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>23.68%</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></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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so useful</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actions:
- The results will be 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:
- Relevant results will be forwarded to Administration, Facilities, a H&S officer and/or Accounts

**NOTE:** Our department now has a bioinformatics committee that deals with a number of things, including issues with the computer cluster.

## 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?

![Graph showing responses to SRD usefulness]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so useful</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered: 33  Skipped: 6

Actions:
- Results will be forwarded to the Academic Staff committee.
- The possibility of including additional information to the SRD form will be considered.
- The implementation of a peer-to-peer support scheme will also be considered – perhaps as part of our departmental mentoring scheme.

**NOTE:** If you have not done so, we recommend you take the “Effective Staff Review and Development” online course before your next SRD (link below)

[https://www.training.cam.ac.uk/cppd/event/3119658](https://www.training.cam.ac.uk/cppd/event/3119658)
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?

![Chart showing the most common ways to inform oneself about funding opportunities](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?

- **Research initiatives**: Moderate interest
- **Teaching**: Medium interest
- **College affiliations**: High interest
- **Mentoring**: Low interest
- **Work-life balance**: Moderate interest
- **Policy**: Low interest
- **Non-themed**: High interest
- **Fellowships**: High interest
- **Outreach**: Moderate interest

**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?

- **Very likely**: 50%
- **Likely**: 20%
- **Neither likely nor unlikely**: 10%
- **Unlikely**: 0%
- **Very unlikely**: 0%
- **NA**: 10%
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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 will be forwarded to Cambplants.

Keep an eye on future updates on the actions we will take, and the replies we get from the relevant parties to the feedback we shared with them.