

# Report on Contract Research On-Line Survey 2003

## Executive Summary

### Response:

- ◆ There was an excellent response to the survey: 38.9% of Contract Research Staff (CRS) at Reading.

### Induction:

- ◆ 25.7% of CRS at Reading stated that they did not receive general information from the University on appointment. 39.2% of CRS were dissatisfied with the information received.
- ◆ Of the 49.5% of CRS who attended the central induction programme 77.9% rated it 'useful' or 'very useful'.
- ◆ 36.8% of CRS were dissatisfied with their departmental induction.
- ◆ 31.4% were negative about the induction to their role as a Contract Researcher.

### Supervision:

- ◆ 83.8% of Reading CRS have regular meetings with their supervisors.
- ◆ Of that group 90% gave positive feedback about their meetings.

### Careers Issues:

- ◆ 38.2% of Reading CRS discussed careers issues with their supervisors, on this measurement Reading was bottom of its comparator group. 90% of Reading CRS who did have these discussions found them helpful.
- ◆ 83.4% of CRS at Reading who used the University's Career Service found it 'helpful' or 'very helpful'.

### Access to Training and Development:

- ◆ Accessibility of information on training at the University was considered to be 'good' or 'excellent' by 85.4% of CRS at Reading.
- ◆ Over a third of Reading CRS do not consider it easy to attend training sessions. 80% of the latter gave their reason for non-attendance as lack of time.

### Staff Development Review:

- ◆ 50% of CRS at Reading have participated in SDR, putting the University third within its comparator group.
- ◆ 42.8% found SDR useful in leading to training. 35.8% thought it useful in leading to changes in work practices. 62.8% said it was useful in highlighting problems, however only 39.1% said it was useful in solving them. 52.1% scored the SDR favourably on 'helping you to focus on your career aspirations and how these are met by your current role', a comparatively good result.

#### Training and development in research skills

- ◆ 76.5% of Reading CRS did not receive any 'off the job' training in their area of research. Of those who did get such training 94.4% gave positive feedback.
- ◆ Just under 50% of Reading CRS received 'on the job' training and 85.1% of this group were positive about it.

#### Training and Development in transferable skills:

- ◆ In comparison with other institutions 5-10% more Reading CRS get opportunities to gain wider experience in areas not directly related to their research. The exception to this is in the area of writing proposals and grant applications. The figures for this show Reading CRS to be second lowest within the comparator group.
- ◆ For those who have taken up these opportunities approximately 90% have found the experience positive.
- ◆ A significant majority of Reading CRS (over 70%) did not believe that training in key areas such as IT and project and resource planning are available within the University although they are. Of this number, 68.6% thought they would benefit from such training.
- ◆ Of those who utilised the options for training 89% considered it useful or very useful.
- ◆ Amongst those who were aware that training was available large numbers (a median of 50%) did not take up the option. Within the comparator group Reading had the highest figure for training not taken.

#### CRS relationship with the University of Reading:

- ◆ 50 % or more of Reading's CRS consider communication from the University at all levels (intra-school department, School etc) to be poor.
- ◆ 73.3% of CRS do not believe they are on an equal footing with permanent academics for promotion.
- ◆ In areas such as terms and conditions of employment, access to facilities and staff training the majority of CRS consider that they are treated equally.

#### CRS Comment at Reading:

- ◆ The largest group of statements concerned the need for a clear path of career progression for CRS through academia.
- ◆ The next largest cluster was praise for the level of staff training provided.
- ◆ Lastly there was appreciation of the support gained from colleagues and supervisors.

## Recommendations

Whilst there are a number of positive aspects to the feedback the University has received through this survey such as CRS's response to the supervision of their research, the Careers Service, and central induction, there are aspects of provision for CRS that need improvement. The first recommendation of the report is that the results of it should be published in an article in the Bulletin acknowledging the positive results and indicating what the University will do concerning the areas that need improving. Secondly the results of the survey indicate a need for the wider implementation of a local concordat for CRS at Reading. The following table shows the issue to be addressed and the recommended actions to address them.

Issue	Recommendation
<p>Induction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Information CRS receive on their appointment needs improvement.</li> <li>◆ Inter-School Departmental (ISD) and role induction needs upgrading</li> </ul>	<p>Revision of staff induction information is already underway and due to be in place for Autumn 2003.</p> <p>The circulation of information on local induction to all schools and ISDs. The provision of support for principal investigators in adopting good practice on induction.</p>
<p>Supervision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Supervision of CRS concerning research issues is conducted frequently and is considered high quality.</li> </ul>	<p>This positive aspect of provision for CRS should be fed back to staff through the use of an article in the <i>Bulletin</i>.</p>
<p>Careers Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Careers discussed relatively little between supervisors and CRS.</li> <li>◆ The Careers service received plaudits from a large percentage of CRS who used it.</li> </ul>	<p>This issue could be addressed in the context of management training provision for principal investigators.</p> <p>This should be fed back to staff through an article in the Bulletin. The University Careers Service Director and staff should also be informed.</p>
<p>Access to Training and Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Over a third of Reading CRS do not consider it easy to attend training sessions. 80% of the latter gave their reason for non-attendance as lack of time.</li> </ul>	<p>Changing CRS's perspective on training can only be done through improving communication on the matter at induction and via principal investigators. Induction is in the process of being revised.</p> <p>Management training provision for principal investigators would also address this issue.</p>

<p>Staff Development Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ High participation rate.</li> <li>◆ The results of SDR process in leading to training, changes in work practices and solving problems need to be improved.</li> </ul>	<p>Feed back to staff via <i>Bulletin</i>.  These issues need to be addressed through training more of those who administer the SDR with CRS.</p>
<p>Training and development in research skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Those CRS who receive ‘off the job’ and ‘on the job’ training in research skills rate it highly.</li> <li>◆ There are low levels of take up for these types of training.</li> </ul>	<p>This should be fed back to staff via the <i>Bulletin</i>.</p> <p>This can be addressed by improving e.mail alerts on relevant training available and by providing more information for principal investigators on the matter.</p>
<p>Training and Development in transferable skills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Reading CRS get good access to experience in areas not directly related to their research.</li> <li>◆ Of those who utilised the training a large majority found it useful or very useful.</li> <li>◆ Low awareness of training that is already available.</li> <li>◆ A high figure for staff who know about training but do not utilise it.</li> </ul>	<p>Fed back to staff through <i>Bulletin</i>.</p> <p>Fed back to staff through <i>Bulletin</i>.</p> <p>Use of e-mail database of CRS to keep them informed of existing training sessions.  Please see recommendations on <i>Access to Training and Development</i>.</p>

<p>CRS relationship with the University of Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 50 % or more of Reading's CRS consider communication from the University at all levels to be poor.</li>   <li>◆ 73.3% of CRS do not believe they are on an equal footing with permanent academics for promotion.</li>   <li>◆ In areas such as terms and conditions of employment, access to facilities and staff training the majority of CRS consider that they are treated equally.</li> </ul>	<p>Central University level: it appears that the CRS Bulletin Board that the University currently uses is not working as well as it might. The use of a CRS list compiled and up-dated through the Personnel Dept database might be used to keep CRS better informed.</p> <p>Intra-school department &amp; School level: at both these levels the crucial members of staff that will act as conduits of information are the supervisors therefore the management training already mentioned would hopefully help increase the flow of information.</p> <p>CRS should be involved in staff meetings in ISDs and in schools. Also it may be advisable to have a senior member of staff from each school to have overall responsibility for CRS and to hold meetings for them on a regular basis to increase communication.</p> <p>The University needs to more clearly inform CRS of their status with reference to promotion and how it relates to their funding. This may be accomplished through supporting principal investigators in providing better role induction for CRS. Fed back to staff through <i>Bulletin</i>.</p>
<p>CRS Comment at Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ The largest group of statements concerned the need for a clear path of career progression for CRS through academia.</li> </ul>	<p>It is unlikely that the University can do anything about this issue on its own. This would need the development of a national or Europe wide strategy in coordination with Government, Funding Bodies and other Universities.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ CRS voiced praise for the level of staff training provided.</li> </ul>	<p>Fed back to staff through <i>Bulletin</i>.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ CRS stated their appreciation of the support gained from colleagues and supervisors.</li> </ul>	<p>Fed back to staff through <i>Bulletin</i>.</p>

## Introduction

The figures given in this report for Reading are compared with the overall results for the 6196 CRS from the forty-three other universities who responded to the survey. A comparison is also made with a smaller group of universities for the purpose of benchmarking and determining where best practice occurs.<sup>1</sup> The survey at Reading resulted in a very high response rate of 38.9% of the group targeted. Traditionally in surveys the maximum return expected is 40%. 136 out of a total 350 contract research staff at Reading filled in the on-line survey. Reading's response rate was 10% greater than the mean response rate of the other Universities.

In some respects the survey gives very positive feedback for the University, especially in the area of the quality of supervision that Contract Research Staff (CRS) receive concerning their research. CRS also rated the central induction, staff training and the careers service very highly. However there are a number of areas where the results of the survey show that provision for CRS is less satisfactory. It appears that CRS need to be better managed over more general work related issues, such as Staff Development Review. Also communication between CRS and the University at all levels needs to be improved. They need to receive better documentation on appointment, and the induction to their role and to their department needs to be upgraded. How these issues should be dealt with are outlined in the report's recommendations.

## Age, Gender, Ethnic Origin, Nationality, and Disability Profile of CRS

The single largest age group is that of 24 to 30 years old. If you include the next age group then 61% of the CRS at Reading is between the age of 24 and 35 years old. There are more male CRS than female, 54.4% and 45.6% respectively. This is the opposite of the rest of the wider survey where women outnumber men by 3.6%. In general terms Reading's CRS sees ethnic minorities well represented in comparison with the profile of the UK population. Whilst forming 5.5% of the UK population, non-white ethnic minorities make up 11% of the CRS. The nationalities represented within CRS are diverse (19 outside the UK). However the vast majority of researchers are from the UK (75.4%). 8.6% of Reading's CRS have a disability which is a rate 2.4% higher than the result for the wider survey.

## Contracts

33% of the CRS at Reading are either on their second or third contract with the University. The largest single section are those CRS who have had one contract (43.4%). These figures are reflected closely in the wider survey of other universities.

## Subject Specialism

This is the breakdown of the subjects in which CRS at Reading work.

---

<sup>1</sup> The comparator group of universities consist of 18 institutions including Reading, the others are: University of Liverpool, University of Manchester, University of Nottingham, University of Oxford, University of Southampton, University of Strathclyde, University of Surrey, University of Warwick, University of York, London School of Economics, Royal Holloway University of London, University College London, University of Bath, University of Bristol, University of Cambridge, University of East Anglia, University of Exeter.

Biological science	34.8%
Physical sciences	18.8%
Agriculture and related subjects	13.0%
Other	9.1%
Engineering and technology	8.0%
Psychology	5.3%
Mathematical sciences and informatics	3.6%
Real Estate Management	1.5%
Food Science	1.5%
Social Studies	0.7%
Veterinary science	0.7%

### Funding sources

CRS in Reading are funded from a broad range of bodies, there is no major dominating source of funds. The top four funders are: the European Union (13.2%), followed by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) (10.3%), UK industry (10.3%) and the Natural Environment Research Council (9.6%). The top four sources of funding for the CRS in the wider survey were: EPSRC (10.2%), Wellcome Trust (9.6%), European Union (8.7%) and UK Government Department (6.0%). This disparity may in part be reflected by the fact that Reading does not have a Medical School.

### Induction Process

A surprisingly large number (25.7%) of CRS stated that they did not receive general information from the University on their appointment. This may be accounted for by some CRS who have been on successive contracts for many years and either did not receive or don't remember receiving induction packs on their appointment. Otherwise it may reflect the fact that a number of the CRS do not remember the information that they were given because it was poorly presented and so ignored and never read.

The above figure does not compare favourably with the collective result for the rest of the universities in the survey where 16.8% stated that they did not receive the same information. Only one university amongst the comparator group received a lower score in this area than Reading. The University that performed best was Southampton with only 7.6% of CRS who stated that they did not get general information about their university on appointment. For those CRS at Reading who did get the information 39.2% were dissatisfied with what they received. Of the CRS in all the other institutions surveyed 34.1% were critical of the documentation they were given on appointment. Within the comparator group Reading was fifth from bottom on this assessment. LSE was at the top of the league with 75.8% of its CRS finding the information they received from the institution on their appointment 'useful' or 'very useful'.

There is an approximately even split (48.5/51.5%) between those CRS at Reading who received induction from the institution and those who did not. This is a strikingly large number who did not receive induction from the institution yet it is a similar result to all the other universities in the survey. Of those who did receive induction from the institution 77.9% found it 'useful' or 'very useful' this is over 20%

higher than the response for all the other universities in the survey. Amongst the comparator institutions Reading was only beaten by Strathclyde on this issue.

The response of Reading's CRS to the induction they received to their department and to their present role was far more mixed. 36.8% of CRS considered that their departmental induction was either 'not very useful' or not at all useful. This level of dissatisfaction is 9.8% higher than the rest of the survey's results. Within the comparator group Reading was fourth from the bottom on this issue. Oxford tops the table with 71.8% of its CRS who expressed satisfaction concerning their departmental induction. As for induction to their present role, 31.4% of Reading CRS were negative about the process, this is within 2 % of the response for all the CRS in the other universities surveyed. Amongst the comparator institutions the University of Southampton came out top in this area with 61.8% of its CRS expressing satisfaction with the induction to their current role.

Overall the induction that CRS receive centrally at the University of Reading is rated highly, but there is much room for improvement in the quality of the information that CRS receive when they start. A higher proportion of CRS need to attend the institutional induction programme. There is room for improvement in the local induction process which could involve supporting principal investigators in adopting good practice on induction

### Supervision issues

In contrast to the previous section, there is a very positive response to the questions on supervision by the CRS from Reading. 83.8% of CRS at Reading have regular meetings with their supervisors, this is very close to the result for the rest of the survey. Reading's results on this matter are matched at a very similar level by the institutions across the comparator group. 57.9% of Reading CRS have these meetings on a weekly basis, as such this level of supervision is 5.7% higher than the overall survey. Reading is also fourth amongst the comparator group for this rate of supervision. Over 90% of Reading CRS who had meetings with their supervisor found them to be either 'helpful' or 'very helpful', this is mirrored nationally and also within the comparator institutions.

Reading's CRS gave a positive response about the supervision that they receive from their supervisors which is in line with the results of the wider survey. This shows that supervisors are managing CRS well concerning directly research project related matters at Reading.

### Careers Issues

The results from Reading indicate that CRS receive much of their careers advice from their supervisors and or colleagues. 38.2% of CRS at Reading received careers advice from their supervisors. This was 6.7% less than across the rest of the survey. Whilst this may not appear to be a significant gap, Reading's score on this matter was bottom of its comparator group. That this matter is not discussed more by supervisors with their CRS at Reading indicates that their management skills could be improved upon. Nevertheless over 90 % of Reading CRS who did get advice on this issue from their supervisors found it helpful or very helpful. This is mirrored in the results of the whole survey and the comparator institutions.

22.1% of Reading CRS went to the University Careers service, this was 6.2% higher than of the survey results throughout the other institutions. Reading CRS used its career service more than any other institution in the comparator group. 83.4% of Reading's CRS found their career service 'helpful' or 'very helpful'. This was a 19.7% higher approval rating than the collective survey of the other institutions. Reading was also at the head of the comparator group once you had removed those institutions whose data set was so small that the resulting percentages became meaningless. Only 2.2% of CRS at Reading received careers advice from their funding body. This figure was reflected in the results of the rest of the survey, and in the comparator group with the exceptions of Oxford, Cambridge and LSE where up to 5 % more CRS obtained careers advice from their funding body.

The majority of CRS at Reading (52.9%) see their future career in research, although the next largest section (21.3%) remain undecided about their long term career aspirations. 42.6% of CRS wish to remain in higher education, with 33.1% still undecided on the sector they want to work in. Over 80% of CRS see their work at Reading as contributing 'partly' or 'a great deal' to their prospects of achieving their aspirations. These local views were mirrored in the comparator group and throughout the remainder of the survey.

There is positive feedback for the careers service at Reading in the survey. It deals with more CRS than at the other institutions surveyed and the positive response that it gets in the survey is better than the careers services receive in the wider survey and at the institutions within the comparator group. Despite this there is some doubt raised over the amount that career management is discussed between supervisors and their contract researchers. This may demonstrate that supervisors may need encouragement to discuss these issues with their staff.

### Access to Training and Development

The accessibility of information on training in the University was considered by a good majority of the CRS (85.4%) to be either 'good' or 'excellent'. This satisfaction rating is 14.4% higher than the general view within the survey, and amongst the comparator institutions Reading is only beaten by Bristol. A resounding majority of Reading CRS also expressed a preference to receive information on training by e-mail. The ease with which CRS at Reading can attend training activities compares well with all the other institutions surveyed. In the context of the comparator group Reading CRS's perception of their access to training lies in fifth place behind CRS at UEA, Bristol, Manchester and Nottingham. Despite this relatively good showing, over a third of CRS at Reading do not consider it easy to attend training sessions. Of that group 80% gave the reason for non-attendance as 'lack of time'. This is 11.5% higher than the collective score for the other institutions in the survey. Amongst the comparator group this puts Reading third highest behind LSE and Bath for the use of this reason not to attend training. As well as indicating the work pressure that CRS at Reading are under it might imply a lack of recognition that training is an acceptable use of their time.

### Staff Development Review (SDR)

Half of the CRS in Reading that responded had participated in the SDR scheme. This compares favourably to the response in the survey of other institutions where only 33.8% of CRS had participated in such a scheme. Amongst the comparator

institutions only three others had a higher participation rate.<sup>2</sup> Of those who had participated in the scheme 42.8% found the process helpful in leading to training, this result was mirrored in the survey in all the other institutions. Of the comparator group Reading was rated eighth on this assessment.

The usefulness of the SDR in leading to changes in work practice was rated lower with only 35.8% of CRS at Reading being positive about its effects. However this response was still higher than in the wider survey. Reading's score was fifth on this issue within the comparator institutions.

According to the survey the SDR was more successful in highlighting problems than find solutions to them. 62.8% of Reading CRS found the SDR useful for the former whereas only 39.1% found it useful for the latter. This ratio is mirrored in the statistics for the wider survey and with one or two exceptions in the comparator group as well. Of the comparator group LSE had the highest result for the SDR helping 56% of CRS to find solutions to problems.

52.1% of Reading CRS's scored the SDR favourably on 'helping you to focus on your career aspirations and how these are met by your current role'. This score was higher than the mean for the whole survey and amongst the comparator institutions Reading was fourth highest.

These results imply that the SDR at Reading, although having a high participation rate, is not being implemented as well as it could be. Therefore support for reviewers of in how to tailor the SDR to CRS's needs may be required.

### Training and Development in Research Skills

76.5% of the CRS at Reading who responded did not get any 'off the job' training in the area of their research. 94.4% of those who did receive 'off the job' training considered it to be either 'useful' or 'very useful'. More CRS participated in 'on the job' training specific to their research although it was still slightly less than 50% of those who responded to the survey. Of those who were involved in 'on the job' training 85.1% reacted positively to it saying that they had found it 'useful' or 'very useful'.<sup>3</sup>

This data shows that training levels concerning research skills amongst CRS within Reading are generally low. Nevertheless when training in this area is given, the vast majority of CRS who attend find it extremely useful. However, this survey does not tell us what level of training in research skills is needed amongst CRS.

### Training and Development in Transferable Skills

#### Gaining wider experience

Approximately 5-10% more CRS at Reading have had opportunities for gaining experience in the different areas outlined than the CRS across the rest of the survey.<sup>4</sup> In general the same can be said for the comparator group except for certain areas

---

<sup>2</sup> Surrey, Bristol and Nottingham in ascending order

<sup>3</sup> (Comparative figures were not available for this section)

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix 1 for list of areas and figures for Reading CRS.

where other institutions were ahead of Reading. The most noticeable exception is the experience available to CRS at comparator institutions on 'Writing proposals or grant applications'. Reading is rated sixteenth out of eighteen.

It appears that there is a considerable demand by CRS at Reading for gaining experience in areas of work that would give them transferable skills. Feedback from those who have gained experience in these areas is very positive and in the majority of cases approximately 90% of CRS stated that it had been 'useful' or 'very useful'. However many CRS state that they have not had the opportunity to develop experience in areas of work that would equip them with transferable skills.<sup>5</sup>

#### Off the job training

One of the key aspects here is that a large majority (over 70% in all cases) of CRS at Reading do not believe that training in the following areas is available, although it is. CSTD offer training in: staff team management, project and resource planning, teaching or lecturing, information technology, writing proposals or grant applications, writing for reports and publication and making formal presentations to an audience. A majority of those who were not aware that this training was available (a mean of 68.6%) stated that they would have found such training useful.

Of those who knew about the training and took advantage of it, an average of 89% considered it useful. Large numbers (a median of 50%) though, knew about the available training and did not take the opportunity. Of the thirteen training areas compared Reading CRS participation rate was lower than the wider survey in twelve areas. When viewed against the comparator group in the majority of cases Reading has the highest figures for training not taken. 54.4% of Reading CRS surveyed had not attended an off the job training session in the previous twelve months.

For those who took part in the off the job training it was a great success. A majority of those who did not take part have expressed a wish to do so. However it is evident that there is no embedded training culture within CRS at Reading. This is backed up by the statistic given above which indicated that just less than a third of CRS consulted stated that they did not attend training sessions because of lack of time. At the other extreme Strathclyde and Surrey's CRS had very high levels of training attendance.<sup>6</sup>

#### Career Development

The most popular approach to career development among Reading CRS appears to be discussion with colleagues locally (93),<sup>7</sup> followed by discussion with outside colleagues (72). Sizeable numbers have used exposure to different areas of work (58), staff development reviews (46), and participation in University training courses (46) with the same aim. It is noticeable that only 6 have used discussions with career advisers for this purpose. These results match the route to career development taken by CRS in the external survey. Of the alternative approaches to their career development Reading CRS pursued increased grant applications, and publications more than others.

---

<sup>5</sup> Please see Appendix 1 for a breakdown of all the data in this section.

<sup>6</sup> For further details of data from this section please see Appendix 2.

<sup>7</sup> These figures are not given in percentages as the CRS use multiple approaches to their career development.

## CRS Relationship with University of Reading

A large majority ranging between approximately 75 and 88% of CRS feel excluded from departmental, school and institutional decision-making processes in comparison with other staff. The comparable figures for the wider survey show CRS demonstrating marginally lower feelings of exclusion spanning between 67 to 80%. Amongst the comparator group the CRS at Exeter demonstrated the lowest feelings of exclusion, between 53 and 66%. Therefore Reading's CRS show considerable feelings of alienation from the University, more so than CRS at many other institutions. A majority of CRS within Reading and in the wider survey share the feeling that they do not have equal opportunities for promotion when compared with other staff. On a more positive note over 56.6% of all the CRS surveyed, including Reading, believe that their terms and conditions of employment are equal to other staff, and over 78.9% consider that they have equal access to staff training and development and their institution's facilities.

On the issue of how the different sectors of the University of Reading have communicated with CRS over policy and guidance relevant to them, only colleagues were rated highly. CRS opinion of the institution's communication on these matters is split evenly 50/50. Faculties and Schools come off worse with 61.1% considering them poor or very poor at communicating with CRS. Departments fared little better, only 51.5% of CRS were positive about their ability to communicate with them over relevant matters. These trends were followed in the wider survey, and only diverged by + or - 3% from the figures for Reading. The only comparator institution which bucks this trend for communication between the institution and CRS is Bristol with a 67.3% approval rating. Exeter performs best for communication at the level of faculty/school and department with approval ratings of 60.8% and 68.6% respectively.

This data demonstrates CRS at Reading feel an overall sense of exclusion from the University of Reading's decision-making structures. 50% or more of CRS at Reading consider communication from the University at all levels to be poor. Only in areas such as the use of facilities, their terms and conditions of employment and access to staff training do the majority of CRS consider that they are treated equally.

## CRS Comment at Reading

The vast majority of comments were on the subject of the lack of clear career progression for CRS within academia. Another recurring theme for CRS was that of lack of recognition, often for conducting other work outside the remit of their research work. CRS also emphasised dissatisfaction with communication from their departments.

In the section where CRS were given the opportunity to give positive feedback, the quality and range of staff training available received the largest number of comments. Also the support gained from supervisors is mentioned more than once as is support from colleagues.

When the CRS were asked what recommendations they would you make for the future development of policy concerning CRS there was a divergent set of responses except for one area, that of career progression. Many comments focus on the need for

a clearly designed career path for CRS within academia to try and deal with the sense of uncertainty that they have to cope with in their work.

## Appendix 1

### Development in Transferable Skills

Experience	Opportunity for experience - yes/no (%)		If ans no would it have been useful/not useful (%)		If ans yes was it useful/not useful (%)	
	Yes	No	Useful	Not Useful	Useful	Not Useful
Staff team management	34	65.4	60	40	96.1	3.9
Coaching others	55.1	44.9	55.1	44.9	93.7	6.4
Managing Budgets	22.8	77.2	60.6	39.4	96.9	3.1
Project and resource planning	44.1	55.9	75.6	24.4	100	0
Teaching or Lecturing	36	64	64.8	35.2	92.5	7.5
Demonstrating	31.6	68.4	36.5	63.5	87.2	12.8
Information Technology	54.4	45.6	51.5	48.5	85.9	14.1
Collaboration with Industry	43.4	56.6	57.5	42.5	100	0
Explaining work to people outside your field	41.2	58.8	56.8	43.2	90	10
Writing proposals or grant applications	36	64	82	18	96.1	3.9
Writing for reports and publication	69.9	30.1	72.7	27.3	97.9	2.1
Making formal presentations to an audience	66.9	33.1	62	38	96.7	3.3
Legal and procedural aspects of intellectual property rights	11	89	48.8	51.2	76.5	23.5

## Appendix 2

### Off the job training

Training Area	Availability yes/no (%)		If ans no would it have been useful/not useful (%)		If ans yes was it useful/not useful/training not taken (%)			If ans yes was training provided by: Dept/Faculty or School/Funding Body/CSTD/Other (%)				
	Y	N	U	NU	U	NU	TNT	D	FS	FB	CSTD	O
Staff team management	16.2	83.8	65.3	34.7	25	8.3	66.7	4.3	8.7	0	82.6	4.3
Coaching others	13.2	86.8	59.7	40.3	45	10	45	22.2	5.6	5.6	66.7	N/A *
Managing Budgets	8.1	91.9	62.0	38.0	23.1	15.4	61.5	0	9.1	0	90.9	N/A
Project and resource planning	13.2	86.8	70.7	29.3	38	0	61.9	11.1	11.1	0	72.2	5.6
Teaching or Lecturing	22.8	77.2	68.8	31.2	34.4	12.5	53.1	3.2	9.7	6.5	77.4	3.2
Demonstrating	13.2	86.8	37.7	62.3	55	5	40	16.7	11.1	11.1	61.1	N/A
Information Technology	35.3	64.7	64.9	35.1	64.7	9.8	25.5	10.2	12.2	4.1	69.4	2
Collaboration with Industry	6.6	93.4	63.3	36.7	82.3	0	17.6	20	0	30	30	20
Explaining work to people outside your field	11.8	88.2	59.8	40.2	61.9	9.5	28.6	25	0	18.8	37.5	18.8
Writing proposals or grant applications	19.9	80.1	73.5	26.5	50.	0	50	11.1	7.4	0	77.8	3.7
Writing for reports and publication	23.5	76.5	71	29	51.3	2.7	45.9	20.6	5.9	2.9	70.6	N/A
Making formal presentations to an audience	26.5	73.5	66.1	33.9	65	5	30	15.8	10.5	7.9	52.6	13.2
Legal and procedural aspects of intellectual property rights	6.6	93.4	50	50	45.5	0	54.5	18.2	9.1	9.1	54.5	9.1

\* N/A – Question Not Asked