrative, detailing the contextual basis for the outcome with reference to evidence sources
+ impact measurement to demonstrate progress, detailing the impact mechanisms and measures to demonstrate progress, together with specific targets
+ action to target staff or students, in support of achieving a specific outcome
+ intended outputs, the effect of actions which will support achieving specific outcomes

Royal Conservatoire of Scotland action plan makes commitments underneath the outcome and identifies the baseline position. It details timescales alongside activities and current progress, some quantified with targets.
Recommendations

+ Keep numbers of equality outcomes small in order to be achievable in the four-year period. Focus on the protected characteristics that the evidence shows need targeted work, prioritise as necessary, but always explain the process behind this decision.

+ Remember that outcomes are institutional wide and as such, there is a balance to be struck between outcomes that are so broad as to be more like organisational aims and those that are too small in scope and resemble operational objectives.

+ Reflect on previous outcomes to show how current outcomes came about.

+ Incorporate the data and evidence used to develop the chosen equality outcomes and to explain how these were prioritised.

+ Consult widely across different stakeholders, such as staff, students and local organisations. Bring in the views of people representing the different protected characteristics. Explain the consultation and development process.
Duty to publish a report on progress of equality outcomes

Overall, the reports showed a lot of activity and actions being undertaken to achieve the 2013 equality outcomes, and evidence was provided to show progress of the activities. The focus of many of the reports was on this progress, with less discussion of the impact that the activities have had on the outcome. Reports often contained both qualitative and quantitative data but did not reflect on progress in relation to 2015 or measure achievement using baseline data from the 2013–15 reports. Some reports did assess the outcomes in terms of completeness but often, where it is identified that they are incomplete, assessment has not been carried out on continuing and relating these to new outcomes.

Where it worked well

Overall, there was good use of a range of creative approaches to providing evidence to show progress, including narrative, data, tables, graphs, case studies and survey results. Some reports assessed each outcome individually, assessing whether it had been achieved fully or partially, and if partially, what was still required. This assessment was supported by evidence from a range of sources and narrative analysing the evidence and progress made. Comparison with baseline data and indicators from 2013 and 2015 enabled a better exploration of whether the outcome had achieved its intended results. This then provided a connection to the new outcomes.

Glasgow Caledonian University has tables assessing progress on outcomes and shows each outcome’s objectives with actions taken to deliver it, with a status column (complete and ongoing used for actions delivered but now to be continued as part of normal business, and complete and closed used when action has finished and will not continue). The final column considers what difference this has made.

Heriot Watt University’s new equality outcomes build on previous equality outcomes and are more focused on people rather than systems and processes. ‘Our first set of Equality Outcomes focused on systems, procedures and foundation areas; spotting gaps in our existing frameworks and creating new ways of working where necessary. Our new Equality Outcomes are about moving forward from these foundations, responding to need and focusing on tangible outcomes for individuals and groups.’ Areas where less progress was made than intended are clearly identified and are given greater focus in new outcomes.

Royal Conservatoire of Scotland has good narrative reflection and comparisons with the previous reporting period. The equality outcomes report for 2017 has a relevant section summarising progress since 2015 directly alongside each outcome, highlighting key achievements as well as things that did not go well. Relevant statistics are given and initiatives cited as evidence of impact. There is an assessment of whether each outcome has been achieved and, if not, what is being carried into 2017–21.

Borders College provides a narrative comparison between what it said it would do in 2013 and where it is in 2017. It recognises that further work is still needed and identifies what still needs to be done. There is discussion of the impact of the equality outcome alongside the range of activities completed, for example it was able to show that activities undertaken to progress ‘learners are prepared for life, work and to be responsible citizens’ had improved student engagement.
Queen Margaret University used statistics, graphs, tables and some reflective narrative plus information on activities and achievements. Baseline indicators of progress are included as part of the comparative statistics and in some places as part of the narrative but not consistently throughout. Tabulated outcome sections include possible activities and outputs, evidence base, the protected characteristics covered and the responsible person.

University of the Highlands and Islands provides a straightforward and concise assessment of its progress in achieving its outcomes using a set of questions for each, laid out in a tabular format. Each outcome has a reflective analysis addressing the following questions:

- key area where progress has been made with regard to equality and diversity
- action taken to progress this key area
- measures in use to monitor progress
- evidence of progress that has been made
- challenges that have been faced in progressing this key area
- further action intended to be taken

**Recommendations**

- Analysis of progress should include reflective narrative and data to evidence progress. Each outcome will have initially been identified using analysis of qualitative and/or quantitative data. Assess progress in each outcome against this baseline data.
- Focus on progress towards the outcome and the impact it has had on the issue it was designed to address, rather than progress on the activities used to achieve it.
- Explain if each outcome has been partially or fully achieved with an explanation as to how this assessment was arrived at, for example discuss successes/challenges, things carried forward, how the approach has developed. This can then be used as an assessment of how your previous outcomes have informed your next outcomes.
- Connect progress to other strategic documents.
- Separate reporting on your outcomes from reporting on mainstreaming. These are separate duties, and while both can be contained in the same report, they should be distinct from each other.
Duty to gather and use employee information

The EHRC assessed HEIs’ data collection and reporting in *Measuring Up? 7.*

Since the last round of reporting, the publication of staff data has improved considerably, with the majority of HEIs publishing ‘snapshot’ staff data for most of the protected characteristics. However, there were still some significant gaps in data publication, with quite a few reports either not providing data across all protected characteristics, and/or for the three areas required by the duty (ie recruitment, development and retention). On average in HEI reports, data publication decreases from recruitment to development to retention. Where data was missing, it was most commonly for pregnancy/maternity, marriage/civil partnership and gender re-assignment.

There was some comparison with previous years’ data for most of the reports, either with 2015 data or yearly data comparisons going back several years. The majority of reports included narrative explaining the data with an analysis.

Very few HEIs provided information on how the data was being used or how data collection and use would be improved.

**Recommendations**

+ Provide a ‘snapshot’ of staff data, and data for recruitment, development and retention. For each of these, data should be for all protected characteristics.
+ Keep the data simple, there is no need to provide complicated breakdowns of the data unless this is to evidence another duty.
+ Provide a narrative and analysis of quantitative data.
+ Compare current with previous data to show progress towards improving staff diversity.
+ Include an explanation of what progress has been made, and the changes made, that will improve the gathering and use of data.
Duty to publish gender pay gap information

Reporting for this duty was thorough and most reports provided considerable detail about pay gaps by grade and job ‘family’, with tables, graphs and narrative. Many described their work on Athena SWAN, which requires a similar approach to evidence and may explain the level of data and analysis in this section.

What is the gender pay gap?

It is difficult to fully assess a national gender pay gap due to inconsistencies in reporting, in particular:

- the majority recorded it primarily as a mean or mean and median; in a small number of reports, it is either not specified or not clear what the figure refers to
- most reports included a range of data across staff types and levels but not all reports included a headline single figure as required
- it was not always clear what calculation was made to achieve the figure stated, which means ‘like for like’ comparisons cannot be made
- it was not always clear to which staff the figure refers, again not allowing for a ‘like for like’ comparison

In light of the inconsistencies figures given cannot be used to provide a robust national average figure.

Where it worked well

Thorough analysis of the pay gap included an assessment across a broad range of criteria. Some included, for instance: all employees by grade rather than job role; an assessment by pay and grade bandings; an assessment by pay gap by band and full-time equivalent; and an analysis by department and subject area.

In some reports, there were detailed listings of pay scales, bands and salaries followed by an analysis of the numbers.

Many reports included comparative data, back to at least 2015 with some going back further and some were able to demonstrate a narrowing of the pay gap over time.

Glasgow School of Art provides an equal pay statement covering all protected characteristics. Its detailed pay gap analysis considers the gender pay gap at each grade and by doing so exposes and considers occupational segregation factors that can be masked by a small pay gap. It sets out key ‘themes’ from the audit and identifies relevant actions, for example reviewing the grade structure and removing some spine points to reduce pay gaps. Intersectional analysis includes age and gender and there is analysis of the disability and race pay gaps.

Moray College’s equal pay statement provides an overall pay gap by gender, disability status and race, then considers these protected characteristics by grade to identify any gaps between staff doing work rated as equivalent. Each of the protected characteristics is compared in turn with the overall pay gap, and a detailed analysis by grade is provided.

Queen Margaret University clearly lays out an equal pay review (all employees), which provides the gender pay gap information for all employees followed by a detailed breakdown by grade (individually and grouped) and full-time/part-time employment by academic and support staff. There is a thorough analysis of this data and also an analysis by ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation and appointed salary.

Royal Conservatoire of Scotland’s 2017 equal pay policy and review presents findings for 2017 together with a comparison of the results of the 2015 and 2013 reviews and gives recommendations of areas for further review. An explanation of the methodology used is given, following the EHRC recommended process and using Close the Gap’s recommended calculation. Data tables are clear and supported by a thorough analysis. All staff are included in the data and data is also provided for age, disability and race.
University of Glasgow’s equal pay statement and gender pay gap shows pay gap by grade with a detailed analysis of where the biggest gaps are. The statement connects to both the university’s gender pay strategy and people strategy. There are objectives aimed at reducing the pay gap.

**Recommendations**

+ Report on the methodology used to calculate gaps and whether this has changed since previous reporting rounds.

+ Provide a single figure for an institution-wide gender pay gap. Include both mean and median figures and identify which is which.

+ Include all staff, including senior staff, staff on zero-hours contracts and visiting staff.

+ Provide narrative analysis where gaps are identified and aim to address the factors that are contributing to these.
Duty to publish statements on equal pay

The specific duties regulations require a statement on equal pay that discusses equal pay policies and occupational segregation, either through two separate statements or one statement that references both. There was a mix of approaches, but in most, there were clear distinctions between sections for the equal pay policy and for occupational segregation. For all HEIs this was the second round of reporting on occupational segregation for gender and the first for disability and race.

In all statements including an equal pay policy, disability, gender and race were covered, and in most, so were all protected characteristics. These statements on the whole contained data and narrative, but also a thorough analysis of the issues. Those that had developed an action plan previously reported on the outputs of previous actions and many contained action plans for addressing issues identified from current data. However, few included comparative data on occupational segregation by gender from 2015 to evidence progress based on a benchmark.

Where it worked well

Good examples of reporting provided figures for a wide range of different staff including both full-time and part-time staff, broken down by job role, and by grade/level. Some also did this by subject area. This clearly showed the areas with the greatest and least pay gaps and allowed for further discussion on occupational segregation.

The use of tables and graphs was common, and provision of a detailed narrative explaining the numbers demonstrated a better understanding of the figures. Some HEIs also provided an analysis of the data comparing it with 2015 data.

Many reports provided action plans with targets explaining what the HEI intended to do to address the gaps identified in the data and analysis.
University of the West of Scotland’s occupational segregation report contains clear tables considering both horizontal and vertical segregation, with a narrative analysis. The report identifies clear actions to be taken to reduce occupational segregation, including:

+ a new performance and development review scheme
+ support and training for managers (i.e. unconscious bias, equality, staff and management development programme)
+ Athena SWAN, Race Equality Charter (REC), Aurora and other continuing professional development (CPD) opportunities

**Recommendations**

+ Include, or link to, your equal pay policy and mention gender, disability and race specifically (as well as other protected characteristics).
+ Compare the current position with data provided in the previous equal pay statement.
Duty to publish in a manner that is accessible

HEIs published reports in different formats, with a mix of separate reports for each reporting duty, with others combining reports in a variety of ways. Where reports were combined, generally it was within the mainstreaming report and the majority of these have clearly defined sections on each reporting duty.

There is a requirement for reports to be published in a manner that makes the information accessible to the public.

This was tested by attempting to find reports through the following means:

- was the report available from the home page?
- if not, was it available in the equality section of the website?
- if not, could it be found through a search within the HEI website?
- was it accessible from a Google search?

The majority of reports sit within the equality pages of the HEIs’ websites, but not all were easy to find. Finding the equality sections of websites in the first place was often challenging. The remaining reports were found in the corporate documents/publications/freedom of information sections of the HEIs’ websites.

The majority of reports, but not all, were clearly titled and dated. There was no correlation between this and whether reports were combined or separate. Dates were occasionally the date of publication alone, rather than the period covered by the report.

Where it worked well

Glasgow Caledonian University has one main report entitled Public Sector Equality Duty Report April 2017 with clear sections for mainstreaming, equality outcomes progress, equal pay and data. There is a separate equality outcomes report.

Recommendations

- Consider where reports are published and how people might look for equality reports if they are not familiar with university structures or information storage.
- Clearly title and date reports. Where reports are combined, it should be clear which duties the report covers.
- Along with the date of publication, include the period the report covers.
- Due to the length of some reports, particularly combined reports, consider including summaries or bullets points at the beginning of sections.