

UNIVERSITY



Freedom of Information 2023

Support for
research staff
*Advice to
Branches*

Contents

Executive summary	3
.....	
The league table	4
.....	
Background	7
.....	
The Freedom of Information request	8
.....	
The responses	9
.....	
The scoring system	10
.....	
What the results show us	11
.....	
Moving to a more sustainable model of research employment	11
.....	
Advice to branches	14
.....	
Appendix 1: Email to Vice-chancellors 16/5/23	16
.....	
Appendix 2: The FOI questions	16
.....	
Appendix 3: The weighting and scoring	18
.....	
Appendix 4a: The scoring in full	22
.....	
Appendix 4b: The percentage score for each factor	29
.....	
Appendix 5: Examples of bridging funds and extended notice periods	38
.....	
Appendix 6: Examples of enhanced redundancy schemes	40
.....	

We have produced this branch-focused document to supplement our report on the Research Staff FOI (see: <https://www.ucu.org.uk?mediaid=14251>)

Executive summary

Given the endemic casualisation amongst research only staff in UK universities and the known impact on staff of such precarity we were interested to find out how many employers were taking active, positive steps to address the issue.

We therefore sent a Freedom of Information request to every UK higher education institution (HEI) that employed at least 20 research-only staff and/or where research staff made up at least 5% of the academic staff (according to the HESA staff data 2020/21): 103 employers in total.

The purpose of the questions contained in the FOI request was to determine the level of support that HEIs are providing to their research-only staff to improve their security of employment.

We then weighted each of the questions we asked and allocated a score to each response to develop a league table (see below) of employers.

We hope that the league table and any publicity surrounding it will encourage employers to work with their local UCU branches to address the high levels of precarity that our research-staff members have to endure.

Branches are urged to:

- ➡ Look at how your employer scores in the league table and using the information in Appendix 4b identify areas that your employer has scored poorly on and determine how

the situation could be improved (for example by adopting some of the better or model practices highlighted);

- ➔ Use the action points (page 10 onwards) and the advice in <https://www.ucu.org.uk/circ/pdf/UCUBANHE85.pdf> to develop a local action plan.

The league table

Using the scoring method agreed (see below and Appendix 3) we inputted all the data for each institution and ranked them by total score (%).

At Appendix 4a we list the individual scoring for each HEI against each element and at 4b the % score for each factor indicating how well each institution has scored for each individual metric.

Institution	Total score / 100
Employer demonstrating better practice in all areas	100
The University of Leeds	64
Ulster University	62
The University of Aberdeen	61.5
University College London	54.5
Queen's University Belfast	53.5
The University of Lancaster	53.5
Cranfield University	53
The University of York	50.5
The University of Leicester	49.5
The University of Manchester	48.5
The University of Glasgow	48.5
The University of the West of Scotland	48
The University of Sheffield	47.5
The Manchester Metropolitan University	45.5
Newcastle University	44.5
Bournemouth University	43.5
Glasgow School of Art	43.5
The University of Birmingham	42.5
The University of Stirling	42.5
University of Nottingham	41.5
Bangor University	41.5

Institution	Total score / 100
Swansea University	40.5
The University of Bath	40.5
City, University of London	40.5
Royal College of Art	40.5
The University of Bristol	40
The University of Liverpool	38.5
The University of Sussex	38.5
Liverpool John Moores University	38.5
The University of Essex	38.5
Kingston University	38
The University of Cambridge	37.5
The University of Edinburgh	37.5
Cardiff University	37.5
The University of Dundee	37.5
The University of Kent	37.5
St George's, University of London	36.5
Glasgow Caledonian University	36.5
Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine	36
University of Gloucestershire	35.5
University of the West of England	35.5
The Open University	34.5
Anglia Ruskin University	34.5
King's College London	34
The University of Lincoln	34
Oxford Brookes University	34
London School of Economics and Political Science	33.5
The University of East Anglia	33.5
Heriot-Watt University	33.5
SRUC	33.5
The University of Salford	32.5
Aston University	32
Queen Mary University of London	31.5
The University of Hull	31.5

Institution	Total score / 100
Edinburgh Napier University	31.5
The University of Warwick	30.5
University of Plymouth	30.5
Teesside University	30.5
University of Hertfordshire	30
The Royal Veterinary College	29
University of Wales Trinity Saint David	29
University of Chester	29
Sheffield Hallam University	28.5
The University of Westminster	28.5
The University of Bradford	28.5
Abertay University	28.5
Loughborough University	28
Royal Holloway and Bedford New College	28
University of South Wales	27.5
The University of Oxford	26.5
Brunel University London	26.5
The University of Strathclyde	25.5
The University of St. Andrews	25.5
The University of Brighton	25.5
University of the Highlands and Islands	25.5
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	24.5
London South Bank University	24.5
Queen Margaret University, Edinburgh	24.5
The University of Huddersfield	23.5
Canterbury Christ Church University	23.5
The University of Exeter	23
University of Durham	22.5
The University of Surrey	22.5
The University of Reading	22.5
Robert Gordon University	22.5
Middlesex University	21.5
Birkbeck College	20.5

Institution	Total score / 100
The University of Central Lancashire	20.5
Keele University	20.5
Goldsmiths College	20.5
Aberystwyth University	19.5
Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine	18.5
Birmingham City University	18.5
University of London (Institutes and activities)	18.5
The University of Wolverhampton	17.5
The University of Greenwich	16.5
The University of East London	16.5
SOAS University of London	13

Background

A small group of UCU anti-casualisation and researcher activists, including members of our Anti-Casualisation Committee, started to meet in 2022 to discuss how we could better target resources to campaign for, and support branches in seeking, more secure employment for 'research only' staff (the term used by HESA in their data collection).

Research staff remain one of the most casualised groups of staff in higher education with 66% employed on a fixed-term contract, a figure that has changed little in the last decade. Even where staff are moved to 'open ended' contracts, these are often still linked to an 'at risk date' when a particular research funding stream comes to an end.

We have published the data on casualisation for many years; the most recent data (taken from the HESA staff record 2021/22) can be found at: <https://www.ucu.org.uk/heprecarity>

We have published our own reports on the impact of casualisation (Counting the Cost of Casualisation in HE: https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/10336/Counting-the-costs-of-casualisation-in-higher-education-Jun-19/pdf/ucu_casualisation_in_HE_survey_report_Jun_19.pdf and highlighted reports by others about the negative impacts on, for example academic freedom¹ and reproducibility of research.²

The new people and culture element (PCE) of REF 2029 also makes it financially expedient for employers to address the endemic casualisation within research culture.

We have also, over many years, published advice on how we think the employment security of research staff can be improved; most recently in in our guidance at: <https://www.ucu.org.uk/circ/pdf/UCUBANHE85.pdf> (member log-in required).

¹Joint Committee of Experts of UNESCO and the International Labour Organisation report 2022

²House of Commons Committee report Reproducibility and Research Integrity May 2023

So we had some data about the precarious employment of research staff in the sector, its impact and a vision of where we would like to be. However, the group felt that we were lacking data about the measures (or lack thereof) that employers were taking to help research staff out of precarity and to make their employment more secure.

The group therefore agreed that they would like to gather data on a range of support measures and use that with the published HESA data to rank employers according to the levels of support they provide to their research staff to improve their security of employment.

The Freedom of Information request

We decided to develop and send a Freedom of Information request to every higher education institution (HEI) that employed at least 20 research-only staff and/or where research staff made up at least 5% of the academic staff (according to the HESA staff data 2020/21).

On 15 May 2023 we sent an introductory email to the Vice-Chancellor/Principal of 103 HEIs that met the above criteria – see Appendix 1 for the text.

We followed that up with the Freedom of Information request that was sent on 23 May 2023 to the published contact at each HEI.

The purpose of the questions contained in the FOI request was to determine the level of support that HEIs are providing to their research only staff to improve their security of employment.

In total we asked 10 questions (in addition to institutional details), with a further request for details if the respondent replied in a particular way. The full list of questions can be seen at Appendix 2.

In our most recent guidance we emphasise the need to use better workforce planning to break the link between finite external funding and employment contracts and many of the measures we asked about in the FOI (e.g. redeployment, bridge funding) can be used to underpin a move to genuine security of employment.

To date we have received 98 responses.

The University of Southampton sent an incomplete reply that we asked to be reviewed on 25 July. To date we have not had a response.

We have had no response from the following institutions:

- ➡ The London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
- ➡ The University of Bedfordshire
- ➡ Bishop Grosseteste University
- ➡ The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama

The responses

The main purpose of the FOI was to gather data to allow us to develop a league table of employers and the levels of support they offered to their research staff to improve their security of employment.

However, it is worth highlighting some of the responses we received.

1 What are the standard contractual arrangements for research only staff at your institution?

The majority of respondents reported that they used a mixture of contracts for research staff or that there was no standard contract in use (84%).

4 Do you offer a period of redeployment to fixed-term research staff (or those with an identified 'at risk' date) where they have priority for suitable vacant or new posts? If yes, for how long.

90% of respondents reported that they did offer some form of redeployment. The most common period in which redeployment was offered was 3 or 4 months or during the contractual notice period.

5. In the last 24 months, when members of research staff have come to the end of their fixed-term contract or the project they have been working on has come to an end, what percentage have been successfully redeployed (or had their contract renewed/extended)?

We asked this question to try and measure how successful employers were in putting in place measures to avoid the dismissal of research-only staff at the end of a fixed-term contract or fixed-term external funding, whilst recognising that a high rate of extension or renewal might (also) reflect a particularly egregious use of fixed-term contracts, especially very short contracts, which consequently become easier than usual to renew or extend.

It is of great concern to us that nearly a third of employers (29 or 30%) were unable to answer this question or sought an exemption to the question based on how long it would take to extract the data.

Our simple question is – if you are not measuring this, how do you know how successful your measures are?

The responses from those institutions who did respond ranged from 0% to over 80%.

6. Do you offer any form of 'bridging' funding to allow research only staff to maintain employment between externally funded projects or other sources of work? if so, please give details.

59% of respondents reported offering some form of bridging but in the majority of cases this was not subject to a formal policy nor supported by central funding but was managed on a case-by-case basis, usually where future funding was already, or was likely to be, secured.

7. Do you offer an enhanced paid notice period to research only staff on fixed-term contracts? If so, please give details.

Only one employer offered this (Manchester).

8. Do you offer an enhanced redundancy payment to research only staff if they are dismissed at the end of a fixed-term contract?

The majority of respondents paid only statutory redundancy pay to research staff dismissed at the end of a fixed-term contract. Just 3 (Leeds, QUB and Ulster) offered what we would consider a significant enhancement on statutory redundancy pay.

9. Is the institution a signatory to the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers?

All but 10 of the respondents were a signatory to the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers but this seemed to have little bearing on the level of support they offered to their staff in terms of job security. It should be noted that the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Research staff states that employers must: "Seek to improve job security for researchers, for example through more effective redeployment processes and greater use of open-ended contracts..."

10. Are there on-going efforts to improve the security of employment of research only staff at your institution within the next 12 months? If so, please give details.

76% of respondents responded yes to this question, although this ranged from vague commitments to support research staff to on-going negotiations with UCU locally to improve the security of employment of research staff.

The scoring system

Once we had the responses, we had to decide:

- ➡ What other data we wanted to use to score each HEI
- ➡ What weighting should be attached to each question / data set (we all agreed that some metrics were more important than others in tackling casualisation)
- ➡ How to score each of the responses to each question

The group appreciated this was not an exact science and that there was no perfect weighting or scoring system. However, the decisions were subject to lengthy discussions and all scoring was carried out by a single member of staff to ensure consistency in scoring across different HEIs.

In addition to the data gathered from the FOI we also looked at the latest HESA staff data on the use of fixed-term contracts for research-only staff (2021/22) and whether the employer was a signatory to the Vitae HR Excellence Award.

The agreed weighting and scoring are set out at Appendix 3.

What the results show us

There is clearly a range in the level of support available to research staff to improve security of employment across the sector, and there appears to be no obvious correlation between type of institution and score achieved.

We therefore believe that the amount of support to improve security of employment is a choice on the part of the employer, and not driven by circumstance (as is often claimed).

For all but one factor, at least one institution (and often more than one) scored the highest, demonstrating that better practice is indeed possible.

However, no institution scored the maximum on all factors.

We believe that it is possible for an employer to have a range of measures in places and be able to score maximum points under each factor and thus score 100 / 100 overall.

On a (slightly) more positive note; more than a ¼ (26%) of institutions responded that in the last 24 months, when members of research staff have come to the end of their fixed-term contract or the project they have been working on has come to an end, over 60% have been successfully redeployed (or had their contract renewed / extended). That figure rises to more than a 1/3 (38%) for those who were able to provide a response to that question.

If you are in one of those institutions then the branch needs to be asking why, given the likely resource this takes, across different departments and institutional bodies, added to the stress and other disadvantages of insecure employment for the research staff themselves, your employer continues to use fixed-term contracts / 'at risk' dates as the default option for the majority of research staff.

Institutions are proving that it is possible to retain staff but are doing so in a way that is detrimental to researchers, the research they carry out and the institutions themselves.

Below, we set out what a better model could look like and how that could, ultimately, move to a more sustainable research model.

Moving to a more sustainable model of research employment

ACTION POINT 1: THE % OF RESEARCH STAFF ON A FIXED-TERM CONTRACT AND USE OF FIXED-TERM CONTRACTS

The fact that the percentage of research only staff on a fixed-term contract in research intensive universities ranges from 2% (UCL) to 99% (LSHTM) shows that the widespread use of such contracts is a choice, not a necessity.

We have been unable to measure the numbers of research staff employed on open-ended contracts with an identified 'at risk' date but we believe such contracts offer few tangible benefits to staff and leave them feeling as insecure as a fixed-term contract would do. It is worth asking your employer for the data on the use of 'at risk' contracts and the number of staff affected.



Ask your employer for a commitment to work with the local UCU branch to set targets for the reduction in the use of insecure contracts for research staff with the aim of all (but an exceptional few) research staff being employed on a secure contract within an agreed timeframe. This should include regular reviews of fixed-term contracts to assess whether any objective justification used for the use of such a contract originally still applies.

ACTION POINT 2: THE USE OF REDEPLOYMENT

Given the current funding model in the UK, a move away from current employment practices to something more sustainable will require employers to look at ways of retaining research staff when funding for a particular project comes to an end.

One key factor in this will be the use of redeployment or a method to allow research staff to move between projects—in many cases, this can and should be a step towards breaking the link between employment contracts and finite external funding altogether. An effective redeployment policy can, in this way, be viewed as a workload management tool.

If you do not already have a robust redeployment scheme in place then consider making a claim to include the introduction of such a scheme (or to improve a scheme you already have if it is not working for research staff). A good redeployment scheme will be:

- ➡ actively pursued by the employer and not left to the individual members of staff
- ➡ timely (to start at least 6 months before contract / funding ends)
- ➡ managed in a way that reduces the stress and impact on the individual involved.

ACTION POINT 3: THE USE OF BRIDGING FUNDS/EXTENDED NOTICE PERIODS

The purpose of both bridging funds and an extended paid notice period following a finite-funded project is to allow research staff (and the employer) time and space to between funded projects (or other work) to find further / alternative work. This could allow time for redeployment, a move to another project to be properly explored and / or for a member of staff to pursue other interests that may lead to further employment. It can also function as an investment on the part of the institution in securing further external research funding.

Although the majority of employers did offer some sort of bridging fund, very few had an agreed university wide process or central funding. Even the more advanced policies had stringent criteria to access them including length of service and future funding already having been secured.

Part of any negotiations on improving security should include discussion on a bridging scheme available to all staff that would be:

- ➡ actively managed by the employer
- ➡ available to all research staff (and indeed all staff with research qualifications or experience)
- ➡ centrally funded with dedicated funding
- ➡ not requiring future funding to be already secured, and enabling staff to actively work towards gaining future funding during the bridging period (a form of ‘active bridge funding’)

- ➡ long enough for all alternatives to be properly explored
- ➡ allowing staff to explore a range of opportunities as an alternative to dismissal.

We are ultimately seeking permanent underwriting of research roles (and more permanent teaching and research posts) through workforce planning that recognises the continuity of work and/or funding in many areas (though there may be a particular finite funding arrangement at any given time).

High-quality bridge funding merges seamlessly into permanent underwriting, and can transition into it.

Whilst we are not recommending them, we have included some examples of bridge funding and extended notice periods that are in operation at Appendix 5. All these failed to score the maximum in our league table but they did score the most highly and would be a good basis to build from.

ACTION POINT 4: ENHANCED REDUNDANCY PAYMENTS

Obviously, we are seeking to avoid dismissals but a substantial redundancy payment could provide the following:

- ➡ a financial cushion to allow the member of staff time to find alternative work
- ➡ an incentive for the employer to properly explore all alternatives to dismissal
- ➡ the option to transform some of the redundancy payment into an extended notice period to maximise the possibility of redeployment.

Employers offering only statutory redundancy pay are doing nothing to compensate researchers for their insecure careers nor to recognise that the current endemic use of fixed-term contracts leads to research staff moving between institutions and failing to build up the level of statutory redundancy payment that would give them any period of financial security if they were to be made redundant.

Ultimately, the harder and more expensive it is to make staff redundant, the more likely employers are to work to retain staff.

See Appendix 5 for examples of more generous schemes that we awarded a maximum score to.

ACTION POINT 5: MEASURING HOW WELL EMPLOYERS AVOID DISMISSALS OF RESEARCH STAFF

We know that measuring the % of research staff on a fixed-term contract is only one measure of employment security, so we were keen to try to find out how successful employers were in avoiding dismissals of research staff by means of redeployment or contract extension/renewal.

We also know that many employers, whilst not using fixed-term contracts, do widely use contracts with an 'at risk' date that do little to improve security of employment and retain staff.

We were shocked by how many employers were unable to answer this question.

If employers are serious about wanting to increase the security of employment of their research staff how are they going to measure what that success looks like?

If your employer was unable to ask this question, then you need to negotiate on metrics to measure how successful they are in reducing casualisation – which should include some measure of staff ‘churn’.

Seek agreement on measures of success for any improvements you negotiate so that you can review and revise policies if necessary.

ACTION POINT 6: WORKING WITH UCU TO IMPROVE THE SECURITY OF RESEARCH STAFF

We awarded a maximum score to those employers who were working with UCU (or planning to) on an agreed policy targeted at improving job security of research staff.

We know that things only change when UCU are involved and putting pressure on the employer. The lack of progress in tackling insecurity demonstrates that the employers will not manage this situation if left to their own devices.

No-one is claiming that changing the culture of research staff employment is going to be easy.

However, there is no moral or practical justification for carrying on with the current employment models for research staff.

Make clear to your employer that you are ready and willing to work with them on these issues but we can not stand by and witness another decade of inaction.

Advice to branches

In our report (<https://www.ucu.org.uk?mediaid=14251>) we have called on employers:

- ➡ to work with UCU towards a more sustainable model for the employment of research staff
- ➡ to commit to reducing the use of fixed-term contracts and / or open-ended contracts with an identified ‘at risk’ date
- ➡ to work with UCU to agree processes and put systems in place that support the continuity of employment and minimise the risk of redundancy at the end of a funded research project.

We urge branches to use the league table and:

- ➡ Review the advice set out in BANHE85
<https://www.ucu.org.uk/circ/pdf/UCUBANHE85.pdf>
- ➡ Look at how your employer scores in the league table and using the information in Appendix 4b, identify areas that your employer has scored poorly on and determine how the situation could be improved (for example by adopting some of the better or model practices highlighted).
- ➡ using this data and in consultation with your research staff members develop a claim that will move research staff to more secure employment. Branches will have different

priorities depending on what is already in place in their workplace and the views of their members but the overall aim is to move to a more sustainable model of employment for research staff. Advice on developing a claim can be found at:

https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/7823/Negotiating-on-casualisation-in-higher-education-a-UCU-bargaining-guide-for-branches-Dec-17/pdf/ucu_negotiatingoncasualisation_he_revdec17.pdf (although the guidance is about anti-casualisation claims more generally, the advice on developing a claim for research staff security will follow the same pattern).

- ➡ Seek negotiations with your employer on your claim and publicise this as widely as possible, building a campaign around your claim.
- ➡ Share any good (or better) practice that you win (or is already in place) with UCU by sending details to jthompson@ucu.org.uk. The more we can promote good practice and isolate bad employers, the easier it will be for the sector to move forward in this area.

Appendix 1: The email to VCs sent 16 May 2023

Dear Vice Chancellor,

I am writing to advise that we will shortly be issuing a Freedom of Information request to your institution on the support being offered to 'research only' staff employed at your institution in terms of improving their security of employment. We use the term 'research only' to reflect the categories of staff used by HESA in their staff data collection.

We understand that a significant proportion of research funding is secured in the form of fixed-term funding from research councils and other funding bodies. However, we are also aware that there are a range of practices in place to help improve the security of employment of research only staff and we are seeking to get a UK wide picture of such practices.

We are always willing to work with employers who want to tackle the endemic casualisation of research only posts. However, the unchanging UK figures on the use of fixed-term contracts for research staff and the increasing use of 'at risk' open ended contracts that do little to improve job security have prompted us to gather this information to get a fuller picture of the current situation.

We will use the results to rank institutions according to the proactive and practical steps they are taking to improve the security of employment for their research staff.

We will also share any examples of better practice that emerge.

In doing so we hope that all employers will rise to the challenge of addressing this widespread and long-standing issue.

We trust that you will work with us to gather this information and with your local UCU branch to address the high levels of casualisation that research staff have endured for decades.

Yours faithfully etc.

Appendix 2: The FOI questions

1. What are the standard contractual arrangements for research only staff at your institution?
2. How many research only staff do you currently employ on a fixed-term contract with less than 4 years' service?
3. How many research only staff do you currently employ on a fixed-term contract with at least 4 years' service?
4. Do you offer a period of redeployment to fixed-term research staff (or those with an identified 'at risk' date) where they have priority for suitable vacant or new posts? If yes, for how long.
5. In the last 24 months, when members of research staff have come to the end of their fixed-term contract or the project they have been working on has come to an end, what percentage have been successfully redeployed (or had their contract renewed / extended)?
6. Do you offer any form of 'bridging' funding to allow research only staff to maintain employment between externally funded projects or other sources of work? if so, please give details.
7. Do you offer an enhanced paid notice period to research only staff on fixed-term contracts? If so, please give details.
8. Do you offer an enhanced redundancy payment to research only staff if they are dismissed at the end of a fixed-term contract?
9. Is the institution a signatory to the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers?
10. Are there on-going efforts to improve the security of employment of research-only staff at your institution within the next 12 months? If so, please give details.

Appendix 3: The weighting and scoring

Metric	Question	Weighting	Possible responses	Scoring	Notes
1	% of research only staff on a fixed-term contract	16%			The group were conscious that this was a crude measure and does take into account staff who may be on open-ended contracts but with an identified risk date. However this is a measure of casualisation. from an established source
			75% or more	0	
			60-74%	3	
			45-59%	6	
			30-44%	8	
			15-29%	12	
			0-14%	16	
2	Type of contracts used	5%			
			Open ended	5	
			Fixed-term	0	
			Open ended with an at risk date	2.5	
			FTC-open ended after 2 years	4	
			FTC-open ended after 2 years with at a risk date	2	
			FTC-open ended after 3 years	3	
			FTC-open ended after 3 years with at a risk date	1.5	
			FTC-open ended after 4 years	2	
			FTC - open ended after 4 years with at risk date	1	
			No standard contract (mix of contracts)	2.5	
3	% of research staff on a fixed-term contract with at least 4 years' service	5%			The group felt that that employers who has a large % of staff with long (4 years +) service were in breach of the spirit of the fixed-term regulations which seeks more secure contracts for staff after 4 years.
			76-100%	0	
			51-75%	1	
			26-50%	2	
			26-50%	2	
			11-25%	3	
			6-10%	4	
			0-5%	5	
4	Do you offer redeployment?	12%			
			No	0	
			Yes, 1 month before contract end	1	
			Yes, 2 months before contract end	3	
			Yes, 3 months before contract end	5	
			Yes, for notice period	5	
			Yes, 4 months before contract end	5	
			Yes, 5 months before contract end	8	
			Yes, 6 months before contract end	10	
			Yes, more than 6 months before contract end	12	
5	% of staff successfully redeployed, renewed or extended at the end of their fixed-term contract or at the end of a fixed-term funding stream	16%			
			Not able to provide data/sought exemption from question	0	
			0-20%	2	
			21-40%	6	
			41-60%	12	
			Over 60%	16	

Metric	Question	Weighting	Possible responses	Scoring	Notes
6	Do you offer any form of bridging between funding?	12%			It was not always easy to award scores given the information provided but we have sought to be consistent in how the scores have been allocated.
			No	0	
			Ad hoc funded, varying departmental /unit policies, on future external funding	4	
			Ad hoc funded, university-level policy, dependent on future external funding	6	
			A centrally funded scheme less strictly tied to future external funding but with length of service criteria in excess of 2 years	10	
			A centrally funded scheme with less restrictive criteria regarding length of service and relationship to external funding	12	
7	Do you offer an enhanced period of paid notice to research staff?	10%			
			No	0	
			Yes	10	
8	Do you offer enhanced redundancy pay to research staff?	12%			
			No	0	
			Yes, we not apply the statutory weekly cap	6	
			Yes, no weekly cap and enhanced weeks	8	
			Yes, generous enhancement	12	
9.	Are you a signatory to the Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers?	2%			For more details see: https://researcherdevelopment.concordat.ac.uk
			No	0	
			Yes	2	
10.	Are there on-going efforts to improve the security of employment of research staff within the next 12 months	8%			It was not always easy to award scores given the information provided but we have sought to be consistent in how the scores have been allocated.
			No	0	
			Yes – ongoing or planned commitments under broad initiatives	4	
			Yes – ongoing or planned vague commitments under agreed policy with UCU	6	
			Yes, on-going or planned specific commitments under agreed policy with UCU	8	
11.	Are you a signatory to the Vitae HR Excellence in Research award	2%			For more details see: https://www.vitae.ac.uk/policy/hr-excellence-in-research
			No	0	
			Yes	2	
Total		100%			

Appendix 4a: The scoring in full

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to R'shr Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence	Total/ 100
The University of Aberdeen	16	2.5	5	12	12	6	0	0	2	4	2	61.5
Abertay University	0	2.5	3	5	12	0	0	0	2	4	0	28.5
Aberystwyth University	3	2.5	3	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	19.5
Anglia Ruskin University	0	2.5	3	5	16	0	0	0	2	4	2	34.5
Aston University	0	2	3	5	6	6	0	6	2	0	2	32
Bangor University	0	2.5	2	5	16	6	0	0	2	6	2	41.5
The University of Bath	0	2.5	5	5	2	6	0	8	2	8	2	40.5
Birkbeck College	0	2.5	3	5	0	0	0	8	0	0	2	20.5
University of Birmingham	0	2.5	3	5	16	4	0	0	2	8	2	42.5
Birmingham City University	0	2.5	4	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	18.5
Bournemouth University	6	2.5	4	5	6	6	0	6	2	4	2	43.5

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to R'shr Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence	Total/ 100
The University of Bradford	3	2.5	3	10	2	2	0	0	2	4	0	28.5
The University of Brighton	3	2.5	5	5	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	25.5
The University of Bristol	12	1	5	5	0	5	0	6	2	4	0	40
Brunel University London	0	2.5	3	5	2	6	0	0	2	4	2	26.5
The University of Cambridge	3	2.5	3	5	16	0	0	0	2	6	0	37.5
Canterbury Christchurch Uni	6	2.5	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	23.5
Cardiff University	3	2.5	2	10	0	4	0	6	2	6	2	37.5
Uni of Central Lancashire	6	2.5	3	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	20.5
University of Chester	0	2	4	5	12	0	0	0	2	2	2	29
City, University of London	16	2.5	5	5	0	0	0	6	2	4	0	40.5
Cranfield University	3	2	5	5	16	6	0	8	2	4	2	53
The University of Dundee	8	2.5	2	5	6	6	0	0	2	4	2	37.5

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to R'shr Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence	Total/ 100
University of Durham	0	2.5	3	5	0	4	0	0	2	4	2	22.5
The University of East Anglia	0	2.5	2	5	16	4	0	0	2	0	2	33.5
The University of East London	3	2.5	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	16.5
The University of Edinburgh	3	2.5	3	5	12	4	0	0	2	6	0	37.5
Edinburgh Napier University	0	2.5	5	5	0	5	0	6	2	4	2	31.5
The University of Essex	0	2.5	3	5	16	4	0	0	2	4	2	38.5
The University of Exeter	3	2	4	0	0	4	0	0	2	6	2	23
The University of Glasgow	12	2.5	5	5	16	0	0	0	2	6	0	48.5
Glasgow Caledonian University	3	2.5	4	5	12	6	0	0	2	0	2	36.5
Glasgow School of Art	12	2.5	4	5	6	0	0	8	0	4	2	43.5
University of Gloucestershire	0	2.5	4	5	12	0	0	6	2	4	0	35.5
Goldsmiths College	0	2.5	3	5	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	20.5

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to R'shr Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence	Total/ 100
The University of Greenwich	3	2.5	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	16.5
Heriot-Watt University	3	2.5	5	5	0	6	0	6	2	4	0	33.5
University of Hertfordshire	3	2	4	5	6	0	0	6	2	0	2	30
University of the Highlands & Islands	6	2.5	5	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	25.5
The University of Huddersfield	6	2.5	5	0	0	6	0	0	2	0	2	23.5
The University of Hull	0	2.5	3	10	2	6	0	0	2	4	2	31.5
Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine	0	1	4	5	12	4	0	0	2	6	2	36
King's College London	0	0	4	0	12	4	0	6	2	4	2	34
Keele University	0	2.5	3	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	20.5
The University of Kent	0	2.5	4	5	12	0	0	6	2	4	2	37.5
Kingston University	3	2	3	0	16	6	0	0	2	4	2	38
The University of Lancaster	12	2.5	5	10	16	4	0	0	2	0	2	53.5

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to R'shr Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence	Total/ 100
The University of Leeds	3	4	5	10	16	4	0	12	2	8	0	64
The University of Leicester	6	2.5	4	12	16	0	0	0	2	5	2	49.5
The University of Lincoln	0	0	4	0	16	6	0	0	2	4	2	34
The University of Liverpool	0	2.5	3	5	16	0	0	0	2	8	2	38.5
Liverpool John Moores University	0	2.5	3	5	16	4	0	0	2	4	2	38.5
Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine	0	2.5	3	5	0	6	0	0	2	0	0	18.5
London South Bank University	0	2.5	3	1	12	0	0	0	2	4	0	24.5
Loughborough University	0	2	5	5	2	0	0	6	2	4	2	28
London School of Economics and Political Science	0	2.5	4	5	0	6	0	8	2	4	2	33.5
The University of Manchester	0	2.5	3	5	12	0*	10	6	2	6	2	48.5
Manchester Met University	3	2.5	3	3	16	6	0	8	2	0	2	45.5
Middlesex University	6	2.5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	21.5

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to R'shr Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence	Total/ 100
Newcastle University	3	1.5	5	10	12	5	0	0	2	6	0	44.5
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	0	2.5	3	3	0	6	0	6	2	0	2	24.5
University of Nottingham	0	2.5	3	5	16	0	0	7	2	4	2	41.5
The Open University	3	2.5	4	5	6	6	0	0	2	4	2	34.5
The University of Oxford	0	2.5	3	5	0	6	0	0	2	6	2	26.5
Oxford Brookes University	0	2	1	5	12	6	0	0	2	4	2	34
University of Plymouth	0	2.5	3	5	0	6	0	6	2	4	2	30.5
Queen Mary Uni of London	0	2.5	2	5	6	4	0	0	2	8	2	31.5
Queen's University Belfast	0	2.5	3	10	16	0	0	12	2	8	0	53.5
Queen Margaret Uni Edinburgh	0	2.5	5	5	0	4	0	0	2	4	2	24.5
The University of Reading	0	2.5	3	5	0	4	0	0	2	4	2	22.5
Robert Gordon University	6	2.5	5	5	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	22.5

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to R'shr Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence	Total/ 100
Royal College of Art	12	2.5	3	5	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	40.5
Royal Holloway and Bedford New College	0	4	3	5	2	0	0	6	0	6	2	28
The Royal Veterinary College	0	1	5	5	2	4	0	8	2	0	2	29
The University of Salford	0	2.5	3	5	12	4	0	4	0	0	2	32.5
University of London (Institutes & activities)	0	2.5	5	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	18.5
The University of Sheffield	3	2.5	3	5	16	0	0	8	2	6	2	47.5
Sheffield Hallam University	8	2.5	4	0	0	10	0	0	2	0	2	28.5
SOAS University of London	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	13
University of South Wales	3	2.5	5	5	0	6	0	0	2	2	2	27.5
SRUC	12	2.5	4	5	0	0	0	6	0	4	0	33.5
St George's University of London	0	2.5	3	5	12	6	0	0	2	4	2	36.5
The University of St. Andrews	0	2.5	4	5	0	6	0	0	2	4	2	25.5

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to R'shr Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence	Total/ 100
The University of Stirling	0	2.5	5	5	16	6	0	0	2	4	2	42.5
The University of Strathclyde	0	2.5	4	5	0	0	0	6	2	4	2	25.5
The University of Surrey	0	2.5	3	5	0	4	0	0	2	4	2	22.5
The University of Sussex	3	1.5	5	5	0	6	0	8	2	8	0	38.5
Swansea University	3	2.5	2	8	16	0	0	0	2	5	2	40.5
Teesside University	0	2.5	3	5	12	4	0	0	2	0	2	30.5
University College London	16	2.5	3	5	12	4	0	8	2	0	2	54.5
Ulster University	0	1	3	10	16	10	0	12	2	6	2	62
University of Wales Trinity Saint David	3	2	5	5	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	29
The University of Warwick	0	2.5	3	5	12	4	0	0	2	0	2	30.5
University of the West of England	0	2.5	2	5	16	0	0	6	0	4	0	35.5
University of the West of Scotland	0	1	4	5	16	6	0	8	2	4	2	48

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence	Total/ 100
University of Westminster	3	2.5	3	0	12	0	0	0	2	4	2	28.5
University of Wolverhampton	3	2.5	5	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	17.5
The University of York	6	2.5	5	5	16	0	0	6	2	6	2	50.5

*The scheme operated at Manchester is, in effect, both a bridging scheme and an extended notice period. To avoid double counting a single measure we have awarded them points under one factor (extended notice period) only.

Appendix 4b: The percentage score for each factor

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to Researcher Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence
The University of Aberdeen	100%	50%	100%	100%	75%	50%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
Abertay University	0%	50%	60%	42%	75%	0%	0%	0%	100%	50%	0%
Aberystwyth University	19%	50%	60%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	50%	0%
Anglia Ruskin University	0%	50%	60%	42%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
Aston University	0%	40%	60%	42%	38%	50%	0%	50%	100%	0%	100%
Bangor University	0%	50%	40%	42%	100%	50%	0%	0%	100%	75%	100%
The University of Bath	0%	50%	100%	42%	13%	50%	0%	67%	100%	100%	100%
Birkbeck College	0%	50%	60%	42%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	0%	100%
The University of Birmingham	0%	50%	60%	42%	100%	33%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%
Birmingham City University	0%	50%	80%	0%	75%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Bournemouth University	38%	50%	80%	42%	38%	50%	0%	50%	100%	50%	100%

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to Researcher Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence
The University of Bradford	19%	50%	60%	83%	13%	17%	0%	0%	100%	50%	0%
The University of Brighton	19%	50%	100%	42%	38%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
The University of Bristol	75%	20%	100%	42%	0%	42%	0%	50%	100%	50%	0%
Brunel University London	0%	50%	60%	42%	13%	50%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
The University of Cambridge	19%	50%	60%	42%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	75%	0%
Canterbury Christ Church University	38%	50%	80%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	50%	0%
Cardiff University	19%	50%	40%	83%	0%	33%	0%	50%	100%	75%	100%
The University of Central Lancashire	38%	50%	60%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
University of Chester	0%	40%	80%	42%	75%	0%	0%	0%	100%	25%	100%
City, University of London	100%	50%	100%	42%	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%	50%	0%
Cranfield University	19%	40%	100%	42%	100%	50%	0%	67%	100%	50%	100%
The University of Dundee	50%	50%	40%	42%	38%	50%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to Researcher Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence
University of Durham	0%	50%	60%	42%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
The University of East Anglia	0%	50%	40%	42%	100%	33%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
The University of East London	19%	50%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	50%	0%
The University of Edinburgh	19%	50%	60%	42%	75%	33%	0%	0%	100%	75%	0%
Edinburgh Napier University	0%	50%	100%	42%	0%	42%	0%	50%	100%	50%	100%
The University of Essex	0%	50%	60%	42%	100%	33%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
The University of Exeter	19%	40%	80%	0%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%	75%	100%
The University of Glasgow	75%	50%	100%	42%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	75%	0%
Glasgow Caledonian University	19%	50%	80%	42%	75%	50%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Glasgow School of Art	75%	50%	80%	42%	38%	0%	0%	67%	0%	50%	100%
University of Gloucestershire	0%	50%	80%	42%	75%	0%	0%	50%	100%	50%	0%
Goldsmiths College	0%	50%	60%	42%	38%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to Researcher Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence
The University of Greenwich	19%	50%	40%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Heriot-Watt University	19%	50%	100%	42%	0%	50%	0%	50%	100%	50%	0%
University of Hertfordshire	19%	40%	80%	42%	38%	0%	0%	50%	100%	0%	100%
University of the Highlands and Islands	38%	50%	100%	0%	75%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
The University of Huddersfield	38%	50%	100%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
The University of Hull	0%	50%	60%	83%	13%	50%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine	0%	20%	80%	42%	75%	33%	0%	0%	100%	75%	100%
King's College London	0%	0%	80%	0%	75%	33%	0%	50%	100%	50%	100%
Keele University	0%	50%	60%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	75%	100%
The University of Kent	0%	50%	80%	42%	75%	0%	0%	50%	100%	50%	100%
Kingston University	19%	40%	60%	0%	100%	50%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
The University of Lancaster	75%	50%	100%	83%	100%	33%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to Researcher Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence
The University of Leeds	19%	80%	100%	83%	100%	33%	0%	100%	100%	100%	0%
The University of Leicester	38%	50%	80%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	63%	100%
The University of Lincoln	0%	0%	80%	0%	100%	50%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
The University of Liverpool	0%	50%	60%	42%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%
Liverpool John Moores University	0%	50%	60%	42%	100%	33%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine	0%	50%	60%	42%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
London South Bank University	0%	50%	60%	8%	75%	0%	0%	0%	100%	50%	0%
Loughborough University	0%	40%	100%	42%	13%	0%	0%	50%	100%	50%	100%
London School of Economics and Political Science	0%	50%	80%	42%	0%	50%	0%	67%	100%	50%	100%
The University of Manchester	0%	50%	60%	42%	75%	0%	100%	50%	100%	75%	100%
Manchester Metropolitan University	19%	50%	60%	25%	100%	50%	0%	67%	100%	0%	100%
Middlesex University	38%	50%	80%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to Researcher Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence
Newcastle University	19%	30%	100%	83%	75%	42%	0%	0%	100%	75%	0%
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	0%	50%	60%	25%	0%	50%	0%	50%	100%	0%	100%
University of Nottingham	0%	50%	60%	42%	100%	0%	0%	58%	100%	50%	100%
The Open University	19%	50%	80%	42%	38%	50%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
The University of Oxford	0%	50%	60%	42%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100%	75%	100%
Oxford Brookes University	0%	40%	20%	42%	75%	50%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
University of Plymouth	0%	50%	60%	42%	0%	50%	0%	50%	100%	50%	100%
Queen Mary University of London	0%	50%	40%	42%	38%	33%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%
Queen's University Belfast	0%	50%	60%	83%	100%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Queen Margaret University, Edinburgh	0%	50%	100%	42%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
The University of Reading	0%	50%	60%	42%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
Robert Gordon University	38%	50%	100%	42%	13%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to Researcher Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence
Royal College of Art	75%	50%	60%	42%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
Royal Holloway and Bedford New College	0%	80%	60%	42%	13%	0%	0%	50%	0%	75%	100%
The Royal Veterinary College	0%	20%	100%	42%	13%	33%	0%	67%	100%	0%	100%
The University of Salford	0%	50%	60%	42%	75%	33%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%
University of London (Institutes and activities)	0%	50%	100%	42%	38%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
The University of Sheffield	19%	50%	60%	42%	100%	0%	0%	67%	100%	75%	100%
Sheffield Hallam University	50%	50%	80%	0%	0%	83%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
SOAS University of London	0%	0%	80%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
University of South Wales	19%	50%	100%	42%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100%	25%	100%
SRUC	75%	50%	80%	42%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%
St George's, University of London	0%	50%	60%	42%	75%	50%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
The University of St. Andrews	0%	50%	80%	42%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to Researcher Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence
The University of Stirling	0%	50%	100%	42%	100%	50%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
The University of Strathclyde	0%	50%	80%	42%	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%	50%	100%
The University of Surrey	0%	50%	60%	42%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
The University of Sussex	19%	30%	100%	42%	0%	50%	0%	67%	100%	100%	0%
Swansea University	19%	50%	40%	67%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	63%	100%
Teesside University	0%	50%	60%	42%	75%	33%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
University College London	100%	50%	60%	42%	75%	33%	0%	67%	100%	0%	100%
Ulster University	0%	20%	60%	83%	100%	83%	0%	100%	100%	75%	100%
University of Wales Trinity Saint David	19%	40%	100%	42%	75%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
The University of Warwick	0%	50%	60%	42%	75%	33%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
University of the West of England	0%	50%	40%	42%	100%	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%
The University of the West of Scotland	0%	20%	80%	42%	100%	50%	0%	67%	100%	50%	100%

Institution	% R staff on FTC	Types of contract	% of R staff > 4 years service	Offer of redeployment	Avoidance of dismissal	Bridging funds available	Enhanced notice period	Enhanced redundancy pay	Signatory to Researcher Concordat	Ongoing efforts to improve security	Signatory Vitae HR excellence
The University of Westminster	19%	50%	60%	0%	75%	0%	0%	0%	100%	50%	100%
The University of Wolverhampton	19%	50%	100%	42%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
The University of York	38%	50%	100%	42%	100%	0%	0%	50%	100%	75%	100%

Appendix 5: Examples of bridging funds and extended notice periods

None of these schemes scored maximum points on our scoring scheme but they are examples of existing better practice in the sector. They fall short of our maximum score due to eligibility criteria and / or length of funding.

SHEFFIELD HALLAM UNIVERSITY

The University has implemented a Sheffield Hallam Research and Innovation Fund (SHRIF) which aims to support inclusive and impactful research and innovation activities towards growth and sustainability. One aspect of the fund is to invest in individuals and teams – this includes bridging funds for researchers on fixed-term contracts where short-term staff retention is critical for grant/contract delivery and skills retention. The scheme operates three competitive calls per year via an application process, which is reviewed by the research community and overseen by the Research Leadership Group. Criteria include:

- 1) Quality and timeliness of the activity
- 2) The need for internal investment to support the transformative activity and the justification as to why this cannot be supported through other means.
- 3) Evidence-led plans to lever future funding.
- 4) Alignment to the scheme and the University plan
- 5) Support for the transformation of our research culture, embedding the principles of climate action, EDI and our Hallam values (ambition, collaboration, inclusion, innovation, integrity)
- 6) Clear potential to deliver the transformative activity.

ULSTER UNIVERSITY

For those on open-ended contracts with an identified 'at risk' date, an additional 6 months of funding support will be offered by the University as a bridging period to allow some additional time for the outcome of funding proposals to be confirmed and/or to allow researchers the opportunity to seek alternative sources of funding for their research activities. However, it is noted that only research staff who have 6 years' continuous employment are offered an open ended contract so the numbers of those able to benefit from this scheme is low.

UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

University of Manchester UCU has recently negotiated improved terms and conditions for an extended notice period of up to three months, currently available to externally funded fixed-term staff with 4 years' continuous service (originally agreed in 2010/11). This notice period typically extends a contract beyond the end date of a particular project, and so staff can be reassigned to new work. The new policy allows requests for reassignment to particular short-term work in the interests of their career development and stipulates that efforts

must be made to accommodate such a request. In addition, the affected employee may also use this period 'to focus on finding another role within the University and/or externally'. This allows the employee to actively work towards securing a new contract, either at Manchester or elsewhere, during the extended notice period. If a new role begins within the three-month period, the notice period functions as a form of bridge funding.

Appendix 6: Examples of enhanced redundancy schemes

The following schemes all scored maximum points as being generous enhancements of statutory redundancy payments (albeit limited to longer serving staff in some cases).

Appendix 6: Example of enhanced redundancy scheme

The following schemes all scored maximum points as being generous enhancements of statutory redundancy payments (albeit limited to longer serving staff in some cases).

LEEDS

The following arrangements apply to fixed term or ongoing staff:

- ➡ Staff who have been employed for less than two years are not eligible to receive a redundancy payment.
- ➡ For staff who have two to four years' service, redundancy payments will be the statutory redundancy entitlement.
- ➡ For staff who have over four years' service, enhanced redundancy payments will be as set out in the table below:

YEARS SERVICE	ENHANCED REDUNDANCY PAYMENT
Over 4 years	4 months net pay
Over 5 years	6 months net pay
Over 6 years	8 months net pay
Over 7 years	10 months net pay
Over 8 years	12 months net pay

QUB

1 week's pay for each year of service for those with up to 2 years of service;

Between 1–3 weeks pay (dependent on duration of service) for each year of service plus statutory redundancy pay up to a maximum of 2 year's salary overall

ULSTER UNIVERSITY

Redundancy payment is based on statutory calculation without a weekly cap plus 20% of annual salary.