



Concordats and agreements: their role in supporting effective research culture and working environments

Appendices

February 2022

Contents

4 Appendix A

28 Appendix B

68 Appendix C

74 Appendix D

82 Appendix E





Appendix A

A1. Documentary review and interviews with initiative owners

During the initial stage of research, we analysed the values, specific commitments, guidance, principles and statements of each of the agreed initiatives. This took place through a mixture of documentary analysis, interviews and group discussions involving 17 stakeholder representatives from across the different initiatives, including from the following organisations:

- AdvanceHE
- DORA
- Gatsby Foundation Education Team
- Georgia Institute of Technology and Leiden University
- Research England
- Research Integrity Concordat Signatories Group
- UK Collaborative on Development Research
- UKRI
- Understanding Animal Research
- UUK
- Vitae
- Wellcome

After reviewing the history and development of each concordat and agreement, together with the principles, the interviews were undertaken between 8th June and 17th July 2021.

The interviews focused on two areas:

- Impact on the research environment: this included how the initiatives are enacted within an organisation, the extent of compliance, how these factors affect adoption, and relative burden on the organisation
- Impact on culture and research practice: this included how the initiatives impact on leadership, talent, diversity, public engagement, reward, resources, teamwork and openness

It should be noted that the interviews focused on the initiative owners' perception of impact, given there was limited documentary evidence of impact across the wide variety of cultural influences.

A2. Quantitative survey approach

The survey stage explored the impact of initiatives in HEIs/HEPs including GuildHE members, Research Institutes and PSREs. Given the focus of these initiatives on policies and procedures within organisations, the survey was targeted at those in ‘strategic influencer’ and ‘operational delivery’ roles, involved in the oversight of the concordat(s) or in implementing processes in support of the concordat(s). The process for identifying and engaging these staff is detailed below.

In discussion with the Project Board, and based upon findings from discussions with initiative owners, a decision was made not to involve researchers directly in the quantitative survey. This was for various reasons including:

- the likely limited awareness of each concordat by name, given the potential translation into other strategic documents within an organisation
- potential duplication of research done by the Wellcome Trust recently on culture in higher education institutes¹
- given the pressures created by COVID-19 on all research sectors, we were mindful of adding undue burden to many people when pre-existing data sets could provide insights

Our data was compared with the Wellcome Trust survey on culture in higher education institutes, which included a very large sample of researchers across different types of research organisation. While our survey focused on those in strategic and implementation roles it should be noted that many will still have been researchers (albeit in more managerial and leadership positions), and researchers were a significant focus within our organisational deep dives. The Challenge Group also contained representation from researchers across different organisations, disciplines and contract types.

All eligible research organisations were invited to take part in the research. A phased approach was taken to recruitment between 9th June and 16th July 2021:

An initial recruitment email was sent introducing the research and the survey sponsors and inviting recipients in the first instance to express an interest.

A follow-up email was sent to initial responders asking for participation from different people within their organisation, such as ‘senior influencers’, senior and managerial professional services staff and Heads of Department across different disciplinary contexts.

An email was sent to respondents containing a link to the survey and detailing the research, its purpose, how the data would be used and who would have access to it.

A total of 81 organisations provided contact details for relevant staff enabling us to construct a contact database of 1,085 people, all of whom were invited to participate in the survey. Of these, 510 participated (47%) covering an even split of staff with strategic and operational roles. Survey field dates were 5th July to 1st August 2021. The achieved interviews are detailed in Table A2.1.

¹ Wellcome (2020). What researchers think about the culture they work in. Accessed at: <https://wellcome.org/reports/what-researchers-think-about-research-culture>

TABLE A2.1: Achieved survey response sample

Organisation type	No. of participating organisations	Total no. of interviews	No. of interviews (operational delivery)	No. of interviews (strategic influencer)
HEP (England)	44	323	158	168
HEI (Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland)	15	81	34	39
GuildHE	4	12	4	5
PSRE	1	6	1	3
Research Institute	16	88	53	38
Total	81	510	250	253

To aid our analyses, we looked to organise the survey data according to different types of organisations. At a high level, this included HEI/HEPs compared with non-HEIs (including PSREs and Research Institutes). Given the size and complexity of the HEI/HEP population, initially we broke data out in relation to the five KEF clusters;² however, this excluded non-English organisations, and it clustered organisations predominantly in relation to knowledge exchange performance only. We therefore opted to analyse the data according to the six TRAC Peer Groups,³ which correspond to different levels of research income. Details of the achieved sample split by the relevant TRAC Peer Groups are in Table A2.2.

The smallest sample sizes were achieved with TRAC Peer Groups E and F. To enable robust subgroup analysis, we combined Peer Groups D to F to create a single group and compare it with Peer Groups A, B and C, which have sufficiently large samples to analyse in their own right.

² Ulrichsen, T. (2018). Knowledge Exchange Framework Metrics: A Cluster Analysis of Higher Education Institutions. Accessed at <https://re.ukri.org/documents/2018/kef-cluster-analysis-report/>

³ TRAC (2018). Peer Groups for annual TRAC, TRAC fEC and TRAC(T)1 benchmarking 2017-18. Accessed at <https://www.trac.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Annex-4.1b-TRAC-Peer-groups-2017-18.pdf>

TABLE A2.2: TRAC Peer Groups

Peer Group	Universe (no. of institutions)	No. of participating institutions	Survey institutions	No. of respondents
A (Institutions with a medical school and research income of 20% or more of total income)	33	12	Newcastle Imperial Leeds Liverpool Bristol York Sheffield Cardiff University University of St Andrews Exeter Lancaster Durham	124
B (All other institutions with research income of 15% or more of total income)	23	12	Keele Aston Royal Holloway Kent Surrey University of Stirling Bangor Canterbury Heriot-Watt University Aberystwyth University University of Strathclyde Essex	79
C (Institutions with a research income of between 5% and 15% of total income / arts teaching institutions)	15	12	Lincoln Bradford Abertay Westminster Salford Portsmouth John Moore's Goldsmiths De Montfort Huddersfield Greenwich Edinburgh Napier University Open University	99

Peer Group	Universe (no. of institutions)	No. of participating institutions	Survey institutions	No. of respondents
D (Institutions with a research income less than 5% of total income and total income greater than £150M)	15	12	Sheffield Hallam East London Birmingham City Wolverhampton Central Lancashire Nottingham Trent Leeds Beckett Manchester Metropolitan Northampton University of South Wales Coventry Oxford Brookes	77
E (Institutions with a research income less than 5% of total income and total income less than or equal to £150M)	45	7	Worcester Sunderland Teeside Derby Bournemouth Chester Bolton	28
F (Specialist music/ arts teaching institutions)	22	3	Norwich University of the Arts Royal Welsh College of Music and Drama Bath Spa University	9

Q1

We are keen to understand how far do you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to your current working environment?

RANDOMISE STATEMENTS

- a. My working environment promotes a good work-life balance
- b. My working environment promotes a collaborative culture
- c. Creativity is welcomed within my working environment in all its forms
- d. My institution/workplace values speed of results over quality
- e. My institution/workplace could do more to ensure research practices do not cut corners
- f. Rigour of results is considered an important research outcome by my institution/workplace
- g. My institution/workplace places more value on meeting metrics, than it does on research quality
- h. I am confident that my institution/workplace would listen and take action if I raised a concern
- i. The culture around research in my working environment supports my ability to do good quality research

Additional statements not in Wellcome Survey

- j. My institution/ workplace inspires, educates and builds public trust and confidence in research
- k. My institution/ workplace recognises all contributions to research
- l. My institution/ workplace incentivises the right behaviours among research staff
- m. My institution/ workplace ensures it has the right resources promote high quality research
- n. The culture around research in my working environment enables us to attract and retain the best research talent
- o. My working environment values openness and honesty about research
- p. Diversity of thought isn't effectively supported through my working environment
- q. The level of administration in my institution's research environment stifles the focus on high quality research

Question type

Q19 in the Wellcome Survey

Grid question

7-point scale

1=Strongly disagree,
4= Neither disagree nor
agree, 7= Strongly agree,
N/A

Split into 2 grids

Q2

How do you think your institution/workplace compares to other research workplaces in regards to ...

- a. encouraging good research culture?
we are referring to the multiple behaviours, values, expectations, attitudes and norms of research communities
- b. encouraging a good working environment?
We are referring to the conditions in which research is undertaken including the administrative context

Question type

Q32 in Wellcome Survey for part (a) ONLY

Grid question

7-point scale

1=Performs much worse, 4= About the same, 7=Performs much better, N/

Q3

In the last 2 years has the focus on IMPROVING RESEARCH CULTURE/ IMPROVING THE WORKING ENVIRONMENT (TWO SEPARATE QS) in your institution increased, stayed the same, decreased?

ROTATE

- a. improving research culture **in your institution**
we are referring to the multiple behaviours, values, expectations, attitudes and norms of research communities
- b. improving the working environment **in your institution**
We are referring to the conditions in which research is undertaken including the administrative context.

Increased

Stayed the same

Decreased

DON'T KNOW

Q3

To what extent do you agree or disagree **leaders communicate clear expectations regarding behaviours and/or culture in my working environment** regarding your institutional senior management?

Q15 in the Wellcome Survey

Grid question

7-point scale

1=Strongly disagree, 4= Neither disagree nor agree, 7= Strongly agree, Not applicable

A3. Quantitative survey questionnaire

Q5

How successful is **your workplace team** in demonstrating each leadership characteristic?

RANDOMISE STATEMENTS

- a. Leading and supporting teams of diverse individuals
- b. Setting and upholding standards in the conduct of research and its application
- c. Creating development and career opportunities

Question type

Q17 in the Wellcome Survey

Grid question

Extremely unsuccessful, Somewhat unsuccessful, Neutral, Somewhat successful, Extremely successful, I don't know, N/A

Q6

How successful is **your organisation / institution** as a whole in demonstrating each leadership characteristic?

RANDOMISE STATEMENTS

- a. Leading and supporting teams of diverse individuals
- b. Setting and upholding standards in the conduct of research and its application
- c. Creating development and career opportunities for research staff

Q18 in the Wellcome Survey

Grid question

Extremely unsuccessful, Somewhat unsuccessful, Neutral, Somewhat successful, Extremely successful, I don't know, N/A

Q7

Which of these are influential in terms of driving a positive research culture/ working environment in your institution? SINGLE CODE ONLY

Concordats and agreements (by that I mean the list of initiatives – DROP DOWN HERE)

REF (The Research Excellence Framework)

Vice Chancellor or other leader of your institution.

Heads of Department

Research Team Leaders

HR policies & practice

Funders

for research staff

Institutional strategy

KEF (Knowledge Exchange Framework)

Researchers/ research community

Other colleagues

National government policies

Industry

1 = Not at all influential,

2= Quite Influential ,

3= Very influential

DON'T KNOW

Question type

DISPLAY SCREEN

We are keen to understand the impact of a range of different concordats, initiatives and agreements on research culture and the research environment.

While we will ask questions about your institution, this is not an assessment of its response to these initiatives, and your answers will NOT be reported either at an individual or institutional level.

Your data will be combined with the wider data set to provide an aggregated view. This coverage of these initiatives is broad to help us understand their impact on research culture and the environment.

- Concordat for Research Integrity
- Concordat on Open Research Data
- Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers
- Concordat for the Advancement of Knowledge Exchange in Higher Education
- Athena Swan
- Race Equality Charter
- Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research
- Concordat on Openness on Animal Research
- Guidance on Safeguarding in International Development Research
- Technician Commitment
- San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)
- Leiden Manifesto on Research Metrics

Q8

How familiar are you with each ...

RANDOMISE ORDER SINGLE RESPONSE PER INITIATIVE

- Concordat for Research Integrity
- Concordat on Open Research Data
- Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers
- Concordat for the Advancement of Knowledge Exchange in Higher Education
- Athena Swan
- Race Equality Charter
- Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research
- Concordat on Openness on Animal Research
- Guidance on Safeguarding in International Development Research
- Technician Commitment
- San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)
- Leiden Manifesto on Research Metrics

Question type

Grid scale

I have a good understanding of it/ I understand it reasonably well/ I have limited knowledge/ understanding of it/ I don't know it

Q9

ASK OF EACH AWARE OF AT Q8

How would you describe how your institution has responded to EACH INITIATIVE AWARE OF AT Q8

CHOOSE ONE ONLY

- Concordat for Research Integrity
- Concordat on Open Research Data
- Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers
- Concordat for the Advancement of Knowledge Exchange in Higher Education
- Athena Swan
- Race Equality Charter
- Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research
- Concordat on Openness on Animal Research
- Guidance on Safeguarding in International Development Research
- Technician Commitment
- San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)
- Leiden Manifesto on Research Metrics

1. It has been fully adopted by my institution as is part of our strategy.
2. It has been adopted by certain functions in my institution, usually in terms of discrete policies or processes.
3. My institution supports the principles of the initiative, but there has been limited integration into internal policies or processes.
4. My institution has not responded to the initiative but intends to in the future
5. My institution has made a decision not to adopt the initiative
6. DON'T KNOW

Q10

ASK FOR EACH INITIATIVE CODED 1 OR 2 AT Q9,
OTHERS CHECK Q11

In which of these ways has your institution implemented INSERT INITIATIVE FROM Q9 CODE ALL THAT APPLY RANDOMISE LIST

- **Strategy**
Embedded into institutional level strategies and/or other key documents (business plans; action plans)
- **Governance and oversight**
Senior leader has a commitment/role in the initiative
Group/ committee or otherwise has oversight
- **Policies, processes and practice**
Adopted/ translated into policies, processes and practice.
- **Resources**
Committed to managing it/ looking after it/ supporting it (eg funding or professional services staff to manage/ embed/look after initiative)
- **Capacity Building**
Provide training, guidance and resources to support the cascading of the adoption of the initiative across the institution.
- **Evaluated, reviewed and reporting**
Progress/ adoption is evaluated or reviewed.
- **Incentivise the right behaviours to encourage adoption**
- **External Communication**
Profile raising outside the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institutions commitment to it.
- **Internal Communication**
Profile raising across the institution: to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it.
- **Other (please specify)**
- **DON'T KNOW**
- **NONE OF THESE**

Question type

- Concordat for research integrity
- Concordat on Open Research Data
- Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers
- Concordat for the Advancement of Knowledge Exchange in Higher Education
- Athena Swan
- Race Equality Charter
- Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research
- Concordat on Openness on Animal Research
- Guidance on Safeguarding in International Development Research
- Technician commitment
- San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)
- Leiden Manifesto on Research Metrics

Q11

ASK FOR EACH INITIATIVE CODED 1 OR 2 OR 3 AT Q9 (BUT A MAXIMUM OF 3 AS PER COMMENTS)

Thinking specifically of [NAME OF INITIATIVE] do you agree or disagree that...

And NEXT INITIATIVE. It is easy to translate the policy to processes that help staff achieve the initiative's aim

- The resources placed into the local administration of the initiative outweighs the benefits it delivers
- It has a positive effect on the research culture
- It has a positive effect on the working environment
- It hinders researchers' ability to get on with their research
- It provides a consistent way of looking at the issue across the sector, which adds value to my institution
- It is easy to measure its success
- Has been embraced by the senior leadership team at the university
- It has improved structures and processes for our institution to address the issue

Question type

Grid question

7-point scale

1=Strongly disagree,

4= Neither disagree nor agree, 7= Strongly agree, N/A

Q12

ASK FOR EACH INITIATIVE CODED 1 OR 2 OR 3 AT Q9 (BUT A MAXIMUM OF 3 AS PER COMMENTS)

And on balance which, if any initiatives does [NAME OF INITIATIVE] undermine, overlap or reinforce? CAN BE MULTICODED

1=Overlaps

2 = Reinforces

3= Undermines

Question type

Concordat for research integrity
Concordat on Open Research Data
Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers
Concordat for the Advancement of Knowledge Exchange in Higher Education
Athena Swan
Race Equality Charter
Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research
Concordat on Openness on Animal Research
Guidance on Safeguarding in International Development Research
Technician commitment
San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)
Leiden Manifesto on Research Metrics

Q13

ASK ALL

This survey is seeking to understand the influence the initiatives have on promoting a positive working environment and driving a positive research culture and ultimately delivers better research outcomes.

Thinking about the initiatives collectively, to what extent do you agree or disagree...

RANDOMISE LIST

1. There are clear benefits from these initiatives on driving better research practice and outcomes
2. It is difficult to measure their impact on driving **positive research culture**
3. It is difficult to measure their impact on driving a **positive working environment**
4. These initiatives have a limited impact on driving positive research culture
5. These initiatives have a limited impact on driving a positive working environment
6. Our institution is able to make more confident choices and decisions because of these initiatives
7. The initiatives have a net negative effect on the research environment

Grid question

7-point scale

1=Strongly disagree,

4= Neither disagree nor agree,

7= Strongly agree, N/A

A3. Quantitative survey questionnaire

Question type

Q14

ASK FOR THOSE WHO AGREE TO STATEMENT 1 AT Q13 (CODE 5, 6, 7)

Please tell us about the clear benefits that you perceive from these initiatives on driving better research practice and outcomes?

Open-ended

Q15

ASK FOR THOSE WHO DISAGREE TO STATEMENT 1 AT Q13 (CODE 1, 2,3)

Please tell us why you do not see clear benefits from these initiatives in driving better research practice and outcomes? Do you feel there better or alternative ways?

Q16

We'd like to ask some questions about you...

How many years have you been working in research or higher education?

Please include from the inception of your career, covering career breaks etc

Less than 1 year

1–2 years

3–5 years

6–10 years

11–20 years

21–30 years

30+ years

N/A

Single code

Q17

How old are you?

a. Under 18

b. 18–24 years

c. 25–34 years

d. 35–44 years

e. 45–54 years

f. 55–64 years

g. 65–74 years

h. 75+ years

i. I'd prefer not to say

Question type

Q18

Which of the following best describes your gender?

- a. Man
- b. Non-binary
- c. Woman
- d. Prefer to self-describe
- e. Prefer not to say

Q19

Which of the following best describes you?

Which of the following best describes you?

- a. Asian
 - Bangladeshi
 - British
 - Indian
 - Pakistani
 - Chinese
 - Any other Asian background
- b. Black
 - African
 - British
 - Caribbean
 - Any other Black background
- c. Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups
 - Asian and White
 - Black Caribbean and White
 - Black African and White
 - Any other mixed/multiple ethnicity background
- d. White
 - British
 - Irish
 - Gypsy or Irish Traveller
 - Any other white background
- e. Other ethnic groups
 - Arab
 - Any other ethnic background
- f. I'd prefer not to say

Q20

Do you consider yourself to be a disabled person?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- Prefer not to say

A3. Quantitative survey questionnaire

Question type

ALLOW NULL

Q21

Your feedback counts, and we appreciate the time you have given already. Is there anything that we have not covered that you would like to add in relation to our job to gather evidence that will help stakeholders improve the ways that key initiatives, concordats and agreements affect research culture and environment. Please do add any further detail here... (ALLOW NOTHING)

Q22

We would like to be able to recontact people in certain institutions in order to explore the impact of the various initiatives in more detail. If you are willing to be recontacted to take part in an interview. Are you willing to be recontacted?

- a. Yes
- b. No

THESE ARE NOT SURVEY QUESTIONS BUT CAPTURED
AS PART OF THE RECRUITMENT PROCESS AND NEED
TO BE SET IN THE DATA

D1

NAME OF INSTITUTION (THIS IS A KEY Q TO MAP ACROSS TO WELCOME DATASET)

D2

Which best describes your interaction with concordats?

Strategic influencer (involved in the oversight of one or more concordats and their applications within the institution)

Operational delivery (involved in implementing processes and procedures in support of one or more of the concordats)

OTHER

D3

JOB TITLE / RANK

D4

Are you a REF (Research in Excellence Framework) Champion/ Lead? YES/ NO

D5

TYPE OF INSTITUTION

HEPs – England/ HEIs – Non England/ GuildHE/ RI/ PSRE

A4. Qualitative case study deep dives approach

Case study organisations were identified, with reference to the survey responses, accounting for the following criteria:

- geographic spread, including representation from the devolved nations
- type and size of organisation, including representation from:
 - HEIs/HEPs including GuildHE members
 - Research Institutes
 - PSREs
- organisational focus, including:
 - relative balance between Science and Humanities
 - relative balance between Teaching and Research
- concordat adoption and impact (as reported within survey responses)

Where we received survey responses and permission to recontact from senior leaders (such as Pro Vice Chancellors, Heads of Research, Culture Leads) these helped us form a longlist of potential organisations, which were discussed and prioritised internally before agreeing with the Project Board. It was necessary to have the connection at a strategic level to then gain buy-in and formal agreement to participate in the case studies, as well as to support us in accessing other staff to interview as part of the case study process.

Case study recruitment commenced while the survey was still in field. Given the need for a pragmatic and efficient approach to recruitment (with fieldwork taking place in between the summer and autumn terms), we supplemented the longlist with other organisations agreed with members of the Project Board and Challenge Group as providing a well-rounded range of organisations for the more detailed case studies.

We had intended to undertake one additional case study with a PSRE. Unfortunately, the sample achieved in the survey was not sufficient to recruit from, and over the period of fieldwork we were unable to gain representation from a PSRE despite inviting several to participate.

Interviews were undertaken via online video meeting with a total of 27 staff across seven organisations. Within each organisation these included individuals with strategic, operational, administrative and/or research roles. A standardised topic guide was developed for each type of staff member. An example of the topic guide used for strategic staff is provided in Appendix A5.

Our analysis process was highly systematic. All interviews were recorded and transcribed. A thematic Excel matrix was developed to enable all the data collected to be mapped at individual and organisational levels against the key questions. This involved a systematic process of sifting, summarising and sorting the material according to the key issues and themes of relevance for the study. The process involved:

- a familiarisation stage, including a researcher's review of the audio files, transcripts and any supporting documentation identified
- based on the coverage of the topic guide, the researcher's experiences of conducting the fieldwork and their preliminary review of the data, a thematic framework was constructed; the analysis then proceeded by coding, summarising and synthesising the data according to this thematic framework
- when all the data had been sifted according to the core themes the team reviewed the summarised data by: comparing and contrasting the perceptions, accounts or experiences of staff; searching for patterns or connections within the data; and seeking explanations internally within the data set

The intention at the outset of this research was to produce standalone summaries from each case study. On conducting the case studies it became apparent that it was not possible to accurately represent the implementation or impact of initiatives at an organisational level due to (a) the diverse ways in which individual initiatives are implemented and (b) the small sample involved in the qualitative research. The decision was therefore taken to develop a small number of anonymised vignettes to focus in on specific themes relating to implementation that emerged from the case study interviews.

A5. Qualitative case study topic guide used by the research team in undertaking case study interviews

My name is [XXX]. I work on behalf of Basis Social. We are an independent research agency who have been asked to carry out this research with you on behalf of UUK, UKRI and the Wellcome Trust.

They have commissioned this research to understand the impact of concordats and agreements on research culture by which we mean the multiple behaviours, values, expectations, attitudes, and norms of research communities; and on the research environment by which we mean the conditions in which research is undertaken including the administrative context. The full list of concordats in scope for the study were included in your invitation. For reference, I have included the list in the chat function of our interview.

Our research has three stages.

The first stage involved

- a documentary review and interviews with initiative owners.
- The second stage involved a survey to understand the impact of concordats in HEIs/HEPs, research institutes, and PSREs.
- This third and final stage will involve deep dives in a range of high education and research institutions, involving qualitative interviews to form case studies for our report.

Our findings will be used by UUK, UKRI, Wellcome, and others in the sector, to inform future deliberations on this area, including the Government's Bureaucracy Review. There will be opportunities for the research community and others to be part of those deliberations. Our focus is purely on providing insight of the adoption and impact of the various initiatives on research culture and the research environment. While we will not provide conclusions or recommendations, there are post report plans to inform conversations about how the initiatives can best promote a more inclusive and welcoming research culture while minimising bureaucracy.

Is that all clear and do you have any questions at this point?

The interview will focus the extent to which various concordats and agreements have been adopted in your institution, and their relative influence research culture and the research environment.

Given your strategic role in [institution] we'd particularly value your view on the collective impact of various concordats and agreements, though we may touch upon certain initiatives in more depth.

We have a lot to get through so please excuse me if I move the conversation on at times.

This interview is confidential and will only be used by the research team. You don't have to answer any question if you don't want to, you can just ask us to move on. I'd very much appreciate your open and honest responses so the evidence we have is an accurate reflection of the situation for the benefit of all.

We would like to record this discussion but only if you are happy with this. The recording is used to ensure we have an accurate record of the discussion for analytical purposes. Do you have any concerns or worries about this? If so, please don't hesitate to raise these now – it won't affect your participation in this research as I can take notes. If you are happy, I'll start recording the session now. [Gain verbal consent].

Additionally, we may wish to use quotes in our report to help illustrate findings. Any quote would be anonymised. We will share quotes beforehand for their sign off.

Are you happy if we use anonymised quotes from the session, providing we gain consent for their use?

Finally, Basis are a company partner of a body called the Market Research Society and abide by their code of conduct. Participation in this discussion is completely voluntary and you are able to withdraw your consent to participate at any point in the process. This includes during this discussion, or up until the report is published at the end of October.

Any questions before we start?

[Role, institutional culture, and environment \(10 mins\)](#)

- To kick off, please tell me briefly about your role and how it relates to the concordats and agreements under review?
- What three words would you use to describe the research culture or cultures at [X]? Why do you say that?
- What would you say are the most significant influences on research culture in your organisation? [NB review and probe on survey findings]
- Has research culture changed at your institution in recent years? Why?
- Thinking about the wider research environment, by which we mean the conditions under which research is undertaken including administrative conditions, what three words would you use to describe this at [X]? Why do you say that?
- What would you say are the most significant influences on the research environment in your institution?
- To what extent do you feel you have the autonomy to influence:
 - The research culture in your institution?
 - The research environment in your institution?
- Before we start to discuss the concordats, do you have any broader points you'd like to make on research culture and the research environment

Concordats overview and strategic role in organization (10 mins)

- Thinking in general about the range of concordats and agreements in scope of this review, what are your top-of-mind impressions?
- Which are most relevant to your institution? Which less so? Why?
- To what extent are they adopted into:
 - Strategic plans
 - Policy and operational documents
- Would it be possible to review any of these documents?
- To what extent are there challenges in adopting the concordats into institutional policies and procedures?

Impact of concordats on culture (25 mins)

- I want to turn back now to the research culture we described earlier. Thinking collectively across the various concordats and agreements, to what extent do you feel they have influenced this culture? Can you give specific examples of this in your institution?
- I now want to focus on certain attributes that may help create a better research culture. For each, would you highlight any concordats that have had a significant influence, either positive or negative:
 - Impact on leadership (by which we mean getting the most out of their team and resources)
 - Impact on talent (carry out research and innovation and attract, develop and retain talent; feel safe in workplace).
 - Impact on diversity (by which we mean diversity of thought, experience and background; valuing all contributions; supporting creativity)
 - Impact on public engagement (by which we mean inspiring, educate and build public trust and confidence in research)
 - Impact on reward (by which we mean recognising all contributions to research; incentivising the right behaviours).
 - Impact on resources (by which we mean ensuring the right resources and infrastructure to unleash the potential of R&D to level-up the country)
 - Impact on collaborative teamwork (by which we mean bringing together a range of skills and knowledge inc. teams from around the globe)
 - Impact on open, trustworthy research (by which we mean openness and honesty about research; researchers and their institutions have a relationship built on trust and mutual respect).
- Are there any other impacts on research culture from the concordats you'd like to raise?
- And overall, to what extent do you feel that concordats contribute to a positive or negative research culture?

[Impact of concordats on research environment \(20 mins\)](#)

- I want to turn back now to the research environment we described earlier. Thinking collectively across the various concordats and agreements, to what extent do you feel they have influenced the research environment in your institution? Probe:
 - Policies and procedures
 - Tools and infrastructure
 - Ability to attract and/or retain funding
 - Levels of administration; where the burden falls
- Are there particular concordats where you feel the balance between administration and benefit is misaligned?
- To what extent do you feel there is overlap between concordats? Probe:
 - Commitments
 - Purpose
 - Administration requirements
 - Reporting
- Are there any other impacts on research environment from the concordats you'd like to raise?
- And overall, to what extent do you feel that concordats contribute to a positive research environment?

[Final thoughts, next steps and close \(5 mins\)](#)

- Have you undertaken any internal reviews or evaluations of the impacts of any concordats or agreements mentioned?
- In your view, what could be done to improve the impact of concordats and agreements on research culture and the environment?
- What would you stop?
- What would you start?
- What would you do more of?

That concludes my questions. Are there any further points you'd like to raise, or do you have any questions?

To say thank you for your participation we would like to offer to donate £10 to a charity of your choice. What charity would you like to donate to?⁴

We will be writing up our findings by the end of October and our evidence will be used to inform future discussions in and by the sector.

Would you like to be kept informed with any interim findings or final reports that are made public?

Thank and close.

⁴ Note that it is standard practice to offer a nominal incentive for participation, in this case a small donation to a charity of their choice. This was not included in the recruitment process and would not have influenced their willingness to participate in the research or responses.



Appendix B

B1. Detailed findings on individual initiatives ⁵

Athena Swan Charter (established 2005)

TABLE B1.1: Levels of awareness of Athena Swan [Base: n 510]

Levels of awareness	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 94)
'Good' understanding	48%	34%
'Reasonable' understanding	38%	41%
'Limited' understanding	13%	19%
Unaware	2%	5%

TABLE B1.2: Levels of adoption of Athena Swan [Base: n 498; all aware]

Levels of adoption	HEIs/HEPs (n 409)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 89)
Fully adopted by institution and is part of strategy	66%	52%
Adopted by certain functions in institution, usually in terms of discrete policies or processes	21%	17%
Institution supports the principles of the initiative, but there has been limited integration into internal policies or processes	6%	15%
Institution has not responded to the initiative but intends to in the future	1%	1%
Institution has made a decision not to adopt the initiative	1%	4%
Unknown	5%	11%

⁵ Note that we do not include detailed findings on the Leiden Manifesto on Research Metrics or the Guidance on Safeguarding in International Development Research due to base size limitations relating to implementation (fewer than 50 respondents).

TABLE B1.3: Areas in which Athena Swan was seen to be implemented within organisations [Base: n 276; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Areas	HEIs/HEPs (n 230)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 46)
Strategy: Embedded into institutional level strategies and/or other key documents	78%	78%
Governance and oversight: Senior leader has a commitment/role in the initiative; or group/committee or otherwise has oversight	83%	89%
Policies, processes and practice: Adopted/ translated into policies, processes and practice	85%	87%
Resources: Committed to managing it/ looking after it/ supporting it	73%	70%
Capacity Building: Provide training, guidance and resources to support the cascading of the adoption of the initiative across the institution	62%	63%
Evaluated, reviewed and reporting: Progress/ adoption is evaluated or reviewed	77%	91%
Incentivise the right behaviours to encourage adoption	48%	48%
External Communication: Profile raising outside the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	53%	54%
Internal Communication: Profile raising across the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	76%	74%
Other	0%	2%
Don't know	8%	0%

TABLE B1.4: Perceived impacts from Athena Swan [Base: n 120; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Perceived impacts	All institutions agreeing
It is easy to translate the policy to processes that help staff achieve the initiative's aim	51%
The resources used in the local administration of the initiative outweighs the benefits it delivers	29%
It has a positive effect on the research culture	65%
It has a positive effect on the working environment	71%
It hinders researchers' ability to get on with their research	9%
It provides a consistent way of looking at the issue across the sector, which adds value to my institution/organisation	68%
It is easy to measure its success	43%
Has been embraced by the senior leadership team at the university	70%
It has improved structures and processes for our institution organisation to address the issue	62%

TABLE B1.5: Perceived relationship between Athena Swan and other initiatives in scope for this research [Base: n 498; all aware]

Perceived relationship	All institutions agreeing
Overlaps with other initiatives	6%
Reinforces other initiatives	12%
Undermines other initiatives	1%
None	1%
Not answered ⁶	76%

Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers (established 2008)

TABLE B1.6: Levels of awareness of Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers [Base: n 510]

Levels of awareness	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 94)
'Good' understanding	43%	12%
'Reasonable' understanding	27%	21%
'Limited' understanding	16%	27%
Unaware	13%	40%

⁶ Note that participants were only asked about relationships between named initiative and three others which they had stated awareness of in order to minimise survey fatigue

TABLE B1.7: Levels of adoption of Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers [Base: n 417; all aware]

Levels of adoption	HEIs/HEPs (n 361)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 56)
Fully adopted by institution and is part of strategy	48%	5%
Adopted by certain functions in institution, usually in terms of discrete policies or processes	27%	20%
Institution supports the principles of the initiative, but there has been limited integration into internal policies or processes	12%	34%
Institution has not responded to the initiative but intends to in the future	2%	14%
Institution has made a decision not to adopt the initiative	0%	4%
Unknown	11%	23%

TABLE B1.8: Areas in which Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers was seen to be implemented within organisations [Base: n 117; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Areas	All institutions agreeing
Strategy: Embedded into institutional level strategies and/or other key documents	75%
Governance and oversight: Senior leader has a commitment/role in the initiative; or group/committee or otherwise has oversight	75%
Policies, processes and practice: Adopted/ translated into policies, processes and practice	79%
Resources: Committed to managing it/ looking after it/ supporting it	73%
Capacity Building: Provide training, guidance and resources to support the cascading of the adoption of the initiative across the institution	70%
Evaluated, reviewed and reporting: Progress/ adoption is evaluated or reviewed	62%
Incentivise the right behaviours to encourage adoption	40%
External Communication: Profile raising outside the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	28%
Internal Communication: Profile raising across the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	70%
Other	2%
Don't know	6%

TABLE B1.9: Perceived impacts from Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers [Base: n 117; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Perceived impacts	All institutions agreeing
It is easy to translate the policy to processes that help staff achieve the initiative's aim	43%
The resources used in the local administration of the initiative outweighs the benefits it delivers	15%
It has a positive effect on the research culture	65%
It has a positive effect on the working environment	67%
It hinders researchers' ability to get on with their research	7%
It provides a consistent way of looking at the issue across the sector, which adds value to my institution/organisation	58%
It is easy to measure its success	32%
Has been embraced by the senior leadership team at the university	60%
It has improved structures and processes for our institution/organisation to address the issue	56%

TABLE B1.10: Perceived relationship between Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers and other initiatives in scope for this research [Base: n 417; all aware]

Perceived relationship	All institutions agreeing
Overlaps with other initiatives	5%
Reinforces other initiatives	12%
Undermines other initiatives	0%
None	8%
Not answered ⁷	75%

Concordat to Support Research Integrity (established 2012)

TABLE B1.11: Levels of awareness of Concordat to Support Research Integrity [Base: n 510]

Levels of awareness	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 94)
'Good' understanding	36%	19%
'Reasonable' understanding	28%	22%
'Limited' understanding	24%	24%
Unaware	12%	34%

⁷ Note that participants were only asked about relationships between named initiative and three others which they had stated awareness of in order to minimise survey fatigue.

TABLE B1.12: Levels of adoption of Concordat to Support Research Integrity [Base: n 429; all aware]

Levels of adoption	HEIs/HEPs (n 367)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 62)
Fully adopted by institution and is part of strategy	45%	32%
Adopted by certain functions in institution, usually in terms of discrete policies or processes	25%	31%
Institution supports the principles of the initiative, but there has been limited integration into internal policies or processes	11%	18%
Institution has not responded to the initiative but intends to in the future	1%	3%
Institution has made a decision not to adopt the initiative	0%	0%
Unknown	18%	16%

TABLE B1.13: Areas in which Concordat to Support Research Integrity was seen to be implemented within organisations [Base: n 173; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Areas	All institutions agreeing
Strategy: Embedded into institutional level strategies and/or other key documents	64%
Governance and oversight: Senior leader has a commitment/role in the initiative; or group/committee or otherwise has oversight	80%
Policies, processes and practice: Adopted/ translated into policies, processes and practice	86%
Resources: Committed to managing it/ looking after it/ supporting it	60%
Capacity Building: Provide training, guidance and resources to support the cascading of the adoption of the initiative across the institution	57%
Evaluated, reviewed and reporting: Progress/ adoption is evaluated or reviewed	53%
Incentivise the right behaviours to encourage adoption	29%
External Communication: Profile raising outside the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	23%
Internal Communication: Profile raising across the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	56%
Other	1%
Don't know	9%

TABLE B1.14: Perceived impacts from Concordat to Support Research Integrity [Base: n 119; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Perceived impacts	All institutions agreeing
It is easy to translate the policy to processes that help staff achieve the initiative's aim	54%
The resources used in the local administration of the initiative outweighs the benefits it delivers	13%
It has a positive effect on the research culture	64%
It has a positive effect on the working environment	60%
It hinders researchers' ability to get on with their research	8%
It provides a consistent way of looking at the issue across the sector, which adds value to my institution/organisation	60%
It is easy to measure its success	24%
Has been embraced by the senior leadership team at the university	60%
It has improved structures and processes for our institution/organisation to address the issue	56%

TABLE B1.15: Perceived relationship between Concordat to Support Research Integrity and other initiatives in scope for this research [Base: n 429; all aware]

Perceived relationship	All institutions agreeing
Overlaps with other initiatives	5%
Reinforces other initiatives	14%
Undermines other initiatives	1%
None	7%
Not answered ⁸	77%

Race Equality Charter (established 2016)

TABLE B1.16: Levels of awareness of Race Equality Charter [Base: n 510]

Levels of awareness	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 94)
'Good' understanding	25%	11%
'Reasonable' understanding	38%	28%
'Limited' understanding	31%	29%
Unaware	10%	7%

⁸ Note that participants were only asked about relationships between named initiative and three others which they had stated awareness of in order to minimise survey fatigue.

TABLE B1.17: Levels of adoption of Race Equality Charter [Base: n 461; all aware]

Levels of adoption	HEIs/HEPs (n 367)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 62)
Fully adopted by institution and is part of strategy	44%	27%
Adopted by certain functions in institution, usually in terms of discrete policies or processes	21%	15%
Institution supports the principles of the initiative, but there has been limited integration into internal policies or processes	10%	22%
Institution has not responded to the initiative but intends to in the future	4%	8%
Institution has made a decision not to adopt the initiative	2%	0%
Unknown	19%	28%

TABLE B1.18: Areas in which Race Equality Charter was seen to be implemented within organisations [Base: n 146; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Areas	All institutions agreeing
Strategy: Embedded into institutional level strategies and/or other key documents	71%
Governance and oversight: Senior leader has a commitment/role in the initiative; or group/committee or otherwise has oversight	67%
Policies, processes and practice: Adopted/ translated into policies, processes and practice	72%
Resources: Committed to managing it/ looking after it/ supporting it	53%
Capacity Building: Provide training, guidance and resources to support the cascading of the adoption of the initiative across the institution	46%
Evaluated, reviewed and reporting: Progress/ adoption is evaluated or reviewed	48%
Incentivise the right behaviours to encourage adoption	35%
External Communication: Profile raising outside the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	40%
Internal Communication: Profile raising across the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	61%
Other	4%
Don't know	16%

TABLE B1.19: Perceived impacts from Race Equality Charter
 [Base: n 118; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Perceived impacts	All institutions agreeing
It is easy to translate the policy to processes that help staff achieve the initiative's aim	29%
The resources used in the local administration of the initiative outweighs the benefits it delivers	6%
It has a positive effect on the research culture	55%
It has a positive effect on the working environment	69%
It hinders researchers' ability to get on with their research	2%
It provides a consistent way of looking at the issue across the sector, which adds value to my institution/organisation	58%
It is easy to measure its success	22%
Has been embraced by the senior leadership team at the university	70%
It has improved structures and processes for our institution/organisation to address the issue	50%

TABLE B1.20: Perceived relationship between Race Equality Charter and other initiatives in scope for this research [Base: n 429; all aware]

Perceived relationship	All institutions agreeing
Overlaps with other initiatives	5%
Reinforces other initiatives	14%
Undermines other initiatives	1%
None	7%
Not answered ⁹	77%

Concordat on Open Research Data (established 2016)

TABLE B1.21: Levels of awareness of Concordat on Open Research Data [Base: n 510]

Levels of awareness	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 94)
'Good' understanding	27%	11%
'Reasonable' understanding	37%	27%
'Limited' understanding	26%	37%
Unaware	11%	26%

⁹ Note that participants were only asked about relationships between named initiative and three others which they had stated awareness of in order to minimise survey fatigue.

TABLE B1.22: Levels of adoption of Concordat on Open Research Data [Base: n 442; all aware]

Levels of adoption	HEIs/HEPs (n 372)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 70)
Fully adopted by institution and is part of strategy	28%	30%
Adopted by certain functions in institution, usually in terms of discrete policies or processes	33%	31%
Institution supports the principles of the initiative, but there has been limited integration into internal policies or processes	15%	16%
Institution has not responded to the initiative but intends to in the future	2%	0%
Institution has made a decision not to adopt the initiative	0%	0%
Unknown	22%	23%

TABLE B1.23: Areas in which Concordat on Open Research Data was seen to be implemented within organisations [Base: n 149; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Areas	All institutions agreeing
Strategy: Embedded into institutional level strategies and/or other key documents	61%
Governance and oversight: Senior leader has a commitment/role in the initiative; or group/committee or otherwise has oversight	60%
Policies, processes and practice: Adopted/ translated into policies, processes and practice	83%
Resources: Committed to managing it/ looking after it/ supporting it	72%
Capacity Building: Provide training, guidance and resources to support the cascading of the adoption of the initiative across the institution	59%
Evaluated, reviewed and reporting: Progress/ adoption is evaluated or reviewed	34%
Incentivise the right behaviours to encourage adoption	26%
External Communication: Profile raising outside the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	13%
Internal Communication: Profile raising across the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	60%
Other	0%
Don't know	7%

TABLE B1.24: Perceived impacts from Concordat on Open Research Data [Base: n 120; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Perceived impacts	All institutions agreeing
It is easy to translate the policy to processes that help staff achieve the initiative's aim	54%
The resources used in the local administration of the initiative outweighs the benefits it delivers	15%
It has a positive effect on the research culture	68%
It has a positive effect on the working environment	47%
It hinders researchers' ability to get on with their research	6%
It provides a consistent way of looking at the issue across the sector, which adds value to my institution/organisation	59%
It is easy to measure its success	45%
Has been embraced by the senior leadership team at the university	58%
It has improved structures and processes for our institution/organisation to address the issue	51%

TABLE B1.25: Perceived relationship between Concordat on Open Research Data and other initiatives in scope for this research [Base: n 442; all aware]

Perceived relationship	All institutions agreeing
Overlaps with other initiatives	5%
Reinforces other initiatives	15%
Undermines other initiatives	1%
None	6%
Not answered ¹⁰	76%

**San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)
(established 2013)**

TABLE B1.26: Levels of awareness of San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) [Base: n 510]

Levels of awareness	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 94)
'Good' understanding	30%	11%
'Reasonable' understanding	26%	20%
'Limited' understanding	19%	15%
Unaware	25%	54%

¹⁰ Note that participants were only asked about relationships between named initiative and three others which they had stated awareness of in order to minimise survey fatigue

TABLE B1.27: Levels of adoption of San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) [Base: n 357; all aware]

Levels of adoption	HEIs/HEPs (n 314)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 43)
Fully adopted by institution and is part of strategy	32%	16%
Adopted by certain functions in institution, usually in terms of discrete policies or processes	23%	19%
Institution supports the principles of the initiative, but there has been limited integration into internal policies or processes	17%	37%
Institution has not responded to the initiative but intends to in the future	4%	5%
Institution has made a decision not to adopt the initiative	2%	0%
Unknown	22%	23%

TABLE B1.28: Areas in which San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) was seen to be implemented within organisations [Base: n 86; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Areas	All institutions agreeing
Strategy: Embedded into institutional level strategies and/or other key documents	64%
Governance and oversight: Senior leader has a commitment/role in the initiative; or group/committee or otherwise has oversight	65%
Policies, processes and practice: Adopted/ translated into policies, processes and practice	74%
Resources: Committed to managing it/ looking after it/ supporting it	45%
Capacity Building: Provide training, guidance and resources to support the cascading of the adoption of the initiative across the institution	37%
Evaluated, reviewed and reporting: Progress/ adoption is evaluated or reviewed	30%
Incentivise the right behaviours to encourage adoption	31%
External Communication: Profile raising outside the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	29%
Internal Communication: Profile raising across the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	56%
Other	2%
Don't know	15%

TABLE B1.29: Perceived impacts from San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) [Base: n 118; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Perceived impacts	All institutions agreeing
It is easy to translate the policy to processes that help staff achieve the initiative's aim	39%
The resources used in the local administration of the initiative outweighs the benefits it delivers	8%
It has a positive effect on the research culture	62%
It has a positive effect on the working environment	58%
It hinders researchers' ability to get on with their research	3%
It provides a consistent way of looking at the issue across the sector, which adds value to my institution/organisation	57%
It is easy to measure its success	25%
Has been embraced by the senior leadership team at the university	53%
It has improved structures and processes for our institution/organisation to address the issue	39%

TABLE B1.30: Perceived relationship between San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) and other initiatives in scope for this research [Base: n 357; all aware]¹¹

Perceived relationship	All institutions agreeing
Overlaps with other initiatives	9%
Reinforces other initiatives	14%
Undermines other initiatives	0%
None	7%
Not answered ¹¹	77%

Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research (established 2010)

TABLE B1.31: Levels of awareness of Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research [Base: n 510]

Levels of awareness	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 94)
'Good' understanding	12%	3%
'Reasonable' understanding	28%	19%
'Limited' understanding	30%	34%
Unaware	30%	44%

¹¹ Note that participants were only asked about relationships between named initiative and three others which they had stated awareness of in order to minimise survey fatigue.

TABLE B1.32: Levels of adoption of Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research [Base: n 345; all aware]

Levels of adoption	HEIs/HEPs (n 292)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 53)
Fully adopted by institution and is part of strategy	14%	15%
Adopted by certain functions in institution, usually in terms of discrete policies or processes	24%	28%
Institution supports the principles of the initiative, but there has been limited integration into internal policies or processes	21%	19%
Institution has not responded to the initiative but intends to in the future	5%	2%
Institution has made a decision not to adopt the initiative	0%	0%
Unknown	37%	36%

TABLE B1.33: Areas in which Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research was seen to be implemented within organisations [Base: n 70; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Areas	All institutions agreeing
Strategy: Embedded into institutional level strategies and/or other key documents	71%
Governance and oversight: Senior leader has a commitment/role in the initiative; or group/committee or otherwise has oversight	61%
Policies, processes and practice: Adopted/ translated into policies, processes and practice	60%
Resources: Committed to managing it/ looking after it/ supporting it	57%
Capacity Building: Provide training, guidance and resources to support the cascading of the adoption of the initiative across the institution	61%
Evaluated, reviewed and reporting: Progress/ adoption is evaluated or reviewed	44%
Incentivise the right behaviours to encourage adoption	37%
External Communication: Profile raising outside the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	41%
Internal Communication: Profile raising across the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	61%
Other	0%
Don't know	10%

TABLE B1.34: Perceived impacts from Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research [Base: n 116; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Perceived impacts	All institutions agreeing
It is easy to translate the policy to processes that help staff achieve the initiative's aim	45%
The resources used in the local administration of the initiative outweighs the benefits it delivers	12%
It has a positive effect on the research culture	70%
It has a positive effect on the working environment	50%
It hinders researchers' ability to get on with their research	8%
It provides a consistent way of looking at the issue across the sector, which adds value to my institution/organisation	51%
It is easy to measure its success	22%
Has been embraced by the senior leadership team at the university	49%
It has improved structures and processes for our institution/organisation to address the issue	40%

TABLE B1.35: Perceived relationship between Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research and other initiatives in scope for this research [Base: n 345; all aware]

Perceived relationship	All institutions agreeing
Overlaps with other initiatives	7%
Reinforces other initiatives	13%
Undermines other initiatives	1%
None	6%
Not answered ¹²	77%

Technician Commitment (established 2017)

TABLE B1.36: Levels of awareness of Technician Commitment [Base: n 510]

Levels of awareness	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 94)
'Good' understanding	12%	27%
'Reasonable' understanding	19%	23%
'Limited' understanding	28%	14%
Unaware	41%	36%

¹² Note that participants were only asked about relationships between named initiative and three others which they had stated awareness of in order to minimise survey fatigue.

TABLE B1.37: Levels of adoption of Technician Commitment
 [Base: n 305; all aware]

Levels of adoption	HEIs/HEPs (n 245)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 60)
Fully adopted by institution and is part of strategy	26%	28%
Adopted by certain functions in institution, usually in terms of discrete policies or processes	31%	17%
Institution supports the principles of the initiative, but there has been limited integration into internal policies or processes	13%	20%
Institution has not responded to the initiative but intends to in the future	3%	13%
Institution has made a decision not to adopt the initiative	1%	5%
Unknown	26%	17%

TABLE B1.38: Areas in which Technician Commitment was seen to be implemented within organisations [Base: n 89; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Areas	All institutions agreeing
Strategy: Embedded into institutional level strategies and/or other key documents	56%
Governance and oversight: Senior leader has a commitment/role in the initiative; or group/committee or otherwise has oversight	67%
Policies, processes and practice: Adopted/ translated into policies, processes and practice	69%
Resources: Committed to managing it/ looking after it/ supporting it	70%
Capacity Building: Provide training, guidance and resources to support the cascading of the adoption of the initiative across the institution	60%
Evaluated, reviewed and reporting: Progress/ adoption is evaluated or reviewed	53%
Incentivise the right behaviours to encourage adoption	38%
External Communication: Profile raising outside the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	39%
Internal Communication: Profile raising across the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	71%
Other	2%
Don't know	9%

TABLE B1.39: Perceived impacts from Technician Commitment
 [Base: n 118; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Perceived impacts	All institutions agreeing
It is easy to translate the policy to processes that help staff achieve the initiative's aim	47%
The resources used in the local administration of the initiative outweighs the benefits it delivers	13%
It has a positive effect on the research culture	60%
It has a positive effect on the working environment	72%
It hinders researchers' ability to get on with their research	3%
It provides a consistent way of looking at the issue across the sector, which adds value to my institution/organisation	61%
It is easy to measure its success	29%
Has been embraced by the senior leadership team at the university	59%
It has improved structures and processes for our institution/organisation to address the issue	57%

TABLE B1.40: Perceived relationship between Technician Commitment and other initiatives in scope for this research [Base: n 305; all aware]

Perceived relationship	All institutions agreeing
Overlaps with other initiatives	5%
Reinforces other initiatives	13%
Undermines other initiatives	0%
None	7%
Not answered ¹³	77%

Concordat for the Advancement of Knowledge Exchange in Higher Education (established 2020)

TABLE B1.41: Levels of awareness of Advancement of Knowledge Exchange in Higher Education [Base: n 510]

Levels of awareness	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 94)
'Good' understanding	16%	1%
'Reasonable' understanding	19%	10%
'Limited' understanding	34%	18%
Unaware	31%	71%

¹³ Note that participants were only asked about relationships between named initiative and three others which they had stated awareness of in order to minimise survey fatigue.

TABLE B1.42: Levels of adoption of Advancement of Knowledge Exchange in Higher Education [Base: n 315; all aware]

Levels of adoption	All institutions agreeing
Fully adopted by institution and is part of strategy	26%
Adopted by certain functions in institution, usually in terms of discrete policies or processes	21%
Institution supports the principles of the initiative, but there has been limited integration into internal policies or processes	17%
Institution has not responded to the initiative but intends to in the future	3%
Institution has made a decision not to adopt the initiative	0%
Unknown	35%

TABLE B1.43: Areas in which Advancement of Knowledge Exchange in Higher Education was seen to be implemented within organisations [Base: n 79; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Areas	All institutions agreeing
Strategy: Embedded into institutional level strategies and/or other key documents	73%
Governance and oversight: Senior leader has a commitment/role in the initiative; or group/committee or otherwise has oversight	72%
Policies, processes and practice: Adopted/ translated into policies, processes and practice	68%
Resources: Committed to managing it/ looking after it/ supporting it	67%
Capacity Building: Provide training, guidance and resources to support the cascading of the adoption of the initiative across the institution	54%
Evaluated, reviewed and reporting: Progress/ adoption is evaluated or reviewed	49%
Incentivise the right behaviours to encourage adoption	34%
External Communication: Profile raising outside the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	28%
Internal Communication: Profile raising across the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	63%
Other	5%
Don't know	10%

TABLE B1.44: Perceived impacts from Advancement of Knowledge Exchange in Higher Education [Base: n 116; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Perceived impacts	All institutions agreeing
It is easy to translate the policy to processes that help staff achieve the initiative's aim	41%
The resources used in the local administration of the initiative outweighs the benefits it delivers	21%
It has a positive effect on the research culture	49%
It has a positive effect on the working environment	47%
It hinders researchers' ability to get on with their research	6%
It provides a consistent way of looking at the issue across the sector, which adds value to my institution/organisation	53%
It is easy to measure its success	34%
Has been embraced by the senior leadership team at the university	64%
It has improved structures and processes for our institution/organisation to address the issue	49%

TABLE B1.45: Perceived relationship between Advancement of Knowledge Exchange in Higher Education and other initiatives in scope for this research [Base: n 305; all aware]

Perceived relationship	All institutions agreeing
Overlaps with other initiatives	8%
Reinforces other initiatives	14%
Undermines other initiatives	1%
None	7%
Not answered ¹⁴	77%

Concordat on Openness on Animal Research (established 2014)

TABLE B1.46: Levels of awareness of Openness on Animal Research [Base: n 510]

Levels of awareness	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 94)
'Good' understanding	8%	19%
'Reasonable' understanding	16%	9%
'Limited' understanding	28%	29%
Unaware	48%	44%

¹⁴ Note that participants were only asked about relationships between named initiative and three others which they had stated awareness of in order to minimise survey fatigue.

TABLE B1.47: Levels of adoption of Openness on Animal Research
 [Base: n 270; all aware]

Levels of adoption	HEIs/HEPs (n 217)	Non-HEIs/Non-HEPs (n 53)
Fully adopted by institution and is part of strategy	20%	34%
Adopted by certain functions in institution, usually in terms of discrete policies or processes	24%	21%
Institution supports the principles of the initiative, but there has been limited integration into internal policies or processes	8%	11%
Institution has not responded to the initiative but intends to in the future	4%	2%
Institution has made a decision not to adopt the initiative	2%	4%
Unknown	41%	28%

TABLE B1.48: Areas in which Openness on Animal Research was seen to be implemented within organisations [Base: n 64; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Areas	All institutions agreeing
Strategy: Embedded into institutional level strategies and/or other key documents	33%
Governance and oversight: Senior leader has a commitment/role in the initiative; or group/committee or otherwise has oversight	61%
Policies, processes and practice: Adopted/ translated into policies, processes and practice	69%
Resources: Committed to managing it/ looking after it/ supporting it	53%
Capacity Building: Provide training, guidance and resources to support the cascading of the adoption of the initiative across the institution	38%
Evaluated, reviewed and reporting: Progress/ adoption is evaluated or reviewed	44%
Incentivise the right behaviours to encourage adoption	33%
External Communication: Profile raising outside the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	29%
Internal Communication: Profile raising across the institution to validate, support and raise awareness of the institution's commitment to it	48%
Other	6%
Don't know	20%

TABLE B1.49: Perceived impacts from Openness on Animal Research [Base: n 116; sample of those who have fully or partially adopted initiative]

Perceived impacts	All institutions agreeing
It is easy to translate the policy to processes that help staff achieve the initiative's aim	50%
The resources used in the local administration of the initiative outweighs the benefits it delivers	14%
It has a positive effect on the research culture	60%
It has a positive effect on the working environment	54%
It hinders researchers' ability to get on with their research	6%
It provides a consistent way of looking at the issue across the sector, which adds value to my institution/organisation	56%
It is easy to measure its success	33%
Has been embraced by the senior leadership team at the university	53%
It has improved structures and processes for our institution/organisation to address the issue	44%

TABLE B1.50: Perceived relationship between Openness on Animal Research and other initiatives in scope for this research [Base: n 270; all aware]¹⁵

¹⁵ Note that participants were only asked about relationships between named initiative and three others which they had stated awareness of in order to minimise survey fatigue

The background features a complex, abstract pattern of white lines on a solid blue field. The pattern consists of multiple parallel lines that curve and intersect to form a series of nested, rounded rectangular shapes, creating a sense of depth and movement. The lines are thin and evenly spaced, contributing to a clean, modern aesthetic.

Appendix C

C1. Perceptions of current working environment

TABLE C1.1: How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to your current working environment?
Summary table of Agree at all (top 3 boxes) (Base: n 510)

	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non HEIs/ Non-HEPs (n 94)
My working environment values openness and honesty about research	83%	87%
My working environment promotes a collaborative culture	81%	90%
Rigour of results is considered an important research outcome by my institution/workplace	78%	88%
My institution/ workplace inspires, educates and builds public trust and confidence in research	77%	93%
I am confident that my institution/workplace would listen and take action if I raised a concern	78%	78%
Creativity is welcomed within my working environment in all its forms	76%	79%
My institution/ workplace recognises all contributions to research	64%	71%
My institution/ workplace ensures it has the right resources to promote high quality research	58%	78%
My institution/ workplace incentivises the right behaviours among research staff	59%	68%
The culture around research in my working environment supports my ability to do good quality research	53%	62%
My working environment promotes a good work-life balance	49%	68%
The culture around research in my working environment enables us to attract and retain the best research talent	48%	63%

continued...

	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non HEIs/ Non-HEPs (n 94)
The level of administration in my institution's research environment stifles the focus on high quality research	40%	30%
My institution/workplace could do more to ensure research practices do not cut corners	33%	28%
My institution/workplace places more value on meeting metrics, than it does on research quality	22%	9%
Diversity of thought isn't effectively supported through my working environment	15%	22%
My institution/workplace values speed of results over quality	12%	9%

C2. Perceptions of organisational culture in comparison with other workplaces

TABLE C2.1: How do you think your organisation/workplace compares to other research workplaces in regards to encouraging a good working environment? (Base: n 510)

	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non HEIs/ Non-HEPs (n 94)
Performs better (5-7)	45%	70%
Performs about the same (4)	26%	16%
Performs worse (1-3)	19%	22%
Don't know	6%	7%

TABLE C2.2: How do you think your institution/workplace compares to other research workplaces in regards to encouraging good research culture? (Base: n 510)

	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non HEIs/ Non-HEPs (n 94)
Performs better (5-7)	43%	70%
Performs about the same (4)	27%	17%
Performs worse (1-3)	23%	4%
Don't know	7%	7%

C3. Perceptions of influences on research culture and the working environment

TABLE C3.1: Which of these are influential in terms of driving a positive research culture/ working environment in your institution/organisation? Summary table of Very Influential (top box) (Base: n 510)

	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non HEIs/ Non-HEPs (n 94)
Research Team Leaders	50%	57%
REF (The Research Excellence Framework)	60%	6%
Funders	50%	46%
Researchers/ research community	49%	46%
Vice Chancellor or other leader of your institution	42%	52%
Institutional strategy	41%	46%
Heads of Department	37%	49%
Other colleagues	35%	47%
Concordats and agreements	29%	22%
National government policies	24%	29%
HR policies & practice	17%	21%
Industry	13%	7%
KEF (Knowledge Exchange Framework)	9%	4%

C4. Perceptions of influence of initiatives on research culture and the working environment

TABLE C4.1: This survey is seeking to understand the influence the initiatives have on promoting a positive working environment and driving a positive research culture and ultimately delivers better research outcomes. Summary table of Agree (top 3 boxes) (Base: n 510)

	HEIs/HEPs (n 416)	Non HEIs/ Non-HEPs (n 94)
There are clear benefits from these initiatives on driving better research practice and outcomes	73%	73%
Our institution is able to make more confident choices and decisions because of these initiatives	65%	51%
It is difficult to measure their impact on driving a positive working environment	55%	54%
It is difficult to measure their impact on driving positive research culture	52%	57%
These initiatives have a limited impact on driving a positive working environment	28%	23%
These initiatives have a limited impact on driving positive research culture	26%	20%
The initiatives have a net negative effect on the research environment	4%	11%



Appendix D

D1. TRAC Peer Group analysis on current working environment

TABLE D1.1: How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to your current working environment?
Summary table of Agree at all (top 3 boxes) (Base: n 416)

	Peer Group A (n 124)	Peer Group B (n 79)	Peer Group C (n 99)	Peer Group D,E & F (n 114)
My working environment values openness and honesty about research	85%	81%	78%	87%
My working environment promotes a collaborative culture	85%	77%	81%	79%
Rigour of results is considered an important research outcome by my institution/workplace	79%	81%	74%	78%
My institution/ workplace inspires, educates and builds public trust and confidence in research	85%	78%	74%	69%
I am confident that my institution/workplace would listen and take action if I raised a concern	81%	76%	77%	76%
Creativity is welcomed within my working environment in all its forms	76%	70%	74%	82%
My institution/ workplace recognises all contributions to research	62%	59%	61%	71%
My institution/ workplace ensures it has the right resources to promote high quality research	78%	53%	46%	50%
My institution/ workplace incentivises the right behaviours among research staff	60%	54%	62%	57%
The culture around research in my working environment supports my ability to do good quality research	55%	57%	52%	48%
My working environment promotes a good work-life balance	49%	43%	48%	53%
The culture around research in my working environment enables us to attract and retain the best research talent	69%	44%	37%	36%

continued...

	Peer Group A (n 124)	Peer Group B (n 79)	Peer Group C (n 99)	Peer Group D,E & F (n 114)
The level of administration in my institution's research environment stifles the focus on high quality research	40%	39%	45%	36%
My institution/workplace could do more to ensure research practices do not cut corners	39%	34%	29%	29%
My institution/workplace places more value on meeting metrics, than it does on research quality	19%	20%	28%	20%
Diversity of thought isn't effectively supported through my working environment	13%	16%	18%	15%
My institution/workplace values speed of results over quality	13%	15%	11%	10%

D2. TRAC Peer Group analysis on perceptions of organisational culture in comparison with other workplaces

TABLE D2.1: How do you think your organisation/workplace compares to other research workplaces in regards to encouraging a good working environment? (Base: n 416)

	Peer Group A (n 124)	Peer Group B (n 79)	Peer Group C (n 99)	Peer Group D,E & F (n 114)
Performs better (5-7)	56%	43%	38%	41%
Performs about the same (4)	24%	28%	30%	24%
Performs worse (1-3)	12%	24%	26%	28%
Don't know	7%	4%	5%	6%

TABLE D2.2: How do you think your institution/workplace compares to other research workplaces in regards to encouraging good research culture? (Base: n 416)

	Peer Group A (n 124)	Peer Group B (n 79)	Peer Group C (n 99)	Peer Group D,E & F (n 114)
Performs better (5-7)	60%	46%	28%	37%
Performs about the same (4)	23%	29%	37%	20%
Performs worse (1-3)	9%	18%	28%	36%
Don't know	9%	6%	6%	6%

D3. Additional TRAC Peer Group analysis on perceptions of influences on research culture and the working environment

TABLE D3.1: How influential are the following in terms of driving a positive research culture/ working environment in your institution/organisation? Summary table of Very Influential (top box) (Base: n 416)

	Peer Group A (n 124)	Peer Group B (n 79)	Peer Group C (n 99)	Peer Group D,E & F (n 114)
Research Team Leaders	57%	42%	49%	48%
REF (The Research Excellence Framework)	56%	51%	61%	71%
Funders	59%	54%	45%	42%
Researchers/ research community	52%	52%	54%	40%
Vice Chancellor or other leader of your institution	41%	46%	37%	45%
Institutional strategy	37%	37%	35%	53%
Heads of Department	55%	33%	32%	24%
Other colleagues	36%	37%	38%	29%
Concordats and agreements	32%	25%	25%	32%
National government policies	23%	25%	21%	26%
HR policies & practice	17%	22%	11%	20%
Industry	8%	19%	14%	12%
KEF (Knowledge Exchange Framework)	9%	8%	8%	11%

D4. Additional TRAC Peer Group analysis on perceptions of influences on awareness, familiarity and adoption of initiatives

TABLE D4.1: How familiar are you with each... Summary table of All Aware (Base: n 416)

	Peer Group A (n 124)	Peer Group B (n 79)	Peer Group C (n 99)	Peer Group D,E & F (n 114)
Athena Swan Charter	99%	100%	98%	96%
Race Equality Charter	94%	89%	93%	96%
Concordat on Open Research Data	88%	90%	92%	89%
Concordat to Support Research Integrity	92%	81%	89%	89%
Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers	93%	85%	84%	84%
San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)	84%	73%	75%	68%
Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research	67%	68%	71%	75%
Concordat for the Advancement of Knowledge Exchange in Higher Education	67%	72%	67%	72%
Technician Commitment	69%	57%	55%	53%
Leiden Manifesto on Research Metrics	62%	61%	63%	55%
Concordat on Openness on Animal Research	65%	49%	44%	47%
UKCDR Guidance on Safeguarding in International Development Research	49%	62%	57%	61%

D5. Additional TRAC Peer Group analysis on adoption of initiatives

TABLE D5.1: How would you describe how your institution/organisation has responded to... Summary table of all fully adopted (Base: n 166)

	Peer Group A (n 51)	Peer Group B (n 25)	Peer Group C (n 35)	Peer Group D,E & F (n 55)
Concordat to Support Research Integrity	45%	39%	40%	54%
Concordat on Open Research Data	38%	23%	20%	31%
Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers	54%	57%	35%	48%
Concordat for the Advancement of Knowledge Exchange in Higher Education	31%	37%	23%	21%
Athena Swan Charter	76%	67%	60%	59%
Race Equality Charter	47%	39%	45%	45%
Concordat for Engaging the Public with Research	18%	13%	11%	12%
Concordat on Openness on Animal Research	31%	18%	14%	9%
UKCDR Guidance on Safeguarding in International Development Research	20%	16%	9%	4%
Technician Commitment	40%	27%	17%	15%
San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)	42%	24%	26%	28%
Leiden Manifesto on Research Metrics	23%	10%	6%	11%





Appendix E

E1. Statistical analysis

Our statistical analysis involved running spearman (non-parametric) correlations on the survey data to measure the degree of association between the overall adoption of an initiative (Q9), the methods of implementation of that initiative (Q10) and the perceived impact (Q11)

Correlation is measured in magnitude between zero and one. Values close to zero indicate no relationship and close to one indicate a strong relationship. Results are given in Table E1 below.

A positive relationship implies that movement up and down both scales move in the same direction. A negative relationship implies that movement up and down on one scale implies a movement in the opposite direction on the other scale.

Note that in Q9, a score of 1 = fully adopted. Consequently, a high negative correlation indicates a strong link between the greater adoption of an initiative, and the method of implementation or the perceived impact.

TABLE E1. Spearman correlations between Q9 (adoption of an initiative) vs Q10 (how implemented) and Q11 (perceived impact).

	Research Integrity	Open Research Data	Career Development of Researchers	Knowledge Exchange	Athena Swan Charter	Race Equality Charter	Engaging the Public with Research	Openness on Animal Research	Safeguarding in International Development Research	Technician Commitment	(DORA)	Leiden
Q10_01 Strategy	-0.237	-0.400	-0.263	-0.205	-0.142	-0.278	-0.272	-0.099	-0.120	-0.139	-0.170	-0.245
Q10_02 Governance and oversight	-0.178	-0.329	-0.233	0.058	-0.160	-0.323	-0.218	-0.155	-0.147	-0.161	-0.158	-0.072
Q10_03 Policies, processes and practice	-0.166	-0.195	-0.194	0.066	-0.169	-0.105	-0.214	-0.181	-0.270	0.062	-0.192	-0.177
Q10_04 Resources	-0.196	-0.215	-0.252	-0.175	-0.123	-0.262	-0.200	-0.137	-0.115	-0.179	-0.110	-0.176
Q10_05 Capacity Building	-0.354	-0.324	-0.199	-0.126	-0.094	-0.191	-0.216	-0.101	-0.088	-0.147	-0.094	-0.141
Q10_06 Evaluated, reviewed and reporting	-0.279	-0.291	-0.293	-0.129	-0.138	-0.193	-0.158	-0.118	-0.065	-0.126	-0.084	-0.107
Q10_07 Incentivise the right behaviours to encourage adoption	-0.164	-0.098	-0.199	-0.085	-0.078	-0.121	-0.137	-0.093	-0.088	-0.090	-0.084	-0.159

continued...

	Research Integrity	Open Research Data	Career Development of Researchers	Knowledge Exchange	Athena Swan Charter	Race Equality Charter	Engaging the Public with Research	Openness on Animal Research	Safeguarding in International Development Research	Technician Commitment	(DORA)	Leiden
Q10_08 External Communication	-0.227	-0.272	-0.263	-0.082	-0.086	-0.161	-0.147	-0.108	-0.055	-0.106	-0.074	-0.065
Q10_09 Internal Communication	-0.273	-0.081	-0.315	-0.161	-0.130	-0.219	-0.216	-0.130	-0.148	-0.180	-0.132	-0.189
Q10_10 Other	0.122		-0.113	-0.030	0.006	0.060		-0.031		-0.009	-0.015	-0.061
Q10_11 Don't know	0.079	0.156	0.111	-0.028	0.003	0.107	0.235	-0.062	-0.043	-0.025	-0.030	-0.110
Q11_01 It is easy to translate the policy to processes that help staff achieve the initiative's aim	-0.274	-0.022	-0.242	-0.357	-0.308	-0.262	-0.129	-0.105	-0.092	-0.230	-0.336	-0.060
Q11_02 The resources used in the local administration of the initiative outweighs the benefits it delivers	0.100	-0.102	0.236	0.039	0.112	-0.048	0.027	-0.108	-0.202	-0.015	-0.043	0.054
Q11_03 It has a positive effect on the research culture	-0.232	-0.136	-0.323	-0.351	-0.217	-0.221	-0.131	-0.240	-0.241	-0.289	-0.322	-0.106
Q11_04 It has a positive effect on the working environment	-0.233	-0.081	-0.347	-0.375	-0.317	-0.183	-0.130	-0.215	-0.289	-0.343	-0.229	-0.106
Q11_05 It hinders researchers' ability to get on with their research	0.110	0.075	0.248	0.055	0.059	0.187	-0.015	0.177	0.047	0.213	-0.003	0.123

continued...

	Research Integrity	Open Research Data	Career Development of Researchers	Knowledge Exchange	Athena Swan Charter	Race Equality Charter	Engaging the Public with Research	Openness on Animal Research	Safeguarding in International Development Research	Technician Commitment	(DORA)	Leiden
Q11_06 Q11. It provides a consistent way of looking at the issue across the sector, which adds value to my institution/organisation	-0.140	0.000	-0.305	-0.200	-0.189	-0.267	-0.256	-0.033	-0.101	-0.314	-0.243	-0.110
Q11_07 Q11. Concordat:: It is easy to measure its success	-0.121	-0.063	-0.083	-0.306	-0.284	-0.118	-0.081	-0.146	-0.091	-0.110	-0.239	-0.006
Q11_08 Q11. Concordat:: Has been embraced by the senior leadership team at the university	-0.569	-0.492	-0.448	-0.408	-0.597	-0.368	-0.351	-0.535	-0.453	-0.575	-0.577	-0.093
Q11_09 It has improved structures and processes for our institution/organisation to address the issue	-0.275	-0.216	-0.396	-0.316	-0.425	-0.235	-0.132	-0.230	-0.186	-0.511	-0.421	-0.076

This research has been commissioned by UUK, UKRI and Wellcome. The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of UUK, UKRI or Wellcome.





Woburn House
20 Tavistock Square
London, WC1H 9HQ

+44 (0)20 7419 4111
info@universitiesuk.ac.uk
universitiesuk.ac.uk
@UniversitiesUK



January 2022
ISBN: 978-1-84036-421-7