PCE Pilot Exercise – Assessment framework

1. STRATEGY

- Senior leadership sets vision, empowers individuals, and enables a diversity of research activities, processes and outcomes.
- Robust processes are in place to evaluate the effectiveness of activities to improve research culture.
- Continuous learning and improvement is fostered at all levels.
- Institution/unit reflects meaningfully and robustly on progress made over the assessment period, relevant to starting point and context, and incorporates learning into future plans.

Quantitative evidence	Qualitative evidence and contextual information

• Data on improvement as a result of strategic initiative(s).	• Documented evidence of the strategy and strategic priorities, with coherent plans towards their achievement. May include:
	    o Key performance indicators
	    o descriptions of any consultation or co-creation activities
	    o reporting lines and accountability mechanisms
	    o approaches for monitoring and evaluation.
	• Evidence of external standards and improvement mechanisms in decision making and strategic initiatives. Achieving an external accreditation and complying with a Concordat is not necessarily an indication of excellence, but examples of such external standards may be used to explain and justify the approaches taken. Examples may include the Concordats, Athena Swan, the Race Equality Charter, and Disability Confident Employer, among others.

2. RESPONSIBILITY

- Staff and research students pursue research, assessment and engagement activities responsibly, with integrity and to the highest standards
- Institution/unit demonstrates socially responsible leadership of research, research infrastructure and facilities.

Quantitative evidence	Qualitative evidence and contextual information
• Learning and training data, such as feedback on effectiveness. • Quantitative data on, for example, the impact of participation in cross-sector initiatives linked to responsible research. • Carbon emissions data, or estimates of such data, including through cross-references to Standardised Carbon Emissions Framework (SCEF) reporting.	• Documented changes in research standards or behaviours. • Pre- and post-training assessments (e.g. on research integrity, data management, for staff conducting research misconduct investigations). • Conformity of measures with the Concordat to Support Research Integrity, including through cross-references to annual reporting. • Documented evidence that membership of relevant committees or involvement in other relevant academic citizenship activities is appropriately recognised (e.g. in workloads or promotion criteria). • Documented evidence of participation in relevant networks, events and initiatives leading to changes in policy and practice. • Documented evidence that the infrastructure, processes and mechanisms in place are working effectively (e.g. to safeguard and promote research integrity, to ensure research is conducted according to appropriate ethical, legal and professional frameworks, obligations and standards). • Unit-level mechanisms for supporting the reproducibility of research, where relevant to the disciplinary area.

3. CONNECTIVITY

- Research and research enabling staff and research students share research, knowledge and expertise widely both internally and externally, including through open research practices.
- Institution/unit promotes and sustains high-quality collaborative research both internally and externally, promoting mobility across careers and sectors and fostering a diversity of ideas, practices and approaches.

Quantitative evidence	Qualitative evidence and contextual information
- Learning and training data, such as feedback on effectiveness. - The number and share of openly-accessible research outputs and activities (e.g. open databases, public performances). - The number and share of research outputs that adhere to FAIR principles - Number of times shared datasets are accessed or downloaded on openly-accessible platforms. - The number of cross-disciplinary grant applications as a proportion of eligible staff FTE. - The number and disciplinary spread of co-authored or co-produced research outputs and activities. - Contribution to collaborative research (Cash) as proportion of public funding, or estimates of in-kind contributions. - The number and disciplinary spread of cross-institutional grant applications as a proportion of eligible staff FTE.	- Documented steps towards open research that go beyond Open Access (e.g. support for open/FAIR data). - Documented evidence of wider activity to encourage the effective sharing and management of research data, as appropriate to the institution or discipline. - Pre- and post-training assessments (e.g. on open research, peer review, commercialisation). - Documented evidence that open research practices are appropriately recognised (e.g. in workloads or promotion criteria). - Documented evidence that activities where knowledge and expertise is shared are appropriately recognised (e.g. in workloads or promotion criteria). - Documented evidence that the infrastructure, processes and mechanisms in place to support staff and research students to share research, knowledge and expertise are working effectively. - Support for events and knowledge sharing activities (including in-kind support). - Evidence of procedures to stimulate and facilitate exchanges between academia and business, industry or public or third sector bodies (e.g. through the secondment of staff or research students). - Support for the development of research networks, centres, groups and events (e.g. waiving room hire charges, communications). - Support for the development of collaborative research (e.g. pump priming funds, cross-departmental networking). - Evidence of cross-HEI shared or collaborative use of research infrastructure including the use of major research facilities both in the UK and overseas. - Documented evidence that leadership of networks, centres and groups is appropriately recognised (e.g. in workloads or promotion criteria). - Mechanisms to pay or reimburse external partners and collaborators in a timely manner. - Documented evidence of the quality and significance of research collaborations across different disciplines, institutions, or with external partners, organisations or communities. - Documented evidence of collaborative research leading to new research tools, technologies, and methodologies. - Documented evidence that the infrastructure, processes and mechanisms in place to support staff and research students to collaborate are working effectively.

4. INCLUSIVITY

- Institution / unit tackles inequities in the research system and robustly addresses equality, diversity and inclusion across all of its activities.
- Institution/unit recognises and values a diversity of experiences, skills, competencies and outputs, including through recruitment, reward and recognition.
- Institution/unit takes fair and transparent approaches to employment, including addressing precarity, discrimination, and bullying and harassment.

Quantitative evidence	Qualitative evidence and contextual information
- Learning and training data, such as feedback on effectiveness. - Longitudinal data on percentage of eligible staff FTE as white, Black, Asian, other/mixed or unknown at institution level. - Longitudinal data on percentage of eligible staff FTE with no known disability, disability declared or unknown at institution level. - Longitudinal data percentage of eligible staff FTE as male, female or other at institution level. - Longitudinal data on percentage of promotion success per under-represented groups. - Longitudinal data on average (mean and median) institutional gender, ethnicity and disability pay gap for academic and research-enabling staff stratified by grade. - Longitudinal data on percentage of fixed-term staff who have been successfully redeployed (or had their contract renewed / extended). - Staff and research student survey data.	- Monitoring and assessment of the effectiveness of policies and initiatives to address under-representation and inequalities at different career stages, as relevant to the institution or unit. - Pre- and post-training assessments (e.g. on equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) principles for members of assessment panels, juries, committees and other decision-making bodies, implicit bias). - Pre- and post-mentoring and coaching assessments. - The development of targeted leadership programmes and demonstrate that under-represented groups are enabled to participate and benefit. - Documented evidence that leadership of EDI initiatives is appropriately recognised (e.g. in workloads or promotion criteria). - Evidence of how equality and diversity issues are addressed, in relation to support for acquiring research funding, or accessing scholarly or operational infrastructure. - Documented evidence that the contributions of professional services and research-enabling staff in research activities are appropriately recognised (e.g. through the use of Contributor Role Taxonomies, such as CRediT). - Documented evidence of implementation of principles and practices from responsible research assessment initiatives, such as those outlined in CoARA or DORA. - Documented changes to assessment processes, criteria and guidance, as informed by responsible research assessment principles. - Support for the use of narrative CVs or other innovative approaches to internal assessment. - Documented evidence that industry or other non-higher education research experience is recognised in recruitment and promotion criteria, as relevant and appropriate to the institution or unit. - Support for staff on fixed-term or atypical contracts (e.g. bridging funds, extended notice periods, mechanisms to support redeployment). - Pre- and post-training assessments (e.g. on supporting individuals who report discrimination or bullying and harassment). - Monitoring and assessment of the effectiveness of mechanisms to safeguard and protect whistleblowers or victims of bullying and harassment, including resolution satisfaction. - Activities to prevent harassment and bullying, including awareness-raising, training and the creation of safe spaces. - Consultation(s) with staff on changes to employment policies or conditions.

5. DEVELOPMENT

- Staff and research students can access relevant and meaningful support at all career stages.

Quantitative evidence	Qualitative evidence and contextual information
- Learning and training data, such as feedback on the effectiveness of mentoring and coaching or professional development. - Staff and research student survey data or other wellbeing measures. - Longitudinal data on share of staff and research students who completed an annual appraisal or equivalent review. - Data on the impact of undertaking CPD activities.	- Tailored approaches to supporting staff and research students at different career stages and on different contract types (e.g. the provision of adapted teaching workloads, mentoring and coaching, and targeted and relevant professional development opportunities). - Pre- and post-training assessments (e.g. for line managers, Principal Investigators and research supervisors). - Documented evidence that line management and supervision is appropriately recognised (e.g. in workloads or promotion criteria). - The development of initiatives to support staff who want to be research active or to return to research after a period of absence (e.g. following parental leave, bereavement, major illness). - The development of initiatives to support staff through career transitions, career porosity and mobility between sectors. - Support for the development of staff support networks and groups. - Documented evidence that leadership of staff support networks is appropriately recognised (e.g. in workloads or promotion criteria). - Documented evidence that the infrastructure, processes and mechanisms in place to support the training and supervision of research students are working effectively. - The development of career pathways frameworks, including for fixed-term, technical and research-enabling staff, that outline progression routes, expectations, and signposting of development opportunities. - Documented evidence of the participation of staff and research students in decision-making structures and committees leading to changes in policy and practice. - Documented steps to raise awareness of careers both within and beyond the institution and support for career transitions, career porosity and mobility between sectors. - Documented steps to enable staff and research students to engage in continuing professional development (CPD) (e.g. time).