**Guidance on completing HREiR action plan template**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Details** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Institution name:** | *Enter relevant information* |  | **The institutional audience\* for this action plan includes (only include direct beneficiaries; complete or delete, as appropriate):** |
|  | **Cohort number:** | *Enter relevant information* |  | **Audience (direct beneficiaries of the action plan)** | **Number of** | **Comments** |
|  | **Date of submission:** | *Enter relevant information* |  | Research staff |   | *These are your primary beneficiaries, and should be prioritised across the action plan - both by being targeted with actions and evaluated through success measures.* |
|  | **Institutional context:** | *Enter relevant information that helps frame the action plan and the intended institutional audience.**For example, this box can be used to disclose the research intensiveness of the institution, providing a justification for the breadth/depth of the actions disclosed.* |  | Postgraduate researchers |   |   |
|  |  | Research and teaching staff |   |   |
|  |  | Teaching-only staff |   |   |
|  |  | Technicians |   |   |
|  |  | Clinicians |   |   |
|  |  | Professional support staff |   |   |
|  |  | Other (provide numbers and details): |   |   |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Complete for submission*** | ***To be completed only when reporting on action plan*** |
|  | **Obligation** | Action | Carried over from previous action plan? | Deadline | Responsibility | The targeted impact of the action(success measure) | Comments (optional) | Progress update | The actual impact of the action (reporting against the success measure) | Outcome (ongoing/carried forward/no further action) |
| **Environment and Culture** |  |  |  |  |  |  |   |   |   |
| **Awareness and engagement** |  **N.B. This section is for reporting only, and should not be completed prior to the beginning of the action plan's term.** |
| The aims of these obligations are to work towards an open and inclusive research culture, and to ensure broad understanding and awareness of this amongst researchers. |   |
| ECI1 | Ensure all relevant staff are aware of the Concordat. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ECI2 | Ensure institutional policies and practices relevant to researchers are inclusive, equitable and transparent, and are well-communicated to researchers and their managers. | *Describe here your actions/interventions for meeting the obligation, referring to actions elsewhere in the action plan if preferred.* | *Has the action been carried forward from a previous action plan?"yes" / "no"* | *Indicate a month and year* | *Name all key parties responsible for the action(s) and success measure(s)* | *Describe here your success measure(s), used to report against the intended impact for researchers and incorporating researchers' views wherever possible.* | *Describe here any supplementary information.* | *Describe here a written summary of the progress made against the obligation, taking a broad view of the people and/or organisational development that may have occurred.* | *Describe here a written summary of the progress made against the obligation, taking a broad view of the people and/or organisational development that may have occurred.* | *Indicate the next steps for the action from the following options:**"****ongoing****" (if the deadline is scheduled in the future),**"****carried forward****" (if the action was not completed as planned by the initial deadline) or* *"****no further action****" (accompanied by a brief explanation).* |
| ECI6 | Regularly review and report on the quality of the research environment and culture, including seeking feedback from researchers, and using the outcomes to improve institutional practices. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ECR1 | Encourage researchers to actively contribute to the development and maintenance of a supportive, fair and inclusive research culture and be a supportive colleague, particularly to newer researchers and students. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| *ECF1* | *Including requirements which promote equitable, inclusive and positive research cultures and environments in relevant funding calls, terms and conditions, grant reporting, and policies* | *Institutions planning actions for specific funders' obligations can insert these obligations into the relevant section of the institution template.* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **For brevity, the remaining obligations have been omitted from this 'Guidance' sheet.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \* The Researcher Development Concordat defines researchers as individuals whose primary responsibility is to conduct research and who are employed specifically for this purpose by a higher education institution or research institute. The primary audience is research staff, e.g. postdoctoral researchers, research fellows, research assistants. The Researcher Development Concordat encourages institutions to include other groups who actively engage in research as beneficiaries of their Concordat action plan. These could be postgraduate researchers; staff on teaching and research, or teaching contracts; clinicians; professional support staff; technicians.  |
| **Further hyperlinks and supplementary information****(more rows can be added)** |  | **Abbreviations and glossary** **(more rows can be added)** |  |  |  |
| **1** | *Use these spaces to provide links and references for information*  |  |  | *Use these spaces to describe* |  |  |  |
| **2** |  *provided in the action plan.* |  |  | *abbreviations and terms used in*  |  |  |  |
| **3** |   |  |  | *the**action plan.* |  |  |  |
| **4** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **7** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **8** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **9** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **10** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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**Tips for completing HREiR action plan template**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Details** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Institution name:** |  |  | **The institutional audience\* for this action plan includes (only include direct beneficiaries; complete or delete, as appropriate):** |
|  | **Cohort number:** |  |  | **Audience (direct beneficiaries of the action plan)** | **Number of** | **Comments** |
|  | **Date of submission:** |  |  | Research staff |   | *Only include institutional audiences considered to directly benefit from the action plan, remembering that research staff should be prioritised.* |
|  | **Institutional context:**This sheet gives a hypothetical response to a group of obligations under *Environment and Culture* > *Awareness and engagement*.Tips and advice are shown alongside to highlight how to organise actions and success measures to deliver the most impact, as well as to demonstrate a transparent and compelling approach to reporting on progress and the original success measure. |  |  | Postgraduate researchers |   |   |
|  |  | Research and teaching staff |   |   |
|  |  | Teaching-only staff |   |   |
|  |  | Technicians |   |   |
|  |  | Clinicians |   |   |
|  |  | Professional support staff |   |   |
|  |  | Other (provide numbers and details): |   |   |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Complete for submission*** | ***To be completed only when reporting on action plan*** |
|  | **Obligation** | Action | Carried over from previous action plan? | Deadline | Responsibility | The targeted impact of the action(success measure) | Comments (optional) | Progress update | The actual impact of the action (reporting against the success measure) | Outcome (ongoing/carried forward/no further action) |
| **Environment and Culture** |  |  |  |  |  |  |   |   |   |
| **Awareness and engagement** |   |
| The aims of these obligations are to work towards an open and inclusive research culture, and to ensure broad understanding and awareness of this amongst researchers.Our internal evaluation revealed that researchers feel the university strategic priorities do not reflect their own (62% in a consultation said that they felt disconnected from the university's recent 'Strategy 2030'). Heads of Faculties also report from conversations at committee meetings that researchers feel the university's strategic priorities are not entirely aligned with the reality felt in specific research disciplines.*Optional: Institutions can use this space (if desired) to discuss the context that frames the actions and success measures disclosed.* |   |
| ECI1 | Ensure all relevant staff are aware of the Concordat. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ECI2 | Ensure institutional policies and practices relevant to researchers are inclusive, equitable and transparent, and are well-communicated to researchers and their managers. | *Providing actions for every obligation is not mandatory, although action plans should aim to target those in their priority areas and/or those highlighted by researchers during the internal evaluation.* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ECI6 | Regularly review and report on the quality of the research environment and culture, including seeking feedback from researchers, and using the outcomes to improve institutional practices. | Host programme of Faculty- and institution-wide workshops on research culture, capturing local and broader views on key themes in research and reflecting these with the institution's 'Strategy 2030' priorities.Gather a comprehensive range of anonymous views from research staff on how they feel their Faculty research environment compares to the institution as a whole through quarterly Faculty pulse surveys. | noyes | Jul-23*Being specific, rather than only stating "ongoing" or "annually", indicates that reporting has been properly scheduled and that actions are timebound*May-23 | • RCWG• Heads of Faculties• PVC-RI*Broad and specific responsibility can show a joined-up approach to working, connects institutional stakeholders around the Researcher Development Concordat and also shares the workload.*• Faculty-HR• RCWG | • Host quarterly workshops for each Faculty, and biannual institutional workshops.*Success measures like the above (i.e., "action completed") are acceptable but should be complemented by other measures that show the impact of the action.*• Drafting of workshop reports led by research staff attendees, and reports instated as a standing agenda item at Faculty committee meetings.• At least 30 research staff attendance (on average) at Faculty workshops. Positive post-event feedback from at least 80% of research staff attendees.• At least 40% of research staff (on average) across all 5 Faculties respond to Faculty pulse surveys.*Success measures like these allow institutions to qualitatively and quantitatively assess progress against the obligation. Note the words underlined in the obligation and consider how the success measures could align with these. Setting numerical (i.e., SMART) targets can provide an unambiguous benchmark to report progress against in the future.* |  | Programme of workshops conducted digitally due to ongoing COVID restrictions1. Attendance was encouraging, with a good number of research staff joining and contributing to both discussions and the chat function. Research staff were less engaged in the reporting of the workshops than hoped, partially attributed to the less stimulating setting of online events.Feedback from research staff attendees was very positive, and both this feedback and the workshop discussion points were fed into Faculty committee meetings. In one instance, this prompted a Head of Faculty to set up focus groups to explore one particular issue more closely.Faculty pulse survey engagement was encouraging, albeit variable across the Faculties. The findings and trends will help inform future Concordat action plans and the university's Research Culture manifesto.*By describing the action's progress in narrative form, institutions can explain success in greater detail, or mitigate challenges experienced, by providing helpful contextual information.* | • All 5 Faculties' workshops held quarterly, as well as two workshops held at an institutional level.• Workshop reporting only partially led by research staff across the Faculties. All Faculty committees successfully instated research culture reports as an agenda item.• 34 research staff attended each workshop on average. 86% of research staff attendees gave positive post-event feedback, with 84% saying they "found the workshop to be helpful".• 38±3% of research staff responded to pulse surveys across all Faculties, although some only received 35% research staff response rates.*Ensuring you report against all success measures provides a better assessment of the impact achieved and shows commitment to researchers that the institution cares about their views and behaviour.* | **no further action**(action now considered normal business)*After selecting from one of the set responses in the column header, institutions can briefly indicate the rationale for this decision (e.g., "action successfully embedded" or "action delayed, partially completed").* |
| ECR1 | Encourage researchers to actively contribute to the development and maintenance of a supportive, fair and inclusive research culture and be a supportive colleague, particularly to newer researchers and students. | *Even if no action is intended/needed, it is encouraged to include success measures that show how different stakeholders engage with/benefit from other actions.* |   |  Jul-23 | • RCWG | At least 70% of research staff answering CEDARS q42.4 ("feel included in your immediate research environment/group") agree or strongly agree (CEDARS 2021: 62%) | Survey response rate in 2021: 16% research staff (n=147)*Optional: This space can be used to provide details not suitable for the other columns. For example, you can add information relevant to an action and/or a success measure to help demonstrate feasibility.*  | CEDARS response rate improved considerably after a campaign of targeted communications. This coincided with less positive responses for q42.4 than anticipated, suggesting that the university is now successfully reaching a previously 'silent' yet dissatisfied group of research staff with the survey. | 64% of research staff responded agree/strongly agree for CEDARS q42.4.22% of all research staff (n=202) responded to CEDARS. |   |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \* The Researcher Development Concordat defines researchers as individuals whose primary responsibility is to conduct research and who are employed specifically for this purpose by a higher education institution or research institute. The primary audience is research staff, e.g. postdoctoral researchers, research fellows, research assistants. The Researcher Development Concordat encourages institutions to include other groups who actively engage in research as beneficiaries of their Concordat action plan. These could be postgraduate researchers; staff on teaching and research, or teaching contracts; clinicians; professional support staff; technicians.  |
| **Further hyperlinks and supplementary information****(more rows can be added)** |  | **Abbreviations and glossary** **(more rows can be added)** |  |  |  |
| **1** | www.university.ac.uk/researchculture/researchcultureworkshops/summary |  | **PVC-RI** | Pro-Vice Chancellor for Research & Innovation |  |  |  |
| **2** | *Using these spaces can help keep the main body of the action plan as concise as possible.* |  | **RCWG** | Research Culture Working Group |  |  |  |
| **3** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **4** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **7** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **8** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **9** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **10** |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |