**Birkbeck, University of London HR Excellence in Research Award - Two-Year Internal Review (2019)**

**Context:** Birkbeck, University of London is fully committed to the implementation of the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers and received the HR Excellence in Research Award in 2017. Reflecting Birkbeck’s cohort of researchers and our small size, the College uses the definition of a researcher (taken from the original Concordat) “PhD to Professor”. Underpinning the original award, a detailed gap analysis was undertaken which involved focus groups with researchers at all career stages supplemented with specific survey feedback. An Academic Advisory Board (AAB) was set up to oversee and evaluate our progress towards delivering the action plan. Members of the AAB are pro-actively recruited from our junior researchers to allow access to committee experience as a career development opportunity. The AAB annually reports progress to the College through the College HR Strategy and Policy Committee (HRSPC).

**Internal evaluation:** Our AAB meet once per term and receive reports on all actions which are either complete, ongoing, due to be initiated, or where progress is being monitored. The AAB monitor that actions are still relevant at the point on initiation, are progressing satisfactorily when ongoing, are completed as described by the success measures in the plan and that any required ongoing evaluations are undertaken. This two year review pulls together a summary the completion reports considered by the AAB over the last two years and also a review of the timelines of our remaining actions against ongoing initiatives to ensure that that they remain current and appropriate. The Academic Advisory Board approved this renewal application documentation on 30 September 2019. The gap analysis document describes the changes to the action plan which resulted from this review; often the changes related to timescales but some actions were significantly amended. The updated action plan was then endorsed by HRSPC on 16th October 2019.

**3. Key Achievements 2017-2019:** A comprehensive staff survey ran in May/June 2019, with a participation rate of 66% from all staff groups. Analysis of this data has been, and will continue to be used to help inform the delivery of actions under the award and initiatives across the College which support the Concordat, as well as to identify synergies between actions and initiatives across the College. The College also participated in the Careers in Research Online Survey (CROS) and the Principal Investigators Research Leaders Survey (PIRLS) for the second time in 2019. All the questions in the staff survey which relate to our research environment have shown an increase in satisfaction over the duration of the award. Specifically Birkbeck:

* “places sufficient emphasis on the importance of all staff being able to carry out high quality research” from 71% (2016) to 76% (2018)
* “enables me to develop my research career effectively” from 67% (2016) to 71% (2018)
* “sufficiently values research in promotions & career development” from 66% (2016) to 70% (2018)

Similarly, in the most recent CROS and PIRLs surveys we achieved an at least 80% positive response in most of the questions relevant to this review – however, those questions where the results dipped clearly show a need to focus our efforts on supporting managers to feel better able to better support their staff, and to support career progression areas (as shown below). This also chimes with areas in the revised Concordat so will be a new area of focus in the next two years, with success measured by using the same survey questions:

**PIRLS**: My institution recognises and values the contribution I make to: Building a research group 75%; Leading a research group 75%; Appraisal/review of staff 75%; Developing research staff 67%; Managing research staff performance 67%; Demonstrating the impact of research 67%; Management and administration within the institution 75%. I am: Confident managing staff performance: 64%; Confident motivating individuals: 75%; Confident recruiting and selecting group members: 75%. 92% of staff were appraised/reviewed in the past 2 years and 64% felt this was useful.

**CROS**: My institution treats me fairly in comparison to other staff groups in relation to: Access to training and development opportunities 79%; Opportunities to participate in decision-making processes (e.g. committees) 79%; Requests for flexible working: 79%; Visibility on websites and staff directories? 72%. Only

64% feel they have a clear career development plan.

Specific achievements from both the HRER action plan delivery to date, and other institutional achievements towards fully implementing the Concordat mapped against the principles of the concordat are included below. Please also see our updated gap analysis and updated action plan. The appendices to this report describe our completed actions to date (Appendix 1 – 17/18 and Appendix 2 – 18/19).

**Principle 1: Recruitment and Selection** Building on actions from the original HRER action plan, the College has broadened the training requirements for all staff (in terms of equality and diversity training and unconscious bias training) and has provided on-line resources to allow all staff to do this training in their own time. The College has added the completion of this training as a key requirement for staff to pass their probation and we are now very close to the point where staff who have not done this training are not allowed to sit on recruitment panels (action completion date Dec 19). In addition, the College has produced a one page reminder slide which is now included in the Recruitment panel chairs pack to be presented at the start of each interview and the panel packs for academic promotion panels, to ensure decision-makers on these key panels have this information in mind as they make recruitment and academic promotion decisions. The College is now actively monitoring that all staff who sit on panels have had the necessary training, remind staff to do the training before interviews take place and report this data to our Equalities Committee.

**Principle 2 and Principles 3 & 4: Recognition and Value; Support and Career Development**

As a consequence of our HRER focus groups identifying concerns from our academic base about transparency in relation to the Colleges expectations from staff at various career stages and especially around career progression (and the actions defined to resolve these issues), the College has undertaken a wholescale review of our academic contractual framework which has led to the roll out of new role profiles and job descriptions for staff at every career stage, and work to better reflect these new expectations in our promotion guidance is ongoing. In addition, a new universal workload allocation model is in the process of being developed to ensure that there is consistency across Schools.

Several other actions in the HRER action plan related to aspects of better supporting our researchers and facilitating access to career development. Various policies and procedures have been comprehensively reviewed and, where necessary, amended and additional guidance produced (including our flexible working policy, fixed term contracts policy, guidance on our training expectations, clarifying processes for regrading for fixed term staff etc.). Whenever these documents were approved they were disseminated by the most effective route (e.g. by email, via HR Business Partners, uploading to the College website etc.).

A Workplace Wellbeing Steering Group has been created to explore and articulate the concept of Workplace Wellbeing at Birkbeck, as well as to consider and develop workplace wellbeing priorities.

In terms of development for our PhD student cohort, a supervisor forum has been set up to improve training and access to peer support; comprehensive guidance has been produced in dialogue with the Directors of our Research Centres and Institutes about how these groups can work more effectively with PhD students and this question is discussed at the annual directors meeting. The provision of teaching training has been significantly enhanced to ensure all students have access to basic how to teach training even if they do not wish to teach (205 students trained since 18/19; cohort ca.750 cf ca 20 students training in 17/18).

**Principle 5: Researchers’ Responsibilities:** Our new guidance relating to our appraisals system makes clear both that the appraisals process can be a highly effectively way to support career development aspirations and that each researcher retains responsibility for developing their own career. Feedback from staff shows that these guides are valued and used (eg 100% of staff who have attended appraisals training in 18/19). We have worked to raise awareness of our careers service and the support that they can give to staff but it is too soon to have data on how effective this has been.

A significant piece of work has been undertaken to launch a central Moodle environment (VLE) for our PhD students to group all the information they need to access about training and support in one place – this is a resource which did not exist at the start of the HR Excellence In Research Award work but is now a primary point of reference for our PhD students (typically 200 unique views per calendar month), and has been so successful that some of our Schools have also launched their own PGR Moodle sites – for example, all induction materials are routinely uploaded for ease of access. Given the distinctive nature of the Birkbeck Student cohort (with many mature and part time learners) having accessible information for students who cannot attend a specific event on a specific day at a specific time is of critical importance.

**Principle 6: Diversity and Equality:** Since the original submission in 2017, the College has developed a set of four Equality Objectives which relate to staff, students and the effective management of equality and diversity, to ensure its culture and structures are inclusive of all staff and students. A stand-alone Equality Action Plan has been developed as a means of progressing the delivery of these specific Equality Objectives, and where necessary actions from other action plans (including HR Excellence in Research and Athena Swam) have been pulled into this over-arching action plan to ensure effective delivery and synergy.

The College holds a Bronze level institutional Athena SWAN award and 4 Departmental Bronze or Silver Awards, with timelines developed for all Departments to apply. The College is a Stonewall Diversity Champion, and a new Supporting Trans Staff Policy was launched in 2018/19. The College is an active participant in Disability Confident ; its status as a Disability Confident Employer (Level 2) was renewed in September 2019 following the completion of work in the action plan related to this. Four staff networks have been developed since 2017: Race, Equality and Cultural Heritage (REACH) network, Parents’ Network, Staff Disability Network and OUTatBBK (Birkbeck’s LGBTQ+ staff network) and are open to researchers.

Through the work of the Disability Confident Self-Assessment Team, a set of key priorities were delivered, which extended the original HRER Action Plan (action 8.3). A more user-friendly Equality Analysis Toolkit has been produced which directly supports the delivery of the original HRER action plan *( Action 1.2)* and informed the recent development of our REF Code of Practice. Guidance for Units of Assessment leads on Equality and Diversity aspects of relevance to REF 2021 Environment Statements was produced and shared, to ensure that our REF submission continues to develop being mindful of E&D considerations.

The College has clarified and now better communicates how internal appointments to more senior roles are made, and feedback from our AAB about the appointment of a new Associate Dean (Research) was extremely positive. Better guidance around how our appraisals processes should be used to support career development has been produced, alongside clearer guidance about formal flexible working arrangements.

**Principle 7: Implementation and Review** One of the key successes of the HRER action plan process at Birkbeck has been the recognition that initiatives like this work best when they work in synergy with other institutional priorities, and a proactive approach to ensuring that actions from the action plan are factored into developing initiatives at the planning stage to ensure both effective delivery and reduced duplication. Our HR Department have instigated regular monitoring of institutional action plans to ensure that this approach is adopted more widely (action 8.2).

**Next Steps:** The College is committed to continue to improve the career development support we offer to our researchers. We are also mindful that this application for the renewal of our HR Excellence in Research Award has been made in the period between the publication of the draft of the revised Concordat and the release of the final version. As such we have added an action to our action plan to ensure we pick up any essential new actions that this creates. On our project timeline, we are due to have delivered all the substantive actions in this action plan by the point of our four year renewal (success measures for these actions are given in the updated plan), with year five being dedicated to a second full gap analysis with our research base to identify additional areas for improvement. This will also allow us to reflect more fully on any new expectations in the revised concordat and to ensure that we have plans in place to address.

Certain key themes have emerged from the renewal gap analysis and these will be key themes for the next phase of activity – we recognise a need to focus resource to improve our training generally and in research integrity matters specifically; not only does this arise clearly in our action plan, it is also an area that has been highlighted in the draft revised Concordat to Support Research Integrity as important and further success measures for this will be defined when the revised Integrity Concordat is published.

In terms of the revised Concordat, we anticipate areas of focus in the next two years will include principle 1 (environment and culture) and we will look to use the process of drafting REF environment narratives to feed into this area. Much (but certainly not all) of the work articulated in principles 2 and 3 should already be captured in ongoing institutional activities (such as our promotions review); however a full review will be required to ensure that nothing is overlooked and any points which sit outside of these areas are addressed effectively. This work will be done under our new action, action 8.13.

Detailed success measures for the next two years are given in our updated action plan and information about actions completed to date is given in Appendix 1 & 2 (Actions completed in 17/18 & 18/19).

**Appendix 1: Summary of Actions from the Original Action Plan Completed in 17/18**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Action** | **Progress report** | **Success measures completed to date** |
| **2.2** | Produce guidance about the roles of the supervisor and the mentor, establish processes to ensure that staff on FTCs have access to both as requiredSee also table 5 line 3 (closely related issue) | Guidance has been uploaded to the College website and mentoring training sessions designed for delivery in 19/20.  | * Guidance exists
* Number of downloads in line with expectations
 |
| **2.6** | Ensure everyone coming to the end of their fixed term contract is reviewed by a committee to consider opportunities for re-deployment. As a minimum this should involve the Line Manager and relevant HRBP, and, where appropriate, other relevant stakeholders. Discussions at management meetings should also be considered to advertise availability to those with vacancies | HR Officers inform Heads of Departments (HoD) at least 15 weeks before the end of fixed term contracts and this will be a regular agenda item for the regular HR/School meeting where next steps will be agreed in advance of the HoD meeting with the person 12 weeks prior to the end of fixed term contract, as outlined in the policy. | * Reliable data provided to Schools and P&S Departments
* Process established and operating in Schools and P&S Departments
 |
| **2.7** | Once the Business World system is live, monitor for staff who roll from one FTC to another (potentially with breaks in service). This may include (repeated) contract extensions. Once we have the necessary data, review whether or not this case requires a specific set of guidelines and/or policies. | The Schools are responsible for reviewing staff FTC data periodically, with any support from HR, as required. The HR Officers print off a report of everyone within 15 weeks of the end of their FTC and discuss it at their monthly meetings with the ED and DoO. Additional regular reports for staff on FTCs (including those on successive FTCs) can be provided as required. Business Areas also have access to self-service reports. This action will also be addressed as part of a larger review of staff contracts, including the Academic Contractual Framework. | * Data collected
* Review complete and any issues identified
* Existing policies implemented effectively and/or new guidelines/ policies produced as appropriate
 |
| **6.1** | Local inductions for PhD students seem to work well but PhD students would value more information about organisational policies and procedures relating to research through a mix of face-to-face and online/packs of materialsEnsure induction also includes information about the Training Needs Analysis (TNA) process | A massively re-vamped College-wide BGRS induction event was trialled in 2017 which featured half a dozen short (10 minute) presentations about key areas PGR students need to know about including the Library and Careers services, Research Integrity and Ethics, Skills, Training and TNA, PGR Reps etc.. This was followed by a welcome event which all PGR students were invited to. Feedback from the first event was extremely positive and the 18/19 event was attended by ca. twice as many students.  | * Information available on BGRS website
* Pack of College-level induction materials available for supervisors and used at BGRS induction events
* Define programme to disseminate TNA information to PhD students leading to significant uptake n TNA (100% of funded students currently)
 |
| **6.6** | Produce guidance about the role of PhD students and the Research Centres/Institutes  | BGRS surveyed Directors of Centres and Institutes and produced a report about different levels and styles of involvement from the different Centres and Institutes. This was circulated to the Directors and discussed at the Centre and Institute Directors meeting in Term 3 17/18. Research Committee now formally ask about PhD student in centres when the centres come in for their three-yearly review | * Guidance produced and agreed by Research centre/institute directors.
* Added as a standing agenda item to the annual directors meeting
 |
| **7.3** | Review processes to ensure members of promotion panels have received appropriate training, including in equality and diversity and unconscious bias. Ensure the process to obtain the training is as efficient as possible (see Table 1, 1.2) | All members of promotion panels are required to participate in on-line equality and U/B training. The members of promotion panels from 2018-19 awards will be confirmed in October 2018. Panel members will be advised subsequently of the requirement to undertake the training. | * Review complete and published
* Changes to process to ensure maximum efficiency made
* c.80% Promotion Panel members have received unconscious bias training
* c.80% Promotion Panel members have completed equality and diversity training
* pro-active monitoring instigated
 |
| **7.5** | Establish a mandatory training programme for members of Departmental, School and College level ethics committees  | Training materials have been developed and are available at <http://www.bbk.ac.uk/committees/research-integrity/> ; in their annual reports from 17/18 onwards Schools will be required to report on ethics and integrity training as well as numbers of ethics approvals and their type.  | Training programme established and delivered in three Schools to date  |
| **7.10** | Investigate and clarify the process for staff or PhD students to access taught modules for training purposes – investigate alternative cost models to make this financially sustainable |  Analysis of this issue has shown that with our devolved budget model it is not feasible to do this at scale without a source of funding to support attendance. Whilst staff are able to access such funding through the staff development budget, at this time it is not possible to offer the same level of support to PGR students, AAB have passed the issue to RSSC. Once the TNA process is embedded it would be feasible to identify such training needs in advance and then to ringfence suitable funds e.g. from the Generic Skills budget or from Schools own resources. As such, this issue needs to be revisited once TNAs are being used effectively.  | Agreement in principle to return to this once the data is available to monitor correctly |
| **7.12** | Produce clear guidance about the College’s expectations for how much time PhD Students and staff on Research Only contracts should spend undertaking training (both project specific and generic) and what, in this context, constitutes training activities | Guidance was written but will need to be revisited in the context of the revised concordat  | Guidance produced and available but needs to be re-drafted to reflect the revised concordat |
| **7.13** | Produce guidance on how to access funds for a conference | This related to a concern noted at the focus groups that there might be eligible individuals in the College who did not routinely obtain this information. Having reviewed the processes in all 5 Schools it was shown that this concern was unfounded and as such it was not necessary to produce any additional guidance.  | Guidance produced and readily available |
| **7.15** | All PhD students should have access generic training in bibliographic and computing skills, language skills, ethical and legal issues, skills for engaging with the public, exploitation of IP, communication and networking skills, leadership, research management and relationship management, professional and careers development. Review current provision to ensure it is fit for purpose and identify gaps. Develop a training programme to fill any gaps  | The necessary gap analysis was undertaken and training planned in 18/19 for any identified areas of concern. In practice, these have been mandatory training for a while for some funders so few gaps were found and it was more a case of updating existing provision than providing new. As such monitoring uptake is not an appropriate success measure | Review completed |
| **7.19** | Plan integrated training programme which address issues around grant writing collectively: * how to write a grant
* how to read a call
* how to review a grant
* how panels work
* what are pathways to impact
* how to write about research for a non-academic audience
* the difference between writing a grant and a paper

quality vs quantity |  A training programme for 18/19 was planned with the Research Office, following on from a successful pilot exercise of part of the programme in BEI in 17/18. Learning from 18/19 to feed into ongoing planning  | Training programme devised and delivered to c.30 researchers |
| **7.26** | Incorporate the relevant recommendations from the College’s review of PGR provision into this process where appropriate | This action is progressing well and RSSC have now taken up oversight of this process. All 75 recommendations in the report have been addressed.  | SPC have signed off this review as completely implemented |
| **7.27** | Ensure that the shared ownership of CPD and training is reflected in appraisal (i.e. performance review and PDR processes)  | The academic review and PDR scheme documentation was reviewed and updated, to address the feedback from the HRER gap analysis. informal academic feedback shows that these guides are used and valued. . | Appraisal (i.e. performance review/PDR) documents reviewed and amended to improve processes for recording training needs and training attendance |
| **8.4** | • Review policy on acting-up to increase transparency, openness and fairness in this area• Review policy on secondments to increase transparency, openness and fairness in this area | The necessary reviews have been undertaken, any necessary clarifications made and the policies have been made more visible on the website.  | Policy reviewed, any revisions made (if appropriate) and readily availablePolicy reviewed, any revisions made (if appropriate) and readily available |
| **8.10** | Investigate how local good practice identified through the gap analysis process should be disseminated more widely as appropriate | The identified good practice was reviewed and, when appropriate, shared with suitable people within the college | good practice disseminated |
| **8.11** | Set up task and finish group to review College Room booking processes for research and recommend improvements,  | The PVM(R) has joined the estates committee and is working directly with the Director of Estates to try and resolve some of the longstanding issues | PVM(R) has joined the estates committee |

**Appendix 2: Summary of Actions from the Original Action Plan Completed in 18/19**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Action** | **Progress report** | **Success measures completed to date** |
| **1.3** | Clarify processes for internal appointment to more senior roles e.g. AD | .Processes reviewed, any necessary changes identified and made, information sent with vacancy adverts enhanced where necessary.  | Guidance produced and implemented |
| **2.2** | Produce guidance about the roles of the supervisor and the mentor, establish processes to ensure that staff on FTCs have access to both as required | A guidance note was produced in discussion with the Research Strategy Group. This is now available on the College website and has been used by Schools to facilitate discussions about these different roles. Following feedback from Research Strategy Group, a formal training programme for Mentors and Mentees has been launched but it is too soon to say how successful this will be.  | * Guidance exists and readily available
* Mentors training programme launched
* The role of mentors discussed at School Research Committees
 |
| **2.3** | Clarify College policies and procedures around use of FTCs and ensure these are readily available | Policies and procedures comprehensively reviewed and made more prominent on the website; HR Business Partners also undertook an information sharing programme with the areas that they look after. | Guidance exists and readily availableHR Business Partners discuss this role with line manages and Dens regularly  |
| **3.1** | Ensure careers advice is available to researchers from across the College is clearly articulated and communicated via relevant websitesWhere it doesn’t currently exist, develop processes to engage with alumni if researchers are interested in moving to a different sector or vice versa | It has been confirmed that careers advice is available for all members of the College. This information has been made more prominent on the College website. Further work will be done on this when later actions in our HRER action plan come on-line. It is too soon to have robust data on whether or not this intervention has been effectiveThe careers service have worked with Development and Alumni to develop an efficient process to do this when they get enquiries. It is too soon to have robust data on whether or not this intervention has been effective | * Information available on the web
* Processes established
 |
| **3.7** | Clarify the process for re-grading staff on Research only grant-funded contracts; and ensure that this process is fair and transparent. Re-grading may be within the same salary band or may involve moving to a higher salary band | The wording used in the annual call for applications has been refined to ensure that grant-funded researchers understand that they can also apply for this type of promotion. An increased number of applications provide evidence that this has been successful, although the numbers involved are below the point where statistical significance can be assumed. This is not surprising given the small number of such posts at the College.  | Policy exists, is publicised and is readily available. |
| **3.8** | Ensure that guidance about the AR and PDR process is clear and accessible and that other processes for supporting career development, including research interviews and mentoring, are clearly referenced within such schemes | Guidance notes have been produced and made available on the HR website. Informal feedback from staff (eg attending training as an AR/PDR reviewer/reviewee training) shows that these documents are used and valued.  | * Guidance exists and is freely available, and is referenced in associated HR documentation, such as induction, probation, appraisal (i.e. performance review/PDR)
 |
| **3.10** | Develop FAQs in relation to flexible working requests and their implications and ensure these are communicated to all Schools – include clarification about if/how a return to full time working can be protected if an individual requests to work part time for a period | FAQs developed and available on the [College website](http://www.bbk.ac.uk/hr/policies_services/policies_az/FlexibleWorking/faq), and has been used by BGRS to produce an updated advisory framework for our PhD students. | * FAQ document available and has been circulated and made available on cognate websites
* Staff survey questions will continue to monitor effectiveness
 |
| **5.1** | * Review local practice and develop clear guidance about mentoring pathways and the different mentoring mechanisms available
* Clarify what is expected of mentors, including the role of the professoriate in mentoring provision

Develop training programme for mentors in mentorship if need is identified | See action 2.2. | * College level guidance about all forms of mentorship which is readily available
* Clear statement of expectations produced and communicated to the professoriate
* Training programme developed
 |
| **5.3** | PDRAs & RFs may well have access to a supervisor and not be automatically assigned a mentor. In practice they should have access to both as required. Clarify the College processes and expectations here | See action 2.2. | College level guidance produced |
| **6.2** | Review supervisors code of practice to ensure fit for purpose |  This is done annually in line with sector best practice and in line with expectations from DTP providers. However, the role the new Research Track system has played in allowing BGRS to contact supervisors directly and establish what their needs are has begun to provide valuable feedback which it is anticipated will begin to feed into this area in time.  | Review undertaken, any necessary changes made |
| **6.4** | Provide greater clarity about the role of the second supervisor and how they are allocated and reflect this in the code of practice, repeat for joint supervision | As part of the process to develop the Research Track system, it was necessary to impose a degree of harmonisation to the terminology used across the College to describe these roles and to develop a fuller understanding of how these roles work in practice. Once this work was complete the code of practice was updated to reflect the new understanding.  | information on the BGRS website and in Research Track (which 100% of students and supervisors use) |
| **7.6** | Review and Refresh the College stress policy and the Colleges approach to stress risk assessment  |  The review was undertaken and a revised process has been implemented. The policy was approved the College Health and Safety Committee. It is too soon to tell how effective this intervention has been | Review undertaken Revised process implemented |
| **7.11** | Review practice to ensure all PhD students, PDRAs, RFs and ECRs can access suitable teaching training even if they don’t have enough hours to do a Cert HE programme | Through a combination approach of making existing training more visible, strategic development of a small number of courses and an advertising campaign to ensure students were aware of teaching-support opportunities which are available via the BPSN (Bloomsbury Postgraduate Students Network) it has been possible to ensure that all students who want to access training for teaching can. There is more work to be done to make this sustainable in the longer term, and to ensure that PDRAs, RFs and ECRs are as aware of these opportunities.  | Complete overhaul of how training is advertised New training developed to fill gapsPRES results show improved satisfaction |
| **7.18** | Increase institutional involvement in relevant networks and programmes e.g. Vitae |  When appropriate, free resources from Vitae are now routinely promoted in all College training courses and information about Vitae events is now routinely promoted to appropriate colleagues. | Resources from Vitae are now routinely promoted in all College training coursesInformation about Vitae events is now routinely promoted to appropriate colleagues |
| **7.20** | Make all training events available to PhD students on the same basis as for staff | Systems issues mean it is not possible for PhD students to use the same booking system as staff for these events so a manual system is used, and so far is working well with all students who have expressed interest being able to attend the staff training.  | Training opportunities made available to PhD students100% of students who have expressed interest able to attend the training |
| **7.21** | Integrate the research-specific training offered by the BGRS and careers service with the more generic offer from HR to ensure we deliver a complete programme to all stakeholders | The described review has been undertaken and any gaps identified have been filled. However, work is ongoing to understand the most effective way to present this information to our stakeholders.  | * Review undertaken and completed
* Integrated programme delivered
 |
| **7.24** | Produce guidance about College-level expectations about editorial support/internal peer review for people producing papers and research grants |  This was incorporated into the wider work on mentoring – see action 2.2. | See earlier actions about mentoring |
| **8.2** | Define process to ensure institutional action plans work synergistically and minimise duplication | Sharepoint site set up to ensure resources are easily shared and regular review by HR Leadership Team (HRLT) established | Mapping undertakenRegular review by HRLT |
| **8.6** | Produce guidance on how Subject Librarians should be used in research  | Guidance available on the Library website and used by subject librarians | * Subject Librarians consulted
* Guidance produced and disseminated
 |
| **8.7** | Promote Vitae resources to appropriate stakeholders |  Information about additional resources from Vitae (or recognition use of Vitae resources in preparing training materials) now routine when appropriate in training.  | Information included in relevant web pages |
| **8.8** | Look to improve the library website to make searching the databases and catalogues as straightforward as possible  |  The re-designed library website is now part of the man College site and where possible databases etc. have been made available via single sign on etc.  | Improved website launchedSingle sign on incorporated into library resources |