

Concordat implementation

Title: The Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers
University of Southampton Implementation Strategy and Plan

From: PDU/HR on behalf of Professor Philip Nelson, PVC Research **Date:** 12th October 2011
(up-dated 14th November 2011)

The University of Southampton, as a signatory to the Concordat to support the Career Development of Researchers, is in the process of implementing the seven Principles of the Concordat. We have been working on implementing the Concordat since January 2009 and the process is promoted and endorsed by the PVC for Research, Professor Philip Nelson, who champions the Concordat within the university. Much of our work to date has been at the institutional level; through disseminating the Concordat, raising awareness among all staff, seeking the input of research staff, creating appropriate implementation mechanisms, identifying lines of responsibility, reviewing institutional practice and establishing professional development support for researchers.

We are about to embark on a step-change in our implementation process by focussing on the Faculty and Academic unit levels in our institution, by working more closely with PIs and encouraging greater researcher engagement; this will enable us to drive the changes we are making deeper into the institution and to better embed the principles of the Concordat. This next phase will begin with discussion papers to the PVC's Research and Enterprise Advisory Group (REAG) and the VC's University Executive Group (UEG). Details of our activities and future plans are laid out below.

Our approach

The University has four key phases for implementing the Concordat and in identifying areas for action:

1. University level – providing the organisational overview of all University level processes, comprising an institutional audit of existing HR policies and practices affecting research staff, review and revision of HR policies and processes where required, the views of research staff on their experience (via a ‘training needs analysis’, focus groups, workshops and CROS reports). A Champion and a working group will hold operational responsibility for implementing the Concordat and monitoring progress.
2. Individual level – informing and involving individual researchers, PIs and senior managers throughout the University, raising their levels of knowledge, engagement with and ownership of the Concordat.
3. Faculty and academic unit level – embedding the Concordat within the University through Faculty engagement, activity and ownership, and through encouraging greater researcher involvement at this level.
4. Review – in order to monitor improvements to the research staff experience and employability, to assess our progress and evaluate the outcomes of our actions, we will undertake periodic reviews (e.g. annually and at other set periods) around all of the above levels. We actively seek feedback from all staff and improving our communication mechanisms is a key priority.

Depending on the type of action undertaken, it is anticipated that phases will overlap and many of the activities may operate concurrently.

Background

The new version of the Concordat, subsuming the EC Charter and Code, was published in August 2008 and the University of Southampton has been active in implementing these documents since January 2009. A Timeline document can be viewed at: http://www.soton.ac.uk/hr/working/policies/Research_concordat.html

Management

PVC Research, Professor Philip Nelson, is the University champion for the Concordat. Professor Nelson has overall responsibility for the Concordat within the University.

At University level he is/has been supported by:

- Human Resources
- Learning and Teaching Enhancement Unit (LATEU) and Staff Development Office (SDO) until 31st July 2011¹
- Advisory Group on the Implementation of the Concordat, chaired by Professor Hugh Perry, from 12 July 2010 to 11 October 2011
 - Members of the Advisory Group included: Research Staff representatives for each Faculty (old structure); a PI; a research manager; two members from HR; two members of the Roberts development team; and a representative from the UCU.
 - The Terms of Reference for the Advisory Group, membership and Minutes from meetings are available at: http://www.soton.ac.uk/hr/working/policies/Research_concordat.html
- Professional Development Unit (PDU) from 1st August 2011 to date²
- Concordat Working Group, Chair³ – advertised and being recruited, reporting to the *Professional Development Unit Advisory Group*⁴, these new governance groups were established on 11 October 2011
 - The Terms of Reference for the Working Group and membership will be made available on the above website

In 2009/10 the University of Southampton began a major restructuring process; the new structure officially came into being 1st August 2011. During the 'transition' period to the new structure, an Advisory Group continued the implementation process that had begun with a 'gap' analysis in 2009 (details below); the group explored the Principles in detail and made recommendations to the PVC for Research in October 2011. The new University structure resulted in LATEU and SDO being replaced by PDU and the Advisory Group by the Concordat Working Group.

Our aim

To ensure that the Principles of the Concordat are applied throughout the organisation in an equitable and meaningful way so as to make a genuine difference to the experience and employment prospects of our research staff. We are very clear that this is not a 'tick-box' exercise.

Our 'target end state' is for:

- All research staff and their PIs to understand, appreciate and apply the Principles of the Concordat in their working relationships and to apply these principles in all academic units
- All HR processes and policies to be thoroughly and appropriately applied to research staff, without exception

¹ The membership of LATEU comprised: A Director of unit, 3 x staff developers/trainers, 4 x educational developers, 2 x specialist staff, 3 x administrative support. The membership of SDO comprised: A Director of unit, 2 x staff developers/trainers, 1 x administrative support.

² The membership of the PDU comprises: PDU: Head of Unit, 4 x staff developers/trainers, 1 x educational developer, 4 x administrative support.

³ The Concordat Working Group membership will consist of: A Chair, 8 X Faculty Concordat 'champions' (who could be research staff), 2 x Research staff representatives, 1 x PDU representative, and Dr Ashley Pringle (member of National Concordat Advisory committee).

⁴ The membership of the PDU Advisory Group currently consists of: A Chair (currently PVC Education), the Chair of the Researcher Development and Graduate Centre working group (RDGC WG), the Chair of the Academic Practice working group (AP WG), the Chair of the Concordat Working Group, the Head of Professional Development Unit (PDU) and the University Registrar.

- All research staff to have had the opportunity to build their CVs, to develop their professional skills and to enhance their career prospects
- All PIs/line managers to be supported and enabled to apply the principles of the Concordat to their staff
- The University to have identified its research staff and their PIs, and maintain accurate data pertaining to research staff
- The University to become an 'employer of choice' by realising our strategic ambition of Delivering Research Excellence
- Faculties to have identified their aims and priorities.

How will we achieve this?

We will achieve 'our target end state' through carrying out the major tasks detailed below and through a series of subsidiary tasks and projects identified as a result of undertaking these tasks and by employing the following general method:

Major Tasks

1. Benchmark and review the current University condition against the Concordat principles
2. To identify our research staff and their PIs, and maintain accurate data on recruitment, retention, professional development and employment of research staff
3. To conduct 'gap analyses' in policy application and procedure, staff knowledge and behaviour, and at the University, Faculty/academic unit and individual levels
4. To consider the outcomes of the 'gap analyses' and each of the Principles in detail to identify areas for action at three levels: i) University, ii) Faculty and iii) individuals
5. To act on and improve identified areas for action
6. To raise awareness of and engage research staff, PIs, and other relevant University staff in the Concordat
7. To encourage greater involvement of research staff as individuals and groups/associations in the implementation process
8. To develop mechanisms and procedures to communicate, monitor, evaluate and regularly review progress throughout the institution on the above

Method

1. We will continue to review existing policies and practices at University level and then drill down through the organisation
2. We will endeavour to engage individuals throughout the process via formal line management mechanisms, research staff associations and groupings, workshops, briefing sessions and notices, newsletters, meetings, and our internal communications and marketing; seeking to expand and build on the levels of engagement
3. Task groups will be established, by the University, as necessary (e.g. reward)
4. Existing bodies and networks (such as REAG, Research Staff associations/groups, UCU) will be briefed and/or engaged to provide advice on, input to and promotion of the implementation strategy.

Gap analysis 1: Institutional audit

The institutional audit (or University level 'gap analysis') consisted of a review of existing HR policies and their alignment with The Concordat (Cooper 2009), the findings were compared with a research staff 'training needs analysis' (Reeves 2009) and the CROS response (2009). The result was a new paper that identified key areas for improvement/action and contained revised recommendations (Cooper and Reeves 2009 – attached here as Appendix A). This paper was submitted to the HRC (as it was then called) on the 9th November 2009. The CROS 2009 data has been used as a benchmark tool in comparison with 2011 data. We will continue to use this survey data to measure our progress in improving the research staff experience.

Gap analysis 2: Individuals

We will encourage all research staff to undertake individual reviews of their skill set using the annual Personal, Performance and Development Review (PPDR) – our appraisal system, and/or coaching from PIs and mentors, self-analysis and the Researcher Development Framework.

Gap analysis 3: Faculty level

The CROS findings of 2009 and 2011 indicated some variation between Faculties which require further investigation (see Implementation schedule, Phase 3 below).

Key actions

For Implementation Schedule see Appendix B.

Principle	Action/recommendation	Responsibility	Timeframe
Principle 1 – on Recruitment, selection and retention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review of the Institutional Induction Programme is being carried out: we will create modules appropriate for research staff needs 	PDU/HR	By June 2012
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review of ‘reward’ system (including recruitment and recognition) is underway; initially focused on academic and research staff, but will be extended to all staff. 	HR	2011 to 2014
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will establish a course on ‘Managing Staff Induction’ (suitable for PIs) 	SDO/HR	December 2010
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review of Probation Procedures will be carried out – a pilot of new Probation forms with School of Geography 	HR	2009/10 Review 2011/12
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be a review of use of Fixed term contracts and comparison with sector benchmarks 	HR	Ongoing
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review will be carried out of training and support for PIs, with reference to recruitment and selection. A new programme will be developed for PIs. 	PDU	2011/12 for 2013
Advisory group recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendation 1: that Human Resources (HR), perhaps in collaboration with the Faculty Finance Managers, finds a way of improving its database to maintain accurate and current data on research staff. 	HR	2012/2013
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendation 2: that each Faculty establishes mechanisms for and reports regularly on the proper delivery of HR processes , including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an appropriate and thorough induction for all new research staff a clear period of probation and timely review for all new research staff an annual appraisal for all research staff using protocols and pro-forma fit for researchers’ purpose, and that the annual appraisal system and data is reviewed by HR training for PIs/line managers in recruitment & selection, talent management, and the responsibilities of PIs in developing research staff recording of induction, probation, appraisal and exit procedures for research staff, and of support for 	Faculties and HR	Paper to REAG November 2011. Paper to UEG by June 2012 (Timeframe to be agreed)

	<p>PIs/line managers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensuring that pay and grade, and rights and duties are understood by research staff and their PIs. 		
Principle 2 – Researchers are recognised and valued by employing organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PPDR process (appraisal) will be reviewed. All research staff, beyond probationary period, to receive an annual appraisal. 	HR and Faculties	Revisit annually
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be a review of the Promotion Process for Academic and Research staff 	HR	2011/12
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ‘Action learning sets’ re-established for female staff seeking promotion 	SDO PDU	2010 2011
Advisory group recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendation 5: that Deans of Faculty recognise and reward outstanding research staff for their informal contributions to the University and that Faculties create similar mechanisms for the recognition of outstanding PIs. 	Dean of Faculty	Paper to REAG November 2011. Paper to UEG by June 2012 (Timeframe to be agreed)
Principle 3 – Researchers are equipped and supported to be adaptable and flexible in an increasingly diverse, mobile, global research environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of a Roberts funded development programme for ECRs (LATEU) and that is responsive to wider research staff needs, develops their talent and enables them to progress and flourish. The continuation of the development programme for research staff. 	LATEU PDU	Jan 2009 – June 2012 From June 2012
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a new ‘Preparing for Leadership’ programme for Level 4/5 staff, including Induction module Establish ‘future academic leadership’ programme for research staff Establish ‘leadership’ programme (suitable for PIs) 	SDO LATEU PDU	Dec 2010 Dec 2010 Dec 2011
Advisory group recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendation 3: that the Dean of Faculty, Head of Academic Unit or other as appropriate, appoints/designates a member of staff whose interest is in the development of research staff – i.e. a group mentor or advisor to work with the AD Research in an informal pastoral role and who can provide 1–2–1 support to research staff and work in partnership with the Concordat Working Group and the PDU. 	Dean of Faculty	Paper to REAG November 2011. Paper to UEG by June 2012 (Timeframe to be agreed)
Principle 4 – The importance of researchers’ personal and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appointment of ECR Skills Training Co-ordinator to deliver Roberts agenda until 2011 	LATEU	Jan 2009
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appointment of Roberts funded ECR Careers Officer to develop career support resources 	LATEU	June 2010

career development is recognised and promoted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and workshops until 2012 Appointment of Roberts funded Researcher Development Officer to design and deliver a 'talent management programme for ECRs until 2012 	LATEU	June 2010
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offer 1-2-1 Management Coaching Develop CareerSTEP/FutureSTEP a peer coaching programme for research staff 	SDO LATEU/PDU	On-going March 2010
Advisory group recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendation 4: that all research staff have immediate access to Career Destinations resources and careers advice. 	Career Destinations	October 2011
Principle 5 - Researchers share responsibility for and need to be pro-active in their CPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The concepts of self-performance and pro-active self-management will be supported and promoted via Roberts programme and SDO 	LATEU/SDO now PDU	On-going
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of opportunities will be offered and available to ECRs via the Roberts programme, i.e. to develop and lead projects, training initiatives etc. There will be ongoing collaboration between HR, LATEU and SDO and Roberts programme to strengthen the University offer to research staff 	LATEU now PDU LATEU & SDO	On-going n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage the growth in the number of research staff groups at Faculty level (PDU) 	PDU	Dec 2013
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools and Faculties to ensure that research staff are represented on appropriate boards and committees. 	Dean of Faculty	Timeframe to be agreed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendation 6: that a simple 'statement of expectations' is drawn up and published around each Principle of the Concordat explaining what the University offers research staff (i.e. what they can expect of the University) and what is expected of research staff in return. 	PDU/HR with PVC Research & Faculties	June 2012
Principle 6 - On diversity and equality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be a strategic equality plan for all staff and students, to establish actions for 2010-2013 	VC & HR	2009-2011 Signed off by Council and the VC in March 2011
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will pay close attention to issues relating to age, gender, role and international staff. Cultural awareness/diversity training will be introduced. 	E&D, HR & PDU E&D & PDU	On-going Dec 2011
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> International staff website established http://www.internationalstaff.ac.uk/?uni=26 	LATEU & HR	Dec 2010
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Electronics and Computer Science (ECS) will develop a gender equality action plan and apply for the Athena SWAN award (silver). We will work with other academic units to extend Athena SWAN awards. 	E&D	Nov 2011
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will create a campaign around 'Every Researcher Counts' (Vitae resource) 	E&D with PDU	Dec 2013
Principle 7 - Stakeholders will undertake regular reviews of the progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will encourage research staff to participate in CROS and internal staff surveys when appropriate, and aim to increase the percentage of research staff respondents with each survey (e.g. CROS 2009 = 27%, CROS 2011 = 34%) 	LATEU & HR now PDU	On-going

in strengthening the attractiveness and sustainability of research careers in the UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Concordat Working Group will be established to communicate, embed, monitor and review progress. 	PDU	Oct 2011
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual reporting on Roberts funding and impact of activities 	LATEU and Graduate Schools	Nov 2010
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revision underway of the document <i>Guidance for Schools on supporting the careers of researchers (Postdocs)</i>. 	HR, SDO, LATEU and UCU – now PDU	June 2012
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will include data on employability issues affecting research staff i.e. retention, redeployment, promotion, Career Destinations use, as part of the HR scorecard. 	HR, Faculties and other Professional services	ongoing

What resources will be allocated?

£4,000 to facilitate the development of research staff associations/groups within Faculties

HR funded review of 'recruitment, reward and recognition'

HR funded review of 'induction'

HR funded review of 'PPDR'

Staff time for Advisory Group/Concordat Working Group

Roberts funded staff and research staff development programme – becoming mainstream University funded programme in 2011/12

Free and open access to Career Destinations resources for all research staff

How will we monitor progress?

To monitor our progress we will:

- Openly take feedback from research staff, internal researcher associations, PIs and other relevant staff
- Conduct annual reviews of action points and the progress made by the Advisory/Working group
- Undertake bi-annual surveys using CROS or other staff satisfaction survey
- Obtain statistical data and information from Faculties and HR on recruitment and selection processes, retention rates, organisation and local induction participants, exit interviews, PPDR and development needs.
- Undertake an institutional review in 2013

Appendix A: Institutional Audit ('gap analysis' University level)

Title: **The Concordat to support the career development of researchers:**

Overview of the current situation within the University of Southampton

From: Julie Reeves, LATEU, & Tony Cooper, Staff Development Unit **Date:** 21 October 2009

This paper provides an overview of activity within the University of Southampton with respect to supporting research staff in general, and ECRs in particular, and in relation to the seven principles of *The Concordat*. The paper draws on two sources of information:

- 1) A 'training needs analysis' (TNA) conducted between January and July 2009 that surveyed the views of a wide range of stakeholders including Schools/research centres, managers and research staff.
- 2) The *Careers in Research On-line Survey* (CROS) conducted in May 2009. The full CROS report by Helen Ralph can be found via Sussed: *University Secretary, Business Intelligence*

A summary of School visits for the TNA is available as Appendix A (separate from this document).

The main findings, good practice and the key challenges are listed below and structured around the seven principles.

Principle 1: Recruitment and selection (P1)

Principle 1 (P1) impacts on how we recruit and select research staff. On the whole, the University of Southampton compares favourably with the sector in these areas according to CROS; we have a higher than sector proportion of staff finding out about our jobs on-line (via Jobs.ac.uk or other web page). CROS also indicates that it is common for many researchers to find out about jobs by 'word of mouth'.

All of the University's application processes came out very well in CROS and this was confirmed by the TNA. The TNA would highlight the practice in the School of Chemistry of monitoring the recruitment process of individuals to ensure that all appropriate criteria are met, as an example of good practice in this area.

An area of concern revealed by CROS is that the University of Southampton staff are on shorter fixed term contracts than the sector. We had a higher than sector response rate for contracts of 7–24 months duration, whereas the sector appears to offer a greater proportion of 25–36 month contracts than we do. Although short-termism is a sector wide problem for research staff, the TNA encountered several researchers who had been at the institution on a succession of short contracts and one major implication of this was that they did not receive an appraisal (for example one researcher had been at the University for 5 years without a PPDR). Administrators and managers were well aware of the problem but found the continual renewal of short-term contracts and extensions difficult to manage. The frequency of short-term contracts may reflect University structure, while combining the findings of both CROS and the TNA suggests this is an area requiring further investigation.

Although exit interviews are not obvious 'recruitment and selection' issues they do affect our understanding of researcher careers' and experience. On the whole, but with the exception of the Schools of Geography and Chemistry, most Schools seemed uncertain as to whether exit interviews were always being conducted. This suggests greater monitoring of procedures and tighter control of implementation processes; individual follow-ups' might be useful.

The TNA found that administrators would welcome the opportunity to share good practice between Schools.

Principle 2: Recognition and value (P2)

Institutional 'recognition and value' was rated very highly in CROS and above the sector average, particularly in terms of recognition of outputs etc (publications, external collaborations). CROS indicates that researchers feel recognised and valued by their research groups and as an institution we are ahead of the sector. Some researchers perceived unequal treatment when compared with lecturers in involvement in decision making, performance related pay and promotions (see also Principle 6 below), but most felt they have equal access to training, conference attendance and flexible working. Researchers feel they are well integrated into their departments but are less integrated into the institution's research community and feel uninvolved in the whole university.

Unfortunately, according to the CROS, researchers have a low level of knowledge about decision making processes and entitlements at Southampton as well as of external factors that may affect them or their inclusion within the University of Southampton (i.e. RAE/REF only 16% had a 'good understanding', 3% had a good understanding of the Concordat, 4% of Roberts and 74% had never heard of Vitae!). Although researchers have a good understanding of their terms and conditions of employment and the appraisal system, and a better than sector understanding of fixed term contracts and research codes of practice, this was still less than half of research staff who responded to the survey (i.e. between 42% to 34%).

The TNA, in contrast to some aspects of CROS, identified pockets where research staff felt a lack of recognition and reward for the other kinds of work they do, for example, in public engagement, in mentoring students, or for self-development and voluntary activities. They also expressed the need for greater recognition of the informal contributions researchers' make to projects and teams.

Principle 3: Supported and equipped for the global research environment (P3)

Induction is an essential support mechanism for all staff. The TNA failed to identify comprehensive Induction programmes for research staff other than what dedicated individual administrators or academics were providing; most Schools rely on the PI although the School of Medicine does have a programme and the School of Psychology pays particular attention to international staff. There were no recorded administrative processes (independent of PPDR) for evaluating and monitoring the success of induction or whether the needs of new staff had been, and continued to be, met. Some managers and administrative staff said they would like to do more, but lack the resource to do so. CROS confirms that 67% of respondents were not offered a 'cross-institutional induction programme', which was slightly worse than the sector. Yet 83% found the information about the employment contract and 75% found the induction to their role either very useful or useful (which is also slightly higher than the sector).

The TNA found that international researchers (as do international students) across the University experience difficulty in getting settled in the UK; for example, signing of contracts, obtaining letters of employment, opening bank accounts and just finding out how things work, all took far too much time and compounded anxiety about doing a good job.

There is little language support and training for international staff and their families or information as to where to obtain such support, even less for the home/EU researchers. General support or training interventions in the internationalising research environment are absent currently, although the proposed Roberts programme for ECRs will attempt to address the imbalance.

Principle 4: Support for career development (P4)

There was universal agreement among Schools on the need for a career service and support and a widespread concern for the lack of career planning for researchers at all levels. Researchers also complained about the lack of career development support in the TNA, which was also reflected in CROS where 59% stated that they 'would like' career management training.

CROS indicates that not only was this an area of shortcoming but that the University of Southampton was behind the sector as a whole, and the Russell group in particular.

The TNA found a good range of courses on offer across the University, but that research staff were not aware of many of these or do not feel they are appropriate. There is a serious lack of knowledge of SDU courses and there did not seem to be much attempt at School or individual PI level to embed learning or transfer it to the work environment on completion of courses, although this area requires more detailed research.

The PPDR process should support career development in a bespoke way, however research staff frequently complained about the lack of PPDR during the TNA, whilst Schools seemed confused as to what ECRs were entitled to. CROS confirmed that only 41% of respondents have had an appraisal in the past 2 years; although it should be noted that the Schools of Biological Sciences and Chemistry were making efforts to implement an appraisal system for researchers. The TNA found that although researchers may have regular meetings with their PIs these tended to focus on work related matters and did not address career issues. Some research staff suggested during the course of the TNA that although they would want their PI to be informed or included in any discussion of career development, they did not feel the PI was the best person to hold this conversation with. CROS indicates that researchers have consulted equally with their PI and family/friends on their careers.

The TNA found that Probation and Appraisal processes for ECRs are unclear and require clarifying.

Principle 5: Researchers share responsibility for their CPD and lifelong learning (P5)

During the TNA several Schools and PIs indicated that greater effort should be made to encourage researchers to take more personal and professional responsibility. Researchers accepted this (TNA) and would like the opportunity to play a more active role in the University. Four Schools/Centres (i.e. Medicine, Biological Sciences, ISVR, Engineering) have organised vibrant and self-sustaining postdoctoral associations, forums or groups. Chemistry and Health Sciences are in the process of setting groups up, whilst other Schools have less structured meetings with/informal groupings of researchers – i.e. Geography, Psychology, ORC, SES, NOCs–SOES. The TNA picked up concern from researchers where they are split between divisions or are so few in number that they may be isolated and have little opportunity to meet with fellow researchers, i.e. LASS, ECS, Physics and Astronomy.

Researcher representation on committees is uneven; although several schools do have representatives on School level groups (for example Medicine, Biological Sciences, Physics and Chemistry) many do not.

As a result of the TNA a ‘Roberts’ funded professional development programme for ECRs⁵ has been designed and based on the proposition that researchers should be encouraged to take greater responsibility for their CPD and life-long learning as much as possible.

Principle 6: Diversity and Equality (P6)

CROS indicates that 91% of respondents believe the University is committed to equality and diversity, however 51% did not receive ‘training or information about equality and diversity’ when they started their contracts.

Across the sector, and within Southampton, CROS identifies perceived unfair treatment according to age and gender (and the School of Medicine appeared to have less satisfaction in these areas than the University average). The TNA endorses CROS and identified perceived discrimination and a lack of inclusion in four key areas:

- 1) Age, 2) gender, 3) roles, and 4) as international staff.

⁵ A copy of the Report on the *Proposed ‘Roberts’ funded Professional Development Programme for ECRs* is available from Julie Reeves on request.

It was a regularly expressed view among the academic profession that Postdocs 'price themselves out of the market' by staying too long in researcher positions, but without adequate career development this could be seen as discriminatory. Postdocs said they experienced unequal treatment in a number of areas; as research assistants and as non-clinicians, in terms of gender and power relationships, and quite a few international researchers felt that they did not receive the same level of induction/departmental introduction as home researchers.

In respect of gender, several schools (notably SOES–NOCs, SES, Psychology) drew attention to the obvious shrinkage in the numbers of women transferring from postdoctoral to academic posts and requested support on this matter. The TNA found, also, that maternity issues (i.e. the question of when or even, more worryingly, if one should start a family), childcare arrangements and family matters were regularly raised by researchers in all Faculties. It is striking that these issues are more likely to occur for ECRs than PGRs and perhaps require special consideration.

The TNA identified that international researchers felt disadvantaged and expressed the need for a greater amount of time to settle into their posts (issues that the School of Psychology induction seeks to address as mentioned above). The School of Chemistry drew attention to the lack of involvement of those unfamiliar with the University in outreach activities for example, which raised the question of the level of inclusion of those staff new to the University (especially international staff) in other areas of institutional life. There is very little provision for dealing with cultural issues in support of researchers or their PIs. The whole area requires further investigation across the institution.

Principle 7: Institutional implementation and review (P7)

The TNA concluded that none of the Schools conducted an adequate evaluation of support and development mechanisms for research staff; even those schools with specific training workshops/programmes (Medicine, SES, ORC) most evaluation is limited to an 'end of session' (Happy Sheet) review and there is no attempt to embed learning, transfer it to the workplace or to monitor outcomes. Where monitoring processes do exist, they depend heavily on the goodwill of individuals (as is the case in Chemistry and ORC) and do not seem to operate as matter of policy.

Without a comprehensive and clear evaluation system and overall monitoring process, implementing and reviewing The Concordat will be limited and difficult for the organisation.

Recommendations revisited:

The paper submitted by Tony Cooper to HRC 30 March 2009 contained a number of recommendations; these have been revisited and revised in light of the TNA information and CROS results. The revised recommendations are as follows:

- The University adopts The Concordat and issues a statement on the implementation of the Concordat to all staff (P7)
 - The University conducts an annual review of The Concordat, monitoring progress and consistency of experience across University
- A Champion appointed to implement The Concordat, to brief PIs and research staff (P7)
- All research staff entitled to (up to) 10 day's professional development training per annum (P3 & P4)
- Strategic interventions to address inequalities in treatment between staff that focus on age, gender, role and international staff (P6)
- Increasing Researchers' responsibilities (P5)
 - All Schools to create/encourage the development of postdoctoral associations/forums with a view to creating a University level forum in the long term.

- The University and all Schools to ensure research staff are represented on appropriate boards and committees. The Secretariat to advise HRC on additional areas where researchers may be expected to have their voice heard and acted on.
- The University provides appropriate support for staff in the global research environment (P3 & P4)
 - All researchers should be offered equal access to a clear process of professional development with support resources; suggest the 'Roberts' funded programme (that will also develop career support materials for researchers) provides the initial model for the University and that SDU and LATEU work together on integrating and clarifying provision, for example on producing a guidance literature with on-line resources for research staff and PIs.
 - A training programme established for line managers and PIs (designed, implemented and funded by University). Suggest LATEU and SDU work on this with a view to establishing a 'talent management programme' for all staff.
 - Induction processes improved, standardised and monitored for evenness of experience. Suggest HR, SDU and LATEU work on this with Schools.
- Recognition of research staff examined further with the aim of producing a range of 'recognition and rewards' especially for non-research activities and of developing appropriate opportunities for researchers to develop their experience (P2)
- HR Processes (PI, P4)
 - Four year contracts were originally proposed, but it is suggested here that the reality of the University's contracts are researched further particularly in the light of the CROS findings. The question of whether or not we should move towards four year/open contracts cannot be addressed until we know more about the reality of fixed term contracts, our retention and conversion rate to permanent contracts and the net effect of contracts on career prospects, for example.
 - PPDR must be an annual process for all researchers and a central monitoring process to be implemented. Regular and informal reviews to be encouraged – a mechanism to be identified and agreed by HRC.
 - HR to clarify the administrative processes surrounding researchers and create pro-forma appropriate for researchers with respect of PPDR and Probationary documents
 - There should be opportunities for administrators to share good practice, i.e. topic briefings, staff conference etc. LATEU and SDU to organise.

Appendix B: Implementation schedule

Phases and milestones (may operate concurrently)	Sub-projects	Carried out by :	Owned by:	Approval required of:	Marketing	Outcomes/ actions	Status/ commenced	Status/ completed
Phase 1: University level								
Benchmarking & gap analysis	TNA ⁶ – internal	Julie Reeves	LATEU ⁷	Professor Philip Nelson and HR Committee (HRC – ceased operation 31 st July 2011)	Report to SMTs ⁸	Key areas identified for action: Principles (P) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7.	2009	End 2009
	CROS ⁹ 2009	LATEU, HR ¹⁰ and Helen Ralph, BI ¹¹	LATEU – BI	Professor Philip Nelson and HR Committee (HRC)	Briefing to staff Report on SUSSED	Key areas identified for action and discussion in P1, 2, 3, 4, & 6.	May 2009	End 2009
	HR policy review ¹²	Tony Cooper	SDO ¹³ /HR	Professor Philip Nelson and HR Committee (HRC)	Paper (30/03/09) to HRC On website	Key areas identified for action in P1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7.	Spring 2009	October 2009
	Concordat Paper ¹⁴	Tony Cooper and Julie Reeves	LATEU – HR	Professor Philip Nelson and HR Committee (HRC)	Paper (21/10/09) to HRC On website	Key areas discussed and synthesised from TNA, HR Policy Review and CROS	Autumn 2009	Completed 9th November 2009

⁶ TNA – Training Needs Analysis (internal document)

⁷ LATEU – Learning and Teaching Enhancement Unit (until 31st July 2011)

⁸ SMTs – Senior management teams

⁹ CROS – Careers in Research On-line Survey – (CROS reports are available via SUSSED)

¹⁰ HR – Human Resources department

¹¹ BI – Business Intelligence

¹² Available on website: http://www.soton.ac.uk/hr/working/policies/Research_concordat.html

¹³ SDO – Staff Development Office (until 31st July 2011 – also referred to as Staff Development Unit)

¹⁴ Available on website: http://www.soton.ac.uk/hr/working/policies/Research_concordat.html

						2009, – P 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7. Advisory group set-up		
	Website for The Concordat	Sonia Wilson	HR	HRC		University information point on Concordat	November 2009	Done: up-dating required
Principles of Concordat considered at University level	List of actions and suggestions for each Principle (Meeting minutes ¹⁵)	Professor Hugh Perry and Advisory Group	Professor Philip Nelson	Formerly HRC. From 1 st August 2011 REAG ¹⁶	Information on website. Through Deans and Client Partners to Faculty, email to research staff	Letter of recommendations to PVC Research, including: 1) To improve contact information. P1 2) Faculties and HR to improve HR processes i.e. Induction, probation, PPDR and exit processes. P1,2,3, 5, 6 & 7 3) Faculties to nominate a research staff mentor/advisor P2, 3, 4, 6 & 7 4) Access to Career Destinations and improved professional	12/07/2010	Completed 11/10/2011

¹⁵ Available on website: http://www.soton.ac.uk/hr/working/policies/Research_concordat.html

¹⁶ REAG – Research and Enterprise Advisory Group (2011 to date)

						development opportunities. P4 & 5 5) Faculties to find ways of informing, supporting and engaging research staff and their Pls. To create mechanisms for recognising and rewarding outstanding contributions. P2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7		
	Recommendations compiled for PVC Research taken to REAG and UEG	Professor Phil Nelson with PDU	Professor Phil Nelson	UEG	REAG meeting to Associate Deans Others to be confirmed	To be confirmed	8 th November UEG to be confirmed	To be confirmed
	Statement of expectations – compiled, published and promoted.	PDU/HR	Professor Phil Nelson	REAG HR-AG ¹⁷	Work in progress	Work in progress	Work in progress	June 2012
Evaluation and continuing improvement on key issues	Implementing Recommendations of Advisory Group and relevant outcomes of	Concordat Working Group (CWG) with HR	PDU-AG ¹⁸	UEG ¹⁹	Websites Briefings	Monitoring progress on key issues identified in Gap Analysis. Continued	Initiated 2011	On-going

¹⁷ HR-AG – Human Resources Advisory Group (governance and title to be confirmed in the new structure)

¹⁸ PDU-AG – Professional Development Unit Advisory Group (11/10/11 to date)

¹⁹ UEG – University Executive Group

	reviews.					promotion of knowledge and understanding of <i>the Concordat</i> throughout the institution.		
	Review of Induction (University level)	HR with PDU ²⁰	HR-AG/PDU-AG	UEG	Work in progress	Work in progress	Initiated 2011	Completed by June 2012
	Review of Reward, recognition and recruitment (HR).	HR with PDU	HR-AG/PDU-AG	UEG	To be confirmed	Work in progress	Initiated 2011	Completed by 2013/14
	Review of PPDR (HR)	HR with PDU	HR-AG/PDU-AG	UEG	To be confirmed	Work in progress	Initiated 2009/10, under revision 2011	Completed by 2013
	Review of Fixed Term contracts	HR	HR-AG	UEG	To be confirmed	Work in progress	Initiated 2009/10	On-going
	Equality and diversity monitoring and review	E&D ²¹	HR-AG	UEG	Website Athena SWAN 'Every researcher counts' campaign	Work in progress To be confirmed	Initiated 2009/10 2012/13	On-going On-going
	Others areas to be confirmed by CWG.							
Phase 2: Individuals								
Engaging research staff	Awareness raising among research staff	PDU	CWG	PDU-AG	Copies of Concordat & Vitae briefing notes distributed Website set-up	Awareness raising activities	Initiated 2009	On-going

²⁰ PDU – Professional Development Unit (01/08/11 to date)

²¹ Equality and Diversity team

					for research staff and on Concordat			
	Increased research staff participation and ownership	Individual researchers, local Research staff associations, Faculties, PDU	Research staff with PDU	CWG, Faculties	Work in progress	Talent management programme, Portfolio pilot, Windmills. P2, 3, 4 & 5 Associations P5	Initiated 2010 (see research staff Roberts programme)	On-going
Engaging PIs/line managers	Awareness raising among PIs/line managers	Faculties and PDU	Faculties, PIs	PDU-AG, HR-AG	Work in progress	Support, briefings and resources for PIs. P1, 2, 3, 4 & 7	Work in progress	On-going
	Review of support and development needs of PIs	PDU and Faculties	PDU	PDU-AG, HR-AG	Work in progress	Work in progress	Work in progress	2013
Phase 3: Faculty and Professional Service Level								
Engaging Faculties and Professional Services	Concordat promoted to Faculties and Professional Services	LATEU/PDU	LATEU/PDU	CWG	Concordat and Vitae briefing notes distributed to SMTs Face-to-face briefings Website	Meetings with SMTs. P1 & 7 Focus groups P7 Guidance notes to Faculties (revised – work in progress)	Initiated 2009	On-going
	Deans and Associate-Deans	LATEU/PDU	Professor Phil Nelson	UEG	PVC Research practice group	Associate Deans – Research focus group and discussions P7	2010 2011	On-going

Embedding the Concordat	Faculties to identify and prioritise own areas for action	Deans with CWG	CWG	PDU-AG	Faculty/academic unit Concordat workshops	Faculty level implementation plan – to be confirmed	Initiated 2011	On-going
Phase 4: Review								
Monitoring and evaluating progress	University and Faculty level reviews, HR scorecard.	Concordat Working Group Deans & Associate Deans Research HR	PDU-AG with HR-AG	UEG	To be confirmed	On-going	On-going	Formal review 2013
	CROS 2011	Stephen Tarling, PDU, Tanya Rowan and Helen Ralph, BI	PDU/HR and BI	Professor Phil Nelson and HR Committee (HRC)	Briefings to staff, Faculties and University Report on SUSSED	Key areas identified for action and discussion. Focus group P5	2011/12	2011/12