Many thanks to all respondents for contributing to the survey!

To keep this document concise, we have only included a few representative graphs and tables; and to avoid risking anonymity, the actual answers to open-ended questions are not shown here. Instead we have summarised and paraphrased the most relevant feedback. We apologise if your feedback was not included here. However, please know that all results were carefully analysed and discussed – keeping in mind that the purpose of this exercise is to help us decide how to maximize the impact of our efforts and how to better represent you as your postdoc committee.

Section 1a: General Information

- Gender balance: 44% female, 46% male, 10% did not say
- Almost equal mix between junior and senior postdocs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>34.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 years</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
<td>18.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 years</td>
<td>42.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 1b: Departmental Post-Doc Induction

- The number of respondents that were welcomed or contacted by the postdoc committee increased from 45% in 2018, to 73% in 2019.
- ‘Face-to-face' welcoming sessions for new postdocs are being implemented by our Welcoming Rep Jeongmin (now Eftychis), which should help to address some suggestions raised in the survey about tours to the building and labs.

**NOTE:** To add printing credit to your card, send an email to Del with the top-up amount and your grant code
Section 1c: University Post-Doc Induction

- The vast majority of responses were positive.
- Although only about half of all respondents have attended the induction

Did you find this induction useful?

![Graph showing the usefulness of the induction with the majority finding it very useful.]

**Actions taken:**
- The results were forwarded to the OPdA

Section 2: Technical and Non-Technical Services

This section covers facilities and shared equipment, as well as technical and non-technical support and services.

- Overall, the feedback on departmental services/support was positive and staff were praised for their work and support!
- Generally, the vast majority of complaints were about lack of resources and space.
- The most recurrent ones were asking for:
  - better allocation of office space
  - more snack/lunch options in the tea-room (e.g. sandwiches)
  - upgrades on analytical chromatographers.
- There were also a few complaints of not enough space to grow plants, and also issues with the bioinformatics cluster.
- One respondent suggested installation of a ramp out the back door to facilitate transporting of gas tanks, which points to a potential health and safety issue.
- Regarding the University provisions section, the most recurrent complaint was of not having enough covered bike racks.
Actions taken:
- Relevant results were forwarded to Administration and Facilities

NOTES:

Regarding snack options and office space, as we are now constrained by Covid-related safety measures, we will be following this up but at a later date once the situation normalized.

The Academic Computing Advisory Committee (ACAC) was chaired by Chris Gilligan, and Alex Webb took over in October. Sally Hames is the current secretary to the Committee. The remit covers all IT issues in the Dept.

Wanne Kromdijk is the academic overseeing the PGF and he is a member of the re-opening team.

Section 3: Staff Appraisals (SRD)

- The feedback was positive on average.
- One respondent commented that the SRD form was not useful because it was more focused on performance than career progression.
- Another respondent suggested the implementation of a peer-to-peer support scheme for paper writing in the department.

Was your SRD useful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so useful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actions taken:
- Results were forwarded to the Academic Staff committee.
• A link to the SRD online training module has been added to the SRD form, with a reminder to complete the training before filling in the form. https://www.training.cam.ac.uk/cppd/event/3119658

The implementation of a peer-to-peer support scheme will also be considered – perhaps as part of our departmental mentoring scheme.

Section 4: Training

• Several respondents commented that the University courses for data analysis and computational skill tend to fill up quickly

• Initiatives are being developed to offer some of those courses in our department

NOTE: Gitanjali Yadev is offering a Masterclass on data analysis in Teams!

• The departmental emails and newsletters continue to be the main sources of information regarding funding and training – so another big thanks to our departmental staff!

How do you inform yourself about funding/training opportunities available for post-docs?

![Bar chart showing the methods of information](chart.png)

Section 5: Mentoring

• Only 21% of respondents have a mentor.
• However, 44% of respondents that do not have a mentor, would like to have one.
• Too bad that our post for running our postdoc Mentoring Scheme is still vacant! Any volunteer/s?

Section 6: Post-Doc Committee

• Most respondents (79%) were familiarized with our departmental postdoc committee
• And we received many useful suggestions and positive feedback – thanks!
Section 7: Post-Doc Lunches

- Fellowships and Research Initiatives themes for postdoc lunches were ranked the highest:

Which of these themes would you be interested in attending?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of interest in different themes for postdoc lunches.]

Section 8: Post-Doc Retreat

- The level of interest and attendance was high, and the feedback was ‘very good’ on average
- 3 out of 4 comments expressed ‘dislike’ for the group session (the group session will be modified in the next postdoc retreat).

How likely is it that you will attend the next post-doc retreat?
Actions:
- The results and comments were forwarded to the 2020 retreat organizing committee

Section 9: Mental Health and Wellbeing

- Good news is that the average level of stress of our respondents (‘moderate’) was probably lower than the average (‘moderate-high’) of staff working in higher education in the UK – according to a 2013 nation-wide survey on stress and mental health wellbeing by University College Union.
- However, this has surely dramatically changed since the pandemic!
- One respondent stated that the Climate crises is a top source of stress.

How would you rate your general or average level of stress?
NOTE: Need help in resolving an issue or dispute with a colleague? If so, please refer to the University’s Mediation Service (link below) https://www.hr.admin.cam.ac.uk/policies-procedures/mediation-service

Jeongmin is our new Wellcome being advocate

Section 10: Cambplants Hub

- There is a general perception that Cambplants mainly targets PIs and is therefore not so relevant for postdocs.

Actions
- The results and comments were forwarded to Cambplants.