**HREE AWARD/CONCORDAT TO SUPPORT THE CAREER DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCHERS: ACTION PLAN (2019-2021)**

**UNIVERSITY OF PORTSMOUTH**

**Update on Progress, Success Measures and Outcomes**

NB - Key to abbreviations at end of document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Concordat summary</th>
<th>Concordat principle</th>
<th>Actions, success measures, timescale and responsibility</th>
<th>Update on Progress, Success Measures and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Online PDR System:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Gather feedback from research staff(^1), PIs(^2) and HoDs(^3) on new PDR(^4) process.</td>
<td><strong>Update on Progress</strong> After the first round of the new PDR system (2019/20), feedback was gathered through separate focus groups with Research Staff and Readers/Professors. Although we were not able to meet the 80% target, <strong>we gained valuable insight from the focus groups, which fed into a wider report submitted to the University Executive Board Jan 2020.</strong> This then resulted in some technical improvements to the PDR system to improve navigation, and flow, as well as new embedded guidance for some fields. Delays to this report, and the subsequent pandemic have prevented some of the remaining recommendations being acted upon. The PDR completion rate for Research Staff (RS) was 61% in 2019/20 and 51% in 2020/21. PDR completion for all staff was 79% and 70% in 2019/20, 2020/21 respectively. The drop in completion rate for RS and all staff is thought to be related to the additional pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>B3 Appraisal &amp; Performance Management (revised from 2017-19 plan to focus on actual PDR not just pilot, with extended deadline)</td>
<td><strong>Principle 2: Recognition &amp; Value</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amended action</strong> - As 80% feedback was not achieved, feedback was requested from Research Staff and Researchers’ fora for qualitative feedback. <strong>Timescale</strong> - Feb ’21 <strong>Responsibility</strong> - LR (RIS) and Fora convenors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Success measure:</strong> Feedback obtained from 80% of research staff who receive a PDR in current cycle. Capture qualitative data on experience of the new PDR process from research staff, PIs and HoDs on new PDR process.</td>
<td><strong>Timescale:</strong> Report Q1 2020. <strong>Responsibility:</strong> Dep. Dir. HR&amp;OD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 By ‘research staff’ we mean research staff on fixed term or hourly paid contracts
2 Principal Investigators
3 Head of Department
4 Performance and Development Review
In order to capture feedback from the 2020/21 cohort we ran a ‘pulse survey’ in Dec 2020 for any RS to complete based on the second year of the new PDR process. There was 15% response to this survey (cohort size 136). In addition, there was a discussion held in the Research Staff Forum meeting on 10 Dec which identified further recommendations for improvements. We ran CEDARS in a short window in April/May 2021, with some reservations around ‘pandemic fatigue’. We achieved a 15% response rate for RS, and a 7% for academics (incl. PIs & HoDS). A total of 70% of RS reported having a PDR (review) in the past 2 yrs (Q21) and 91% of academics. Only 57% reported the review as useful, with 34% saying wasn’t useful. 50% of academics found it useful, but 48% thought it wasn’t.

We have made PDR a priority focus for our next 2 yrs in the new Concordat Action plan, and will build on what we have learned and progress made in this current cycle.

**Outcome**

**PARTIALLY ACHIEVED** – further development and improvements to PDR process and experience for Research Staff will be carried forward as part of actions 5 and 6 in the new action plan, under the University’s Priority 2.

| 1.2 | B3 Appraisal & Performance Management | **Action:** Gather feedback from research staff leaving the institution. | **Update on Progress** |
| Principle 2: Recognition & Value | **Success measure:** Exit interviews undertaken with two thirds of research staff leaving the institution using a revised approach to exit interviews.  
**Timescale:** by end Q3 2021.  
**Responsibility:** PIs, HoDs, HR.  

NB: Action arose through focus group with research staff held in May 2019. | In seeking to implement this action we found that low facilitation of exit interviews was an issue that extended beyond the research staff community. Furthermore, a pulse survey carried out December 2020 identified that only 1 out of 20 respondents who had moved from one internal post to another had had an exit interview. Seeking to understand the barriers and challenges we sought areas where it was working, with a view for this to be good practice to share. For example, the Faculty of Business and Law report that exit Interviews are routinely undertaken. Contract research staff on internally-funded projects have an exit interview with the ADR and the relevant research lead which focuses on identifying ways in which the Faculty can help the researcher complete projects detailed in their existing research pipeline. This complements the exit interview held with/by the Subject Group line manager, in line with UP HR processes. Furthermore, the Institute of Cosmology and Gravitation (ICG) operate a system for their research staff; exit interviews are carried out with all Research Staff, in particular:  
- Interviews are carried out face to face (online since COVID 19) by a PostDoc officer (member of staff)  
- Record of responses kept but no names included - all anonymised  
- Anonymised summary of feedback goes to the chair of the Athena Swan committee in the ICG as well as the ICG director.  

**Good practice identified will be shared with RDG and included in the PI guide.** |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Careers and progression for research staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>B5 PIs aware of responsibilities and D8 PIs encourage researchers to attend training &amp; career development events &amp; courses (carried forward from 2017-19 plan with extended deadline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle 2, 3 &amp; 4: Recognition &amp; Value and Support and Career Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | **Actions:**  
|  | 1. Develop and disseminate guide for PIs that refers to their responsibilities and signposts to the support and development opportunities that are available for research staff to support them in encouraging research staff to develop their careers.  
|  | 2. Provide training sessions relating to managing research staff for PIs to accompany guide. |
|  | **Success measures:**  
|  | A. Guide is delivered to 100% of PIs when they are recruiting a new member of research staff - to go into induction pack of new academic staff and new research staff. Also RIS to take to staff inductions and request that HR add to induction packs. |
|  | **Update on Progress:**  
|  | 1. PI Guide was produced (in line with the old Concordat) and disseminated via a webpage. Content was then updated in line with the new Concordat. However, input received through consultation has extended far beyond supporting career development and this guide/webpage now forms part of a larger resource to support PIs in supporting their Research Staff in many areas, including, induction, wellbeing, access to support networks and fora etc. This expanded webpage was launched through Research and Innovation Services newsletter (March ‘21) and blog (April ‘21). This webpage will be monitored and further developed as more resources are produced in line with new action plan actions and priorities.  
|  | 2. Training sessions were postponed due to COVID situation and the updating of the guide to the...
B. See 20% increase in CROS\(^5\) question 23.1a “you are encouraged to engage in personal and career development?” (CROS 2019 76% agreed or strongly agreed) & Q. 15.5a “was the appraisal effective in leading to training or other containing professional development opportunities”. (CROS 2019 50% useful or very useful).

**Timescale:** Q2 2020 ( & CEDARS 2021).

**Responsibility:** RIS to develop guide. RIS to monitor researcher feedback and CROS data. HR Service Centre Manager to deliver to PIs (75.6% score in CROS 2019 for Q23 - You are encouraged to engage in personal or career development.).

new Concordat. The first **online session was delivered to the Profs’ Forum on 10.3.21**, and other sessions will be scheduled.

**Success Measures**

A. There is a move away from physical (hard copy) induction packs - All PIs will be signposted to the new PI webpage and guidance will also be included in the online induction website being created. (see action 2.2)

B. CEDARS now replaces CROS. Equivalent CEDARS questions and results from May ’21:

- Q. 30.1a 93% agreed or strongly agreed that their line manager encourages them to engage in personal and career development activities. **(22% increase on CROS 2019)**
- Q. 21.a How useful did you find your staff review/appraisal? 57% of RS said it was useful or very useful. (NB There was a slight change in wording of the question in CEDARS 2021 from the CROS 2019 question).

We also carried out a pulse survey in December 2020 to all Research Staff: (20/136 respondents) to explore CPD and PDR.

- Q. Have you accessed any of the following development opportunities in your time at UoP? **17/20 had accessed training opportunities (85%)**

\(^5\) Careers Research Online Survey run by Vitae.
### Q. Rate your experience of the PDR process from 1 (not helpful) to 5 (extremely helpful)

| n=18 | 1 - 11%; 2 - 11%; 3 - 50%; 4 - 22%; 5 - 6% |

The Pulse survey indicates that 85% of Research Staff (RS) have participated in some form of training. It also indicated that 22% of RS found the PDR process to be not helpful (compared to 50% in CROS 2019), but half RS were ambivalent (50%) and only 28% found it to be helpful.

**Outcome**

**PARTIALLY ACHIEVED** - this will be built upon in the new action plan specifically under actions 1, 4, 5, 9, 11, and 15.

#### Principle 2, 3 & 4: Recognition & Value and Support and Career Development

**Action:** Review University’s Handbook for Research Staff.

**Success measure:** Fit for purpose handbook is agreed, and disseminated.

**Timescale:** By Q3/4 2021.

**Responsibility:** HR (Supported by CIG6).

**Update on Progress**

The handbook (that outlined legal rights and responsibilities) was out-of-date and due for review. The review has been delayed due to inclusion in a wider and executive-led review of academic roles and structures, which is currently underway (May ‘21). The contractual elements of the handbook regarding their rights and responsibilities are covered in the contract information sent to new Research Staff by HR as part of their ‘onboarding’.

We therefore amended the action and focused instead on a new Induction for Research Staff Website - a specific request from a review carried out with

---

6 Concordat Implementation Group
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<p>| 2.3 | B12 Promotion opportunities transparent and communicated | Principle 2, 3 &amp; 4: Recognition &amp; Value and Support and Career | Action 1: Review of fitness for purpose of standard job specifications &amp; review guidance around promotion, re-grading and progression to ensure that it is accessible to research staff. Conduct a University level (rather than individual level) review to ensure | researchers during 2019/2020. Structure and content of this website has been based on feedback from consultation with research staff, PIs/managers and additional content will be added in response to requests/needs as they arise. As with the PI guide, content goes beyond, but does still include, support for career development. It will contain specific support and guidance for our Research Staff. CEDARS 2021 33% RS found institution induction useful 33% not very useful 16% not offered 16% offered but not taken. 58% RS found Faculty/departmental induction useful 8% not useful 33% not offered. CEDARS results show that our priority to develop and improve induction within the new action plan is required. Outcome AMENDED ACTION ON TRACK - and will be carried forward under new actions 3 and 4. | Update on Progress Action 1 update At the outset of this period the standard job specifications only cover grades 4 to 8, not grade 9. Data analysed as part of 6 year review (April 2019), shows |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmen t</th>
<th>that research staff duties are commensurate with grade e.g. dipstick text of role holders/role descriptors to ensure fit. Review qualifications vs grade level trends over years.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success measure:</td>
<td>Fit for purpose job specification that covers the full range of progression available and accessible to research staff. Duties are commensurate with grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale:</td>
<td>by Q4 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility:</td>
<td>HR (Supported by CIG).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A job specification has been created for Grade 9 research staff** and is published on the intranet, this provides for a more explicit extended potential career path for research-only staff. However, a more holistic review of job specifications, grading, promotion and progression for research staff has been overtaken by the executive led review of academic roles and structures mentioned earlier.

**Action 1 Outcome**
**ACTION PARTIALLY ACHIEVED** - job grading review will be carried forward under whole institution review of structures.

**Action 2 update**
An anonymised dataset including any employee who had had a research-only contract at some stage during that period (N=360) whether it be on a casual/hourly-paid, fixed term or permanent basis during the period Oct 2009 to November 2020 was **collated and analysed**. The analysis indicated the following:
- the distribution profile of grades showed a slight difference between male and female staff, with the grade distribution for males slightly higher than that for females - the most populous grade for males was Grade 8, and for females Grade 7.
- there was no significant difference in grade profile in terms of ethnicity (white/BAME; the volume of data did not support a more granular analysis)
- that Research Staff tend to have a number of roles during their employ ( whilst 20% (71 out of 360) have remained in the same role, the median value is 4 different roles and there are 25% of research staffs who have had 6 or more roles;
- 36% (130 of 360) of Research Staff employed in the period achieved a permanent role at some stage of their employment, and the remainder 74% did not ( or have not yet, for current non-permanent staff) gain permanent academic or research roles at the University.
- Of those that gained a permanent role at some time during their employment, 62% obtained this within the first 3 years of the date they first joined. In the set of those gaining a permanent role at some stage there was no significant difference between males (48%) and females (52%). 8% of this group had a disclosed disability (compared to the University figure for academic and research (A&R) staff of 11.8%). 77.7% reported as white ethnicity, compared to 74.6% for current University figures for A&R roles.
- Research Staff gaining a permanent role are most likely to have progressed to higher grades (only 14% occupied only 1 grade during their employ, however, non-permanent staff the majority (60%) remained on the same grade throughout their employ no matter if they held multiple different contracts/roles.
- A total of 39% of Research Staff having a permanent role at some stage started out at grade 5 or lower.
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| 2.4 | C14: Mentoring arrangements should be supported by employers as a key mechanism for career development and enhancement. | PRINCIPLE 4  
The importance of researchers’ personal and career development, and lifelong learning, is clearly recognised and promoted at all stages of their career. | Action: Conduct mapping of key University processes/documents where there is potential to add a question/prompt around support for mentoring and/or support for the career development of researchers, to consider, for example: Internal funding criteria/processes (Central and Faculty led), Intention to Apply process for external bidding, Centres and Institutes Policy, standard University Terms and Conditions for grants that employ research staff.  
Success measure: CROS question 24; see at least a 20% increase in positive responses to this question by 2021. (24.15a In which areas have you undertaken, or would you like to undertake, training and other continuing professional development activities - Being Mentored - 20% undertaken, 54% Not undertaken but I would like to)  
ACTION ON TARGET findings have fed into the gap analysis against the new Concordat and will be fed into the next RDG meeting to identify recommendations.  
Update on Progress  
The following processes/documents were reviewed:  
1. Intention to apply process  
2. Initial and Continuing Professional Development Policy  
3. Recruitment and Selection Policy  
4. Staff Induction Checklist  
5. Centres and Institutes Policy  
6. RIS TRIF programme  
7. Faculty internal funding - this came from discussion with ADR for Faculty of Business and Law (BaL)  
8. Standard Ts and Cs for grants that employ research staff (No standard Ts and Cs for grants -they are all bespoke).  
Recommendations resulting from review have been detailed and action prioritised for the next 12 months identified under the auspices of the Researcher Development Group. Recommendations have been shared with relevant ‘owners’. The first recommendation - creation of an induction website for researchers has been completed. Other actions are in train e.g. request for new field/checklist about |
### 2.5 C14: Mentoring arrangements should be supported by employers as a key mechanism for career development and enhancement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility: RIS/Faculties/Finance (Supported by CIG).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mentoring/career development to CRM system for bid process is on the schedule for discussion by the Community of Practice that prioritises CRM changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Success measure**
The original success measure was linked to CROS Q24, yet, there is not a directly equivalent question in CEDARS. However, we are able to interpolate between the two surveys, to get an indication of the direction of travel, and to support the career development Priority 4 within the next action plan.

In addition, **good practice was identified** in the Faculty of Business and Law where formal mentoring and professional development support for research staff is embedded into their processes and Research Staff get the same rights as other staff in bidding for funds/conferences, policy, allowances etc.

**Outcome**
**ACTION ACHIEVED** Career development will be carried forward in the new action plan under actions 11,12,13,14,16.

**Action:** Build specific strand for researcher development into the Themes initiative:
- a. including successful delivery of TRIF Fellows scheme
- b. PIs of TRIF project are mentored (and support for career development of research staff is an explicit part of the mentoring).

**Update on Progress**
- a. TRIF fellows scheme **has been delivered to 12 individuals** - 7 development sessions were delivered, 1 session cancelled due to Covid. All fellows have also been offered mentoring and up to 4 hours of external executive coaching alongside the 7 days of training. (Coaching was an additional element included in the
| **Success measure:** | 
|---|---|---|
| a. 80% of TRIF fellows have achieved their stated objectives. | b. 100% PIs report in final TRIF project reports that they have received mentoring, and where appropriate, where they have supported their research staff. | programme to provide even greater support for the fellows. |

**Timescale:** Q4 2021

**Responsibility:** Theme Directors (to liaise with ADRs as appropriate).

The programme completes at the end of this academic year. An interim survey of the fellows was conducted to ascertain progress against objectives (10 of 12 fellows responded.)

- 100% state objectives partially met - feedback states funding was withdrawn due to covid so this would have an impact on this.
- 70% accessed at least one coaching session.
- 50% benefitted from structured mentoring or informal support.

In addition, fellows provided qualitative feedback on the coaching e.g. “The coaching sessions have been outstanding. While the group training sessions have helped me adopt a more strategic approach to my research, especially regarding funding applications and project management, the one-to-one academic coaching has transformed my work identity.” and, “The coaching was (and still is) a highlight. Having this every few months has really helped me assess where I am at and focus on my coming goals.”

**b.** TRIF project funding was awarded to 19 individuals (20 projects in total). 50% of PIs benefitted from structured mentoring or informal support.

**Additional outcomes:**
Researcher development has been built into new Research Leadership cohort programmes that were launched October 2020 - both programmes have a day entitled ‘Working With and Developing Others’, where specific reference is made to the concordat. Lessons learned in the TRIF programme fed into the planning of these new programmes as part of routine discussions between the Director of CPD and the officer coordinating the TRIF programme.

In addition the University has launched its new mentoring system ‘Qooper’, which was not an explicit action of the Concordat action plan, but is nonetheless supportive of its aims. We will monitor uptake of Qooper by Research Staff - at present ~10% of Research have registered with the system.

**Outcome**

**ON TARGET WITH PARTIAL SUCCESS.** Mentoring will be carried forward in Action 3 of new action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Valuing the contribution of research staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>B1 Employers are encouraged to value and afford equal treatment to all researchers, regardless of whether they are employed on a fixed term or similar contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle 2 Researchers are recognised and valued by their employing organisation as an essential part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> to increase public presence of research staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Success measure:</strong> Total of 10 RS stories in 2019/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- RIS blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least 3 articles in The Conversation written by research staff in 2019/20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Update on Progress</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To support confidence in public engagement, Research Staff have been offered training and opportunity for media engagement through regular liaison with the Media and Communications team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training offered to Research Staff includes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Media training - The Press and Media team offer regular media training provided by experienced external media training professionals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| of their organisation’s human resources and a key component of their overall strategy to develop and deliver world-class research. | At least 1 research staff member longlisted for vice-chancellor’s award.  
**Timescale:** by end Q2 2020.  
**Responsibility:** Media and Communications team (supported by Researchers’ Net, Research Staff Forum). | throughout the year. The half and full-day sessions put academics into interview scenarios, which are recorded allowing the trainer to provide feedback and analysis to help hone media interview skills and experience.  
- The University has a close relationship with the news and opinion website, The Conversation, where academics write articles on current news and topics for a global, non-scientific audience. As part of the relationship, the Press and Media team arrange for different editors from The Conversation to come to the University (3 or 4 times a year) to give a practical workshop about who they are and giving researchers the opportunity to pitch article ideas.  
- The Press and Media team also give informal presentations about The Conversation throughout the year.  

10 members of Research Staff accessed Media training during 2019/2020.  

In the past two years research staff have been prolific contributors to The Conversation, tripling the rate of contribution compared to the prior 6 years, and exceeding the target for 2019/20.  

**Success measure:**  
30 articles written in The Conversation between 2012-2020.  
- 2012-2018 = 15 articles  
- 2018/19 = 9 articles  
- 2019/20 = 6 articles (double the target number)
Since July 2019 there have been **19 items featuring research staff on the University website**, including news, blogs, webinars, podcasts.

Only **1 blog** on the Research and Innovation Services site was written by a member of Research Staff in 2019/20. Other blogs have raised the profile of the Concordat or Research Staff issues but weren’t written by Research Staff themselves.

**One member of Research Staff was long-listed for a VC award** in 2019/20.

**Outcome**
**ACHIEVED**

| D3 Researchers aware of the need for ethical behaviour | Principle 3, 4, 5 support and career development | **Action:** To increase the number of research staff who have received Responsible Conduct of Research training. Through more targeted communication and involving PIs.  
**Success measure:** Improved attendance figures (20% of cohort 2019/20 = 27 research staff).  
**Timescale:** Q3 2020.  
**Responsibility:** RIS / Senior Ethics Advisor, PIs. | **Update on Progress**  
Responsible Conduct of Research training sits within a wider training programme - Research and Innovation Staff Development Programme (RISDP). During the period of this action plan, a comprehensive review of the whole RISDP programme was carried out and a new approach to communicating training initiated. The content of Responsible Conduct of Research training was also reviewed, and changes made to how it was delivered. We now have 3 different mechanisms - through ‘Applying to Ethics Committee’, and’ Introduction to Good Clinical Practice in Clinical Research’ workshops and online ‘Ethics, Integrity and...
NB: In 2018/19 - 6 research staff accessed the training.

Governance training’ through 13 new modules on the University’s VLE site, moodle. The following sessions were delivered during 2019/2020 (NB - 2 training sessions due to be delivered in March and June 2020 were cancelled due to COVID):

- Applying to an Ethics Committee - 22.10.19, 10.12.19, 21.01.20 (No Research Staff attended any of these sessions)
- Introduction to Good Clinical Practice in Clinical Research 19.2.20 (2 Research Staff attended)
- 2 members of Research Staff have accessed at least one of the online moodle modules.
- In total - 4 Research Staff accessed ethics/integrity training in 2019/2020.

In 2020/21 to date:

- 15 Research Staff have participated in a relevant session:
  - Applying to an Ethics Committee - 7.12.20 (4 research staff), 16.3.21 (1 Research Staff)
  - A specific session promoted by the Research Staff forum and dedicated to RS ran 5th Feb. 2021 (10 Research Staff attended).
  - One further general session is planned for June.

Based on feedback received from representatives of the research community, there are a number of possible reasons why the take up onto ethics training specifically could be low:

- in certain subject areas (eg Science and Health/Creative and Cultural Industries) research ethics is ‘drilled in’ from first year of undergraduate through PhD and as staff.
| | | Therefore, some staff do not perceive that they need any more training especially when ‘they would have had a wealth of experience with applying for research ethics to get to that point in their career.’ Ethics is ‘inbuilt’. |
| | | - with the push for open science, transparency and reproducibility, a lot of research integrity and best practices are taught early on. |
| | | - Research Staff are ‘self-taught’ when required, rather than waiting to access formal training when it is delivered |
| | | - Research Staff often do not lead projects, therefore their ‘ownership’ in framing research ethics and integrity is limited. The individual researcher does not always recognise their responsibility in this. PIs have a role here in promoting this. |
| | | - Time is limited to access anything beyond their immediate contractual responsibilities. |

Further context: To note, of all the RISDP sessions delivered during 2019/2020, Research Staff made up 10% of all attendees (n = 49, 36% of the RS cohort) Research Staff attended a RISDP training session.

**Outcome**

**NOT ACHIEVED**

Following extensive exploration of the area, and an improved offering and communication of the training offer we have decided to close this action. We believe the conditions that led to the creation of this action in previous years have changed. Monitoring of uptake for training specific to research integrity and misconduct
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| 3.3 | D5 Researchers should recognise that the primary responsibility for managing and pursuing their career is theirs. | Principle 3, 4, 5 support and career development | **Action:** More targeted promotion of development opportunities to PIs as well as research staff.  
**Success measure:** 80% of research staff engaging with some form of development activity during their employment. 30% within first 6 months of joining the University. Monitor research staff attendance at training events and CROS questions.  
**Timescale:** Q3 2020.  
**Responsibility:** RIS/Associate Deans’ Research (ADRs). | under the new offer will be subject to routine monitoring with RISDP. Also, focus in the next action plan on embedding the 10 days for professional development will ensure that research staff have the time and support of their PIs to participate in training as required.  
**Update on Progress**  
Research Staff participation in development was sampled using a pulse survey in December 2020, (20 responses - 15% of cohort, 19 respondents joined previous to January 2020, 1 joined 1.1.20-30.6.20):  
- 17/20 (85% of respondents) had accessed some form of development activity during 19/20  
- 16/20 - attended a training course/event  
- 12/20 conference  
- 11/20 - self directed learning  
- 8/20 KE activity  
- 6/20 Public engagement  
- 4/20 experiential learning  
- 4/20 committee membership  
- 3/20 mentoring scheme  
- 2/20 policy development  
- 1/20 scholarship  
- Job shadowing/exchanges = 0  
In CEDARS 2021 we set an institutional question (Q.46) around development that referred more explicitly to a broader interpretation of development, embracing formal/informal and experiential forms of development. In this question:
75% of academic staff reported undertaking 5 or more days, and 43.3% 10 or more days in the past year.
- Research Staff reported 52% undertaking 5 or more days, and only 38.1% with 10 or more days in the past year.
- Total Research Staff undertaking some form of development in last 12 months = 86% (CEDARS May ‘21)
- Total PIs undertaking some form of development activity in last 12 months = 97% (CEDARS May ‘21)

Additional information:
We now have a RISDP Google Currents group and a new Research and Innovation Staff Development (RISDP) webpage.
In 19/20, 10% of attendees at a RISDP training event were Research Staff (RS) - equating to 49 individuals, 36% of the total number of RS. (Important to note that there are many other development opportunities taken up by RS not covered here - eg, institutional mandatory training, that which is delivered by other professional services, informal, locally delivered support, mentoring and more.)

Outcome
ACHIEVED IN PART
Whilst the overall picture for Research Staff accessing development is positive, we cannot be certain from the data that those starting the University are accessing development within 6 months of joining. However, we
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.4</th>
<th><strong>B1 Employers are focusing on Induction under Priority 3 in our new Action Plan.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Principle 2** Researchers are recognised and valued by their employing organisation as an essential part of their organisation’s human resources and a key component of their overall strategy to develop and deliver world-class research. | **Action:** Build in requirement for a number of days* for researcher development time into internal funding schemes (to include academic citizenship). **Success measure:** All internal research funding schemes adopt the 10 day rule. (20% increase in CROS Q. 25 “time spent on training and/or CPD”.) **Timescale:** Q2 2021 (to be aligned with new Concordat). **Responsibility:** ADRs / Theme Directors. | **Update on Progress** Agreement has been made by ADRs, Theme Directors and RIS that internal research funding schemes commencing AY 2021/22 will include the ’10 day rule’ (pro rata) for development time to be allocated to Research Staff. This will be monitored at the Researcher Development Group and through the Faculty Research and Innovation Committees. The following definition (agreed by representatives of the Research Staff community and the Researcher Development Group) will be used as a guide to inform PIs and Research Staff regards what activity can be counted towards these 10 days: 

Activities counted towards the 10 days of Research Staff development time (pro-rata), where they are not a core part of the researcher’s role, may include the following:

- Self-directed Learning
- Experiential Learning
- Job Shadowing
- Exchanges
- Conferences
- Taking part in a mentoring scheme (as mentor or mentee)
- Committee membership
- Participating in policy development
- Public engagement
- Knowledge exchange activities
- Attending a training course, workshop or webinar |
Scholarship
NB - this is not a definitive list, nor a list of required activity, and all these activities will necessarily be available to all Research Staff. The emphasis is that the University/PIs/Managers of Research Staff are providing Research Staff with the opportunity to have this time for their development. Research Staff, in discussion with their line managers, will be expected to make their own judgements regarding what they count for their 10 days and will have the responsibility to record this appropriately.

In CROS19, average time spent on professional development was 2-3 days. See 3.3 for 2021 data.

**Outcome**
**ON TARGET (slightly delayed, implementation in 21/22)**
This action will be further developed as part of the new actions 1, 2, 3 and 4 (in our Priority Area 1.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Researcher voice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.1 | F1 procedures in place for regular review of the Concordat and the extent to which UoP meets it | Principle 7 Implementation and review | Action: Gather feedback via CROS/PIRLS ⁷ and monitor uptake.  
**Success measure:** Exceed CROS uptake for benchmark group.  
**Timescale:** CROS May 2019 & PIRLS equivalent Q4 2019.  
**Responsibility:** RIS. | Update on Progress  
CROS was delivered in 2019. PIRLS equivalent was not run due to clash of timescales with a University wide survey running. Focus groups with academic staff were run to explore specific areas and were delivered instead.  
CEDARS now in place of CROS and PIRLS - was set up to run CEDARS in 2020 but this was postponed due to COVID-19. **CEDARS ran April-May 2021.** |

---

⁷ Principal Investigators and Research Leads Survey run by Vitae.
**Pulse survey administered Dec 2020** had 20 Research Staff respondents (15% of cohort). Outcomes of this survey are being used to inform a range of actions within this action plan and for the next action plan. Research Staff Forum and Researchers Network have also carried out a number of exploration and feedback events.

**Success measure**
- 22% uptake for CROS in 2019
- 15% of Research Staff Cohort responded in CEDARS 2021

**Outcome**
**NOT ACHIEVED**
We have had good engagement from the Research Staff Fora (see events) but the survey response has been below what we aimed for. This may be due to pandemic fatigue/survey fatigue, however, we will continue to address this through Priority area 5 in the new action plan (actions 1 and 2).

| 4.2 | F2 Obtaining feedback from researchers | Principle 7 Implementation and review | **Action 1:** Relaunch Research Staff Forum  
**Success measure:** Attendance of equivalent of 15% of research staff cohort over a 12-month period.  
**Timescale:** Q2 2020.  
**Responsibility:** PIs, HR, RIS & senior research staff (to also consult with ADRs and HoDs). |
| Update on Progress  
Following feedback from Researchers’ Network colleagues, and review of data indicating a drop-off of research staff engagement, the Concordat Implementation Group (now known as Researcher Development group) re-launched the Research Staff Forum and also revisited purpose and membership of Researchers’ Network.  
**Researchers Network (RN) purpose and target membership reviewed and relaunch event held 25.2.20** |
**Action 2:** Revisit Researchers Network and agree purpose and target membership.

**Success measure:** Newly agreed purpose and membership (in light of Research Staff Forum).

**Timescale:** Relaunch Q3 2019, first data end Q2 2020.

**Responsibility:** PIs, HR, RIS & senior research staff & current Researchers Network champions (consult with ADRs & HoDs).

NB - Definition of fora as follows:
Research Staff Forum - for all Research Staff
Researchers’ Network - for any Researchers up to Reader
(We also have Readers’ and Profs’ Fora)

---

**Research Staff Forum (RSF) relaunch event held 26.2.20**

Convenors of fora have directly supported and used the community to support the following:
- all 4 convenors are members of the Researcher Development Group
- convenors have been part of working groups working on actions for this action plan
- convenors have supported dissemination of information and events via their fora
- are growing a google+ community
- liaising and engaging externally with key bodies and organisations eg. UKRSA
- have delivered a number of events, development sessions and network opportunities.

The Researchers’ Network and Research Staff Forum ran a series of online events with help and guidance for researchers, including:
- Bid preparation and how to get your first grants
- Promotion and career planning
- Work-life balance
- Rights and responsibilities as a researcher
- Increasing your visibility (both online and offline)
- vital information every researcher at the university needs during their induction.

Between Feb 2020 and end of April 2021:
**9 events were delivered by the RSF/RN - with 196 attendees** (some attendees attended multiple events).
CEDARS Institutional Q. 45 asked how many respondents have engaged with their career stage forum. 67% of Research Staff stated they have engaged either through attending an event, networking session or through social media.

**Outcome**

**ACHIEVED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADR - Associate Dean Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY - Annual Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaL - Faculty of Business and Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDARS - Culture, Employment and Development in Academic Research Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIG (read RDG) - Concordat Implementation Group - changed to Researcher Development Group since the action plan was approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD - Continuing Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM - Customer Relationship Management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROS - Careers in Research Online Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep.Dir.HR+OD - Deputy Director Human Resources and Organisational Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HOD - Head of Department
HR - Human Resources
PDR - Professional Development Review
PI - Principal Investigator
PIRLS - Principal Investigators and Research Leaders Survey
RIS - Research and Innovation Services
RS - Research Staff
TDs - Theme Directors
TRIF - Themes Research and Innovation Funding