POST-DOC SURVEY DEC 2017

QUICK GUIDE:

SECTION 1: GENERAL INFORMATION

Q1. How long have you been a postdoc?
< 3 years: 46%   (2016: 38%; 2015: 44%)
3 – 5 years: 24%   (2016: 21%; 2015: 24%)
> 5 years: 30%   (2016: 41%; 2015: 32%)

Q2. How long have you been in the department of Plant Sciences as a post-doc?
< 3 years: 68%   (2016: 67%; 2015: 58%)
3 – 5 years: 24%   (2016: 14%; 2015: 27%)
> 5 years: 8%   (2016: 19%; 2015: 24%)

Q3. How much longer do you have on your contract/fellowship in the department?
< 1 years: 35%
1 – 2 years: 46%
> 2 years: 19%

Q4. What is your gender?
Male: 43%   (2016: 40%; 2015: 44%)
Female: 51%   (2016: 52%; 2015: 37%)
Prefer not to say: 5%   (2016: 8%;   2015: 20% i.e. skipped question)
Other: 0%

SECTION 1b: POST-DOC INDUCTION (DEPARTMENT)
Q5. If you are new to the department (started in the last 6 months) were you contacted by a member of the Post-Doc committee?

Yes: 7/15 = 47%   (2016: 8/15 = 53%)
No: 8/15 = 53%   (2016: 7/15 = 47%)
(Skipped: 22/37 = 59%)

Q6. Is there any way we could have contacted you better when you first arrived?

Thank you to everyone who responded! The committee will try to take your suggestions on board.

Q7. Are you aware of the Post-Doc website on the Plant Sciences Intranet?

Yes: 27/34 = 79%   (2016: 20/28 = 71%)
No: 7/34 = 21%   (2016: 8/28 = 29%)
(Skipped: 3/37 = 8%)

Outcomes:
Not all new starters are being welcomed/made aware of the Postdoc support available in the department.
The Postdoc Committee will work to improve this in the upcoming year.

SECTION 1c: POST-DOC INDUCTION (UNIVERSITY) (2017 only)

Q8. Did you attend the OPdA Post-Doc Induction Event?

Yes: 15/31 = 48%
No: 14/31 = 45%
Not yet, but planning to: 2/31 = 6%
(Skipped: 6/37 = 16%)

Q9. Did you find this induction helpful?
9 out of 15 responders found the induction helpful, 3 did not and 3 were neutral.

Outcomes:
We have passed all of your feedback to the Office for Postdoctoral Affairs (OPdA), who run the university-wide induction sessions for postdocs.

SECTION 2: POST-DOC TECHNICAL/INFORMATION SUPPORT SERVICES (2017 only)

Q10. Are you satisfied with the technical support in the department?

Very satisfied:	9/34 = 26%
Satisfied:	14/34 = 41%
Neutral:	5/34 = 15%
Not satisfied:	5/34 = 15%
Very unsatisfied:	0/34 = 0%
Haven't been here long enough:	1/34 = 3%
(Skipped:	3/37 = 8%)

Total positive: 23/37 = 62%; Total neutral: 9/37 = 24%; Total negative: 5/37 = 14%

Q11. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve these services?

Thank you to everyone who responded. ***Your anonymised feedback has been passed to the Academic Staff Committee for their consideration***

Q12. Are you satisfied with the way that information is communicated to you, as a post-doc, within the department?

Very satisfied:	1/34 = 3%
Satisfied:	23/34 = 68%
Neutral:	6/34 = 18%
Not satisfied:	3/34 = 9%
Very unsatisfied:	0/34 = 0%
Haven't been here long enough:	1/34 = 3%
(Skipped:	3/37 = 8%)

Total positive: 24/37 = 65%; Total neutral: 10/37 = 27%; Total negative: 3/37 = 8%

Q13. If not please provide some detail on what kind of information you feel is not communicated well.

Thank you to everyone who responded. ***Anonymised feedback has been passed to the Academic Staff Committee for their consideration***

Q14. Is there anything else you would like to say about the current level of support provided by the department and/or University?

Thank you to everyone who responded. ***Anonymised feedback has been passed to the Academic Staff Committee for their consideration.***

Outcomes:
Feedback based on the survey responses has been raised directly at the latest Academic Staff Committee for their consideration, including concerns about **limited support capacity**, the **publicization of funding opportunities**, **pastoral care** and **career support**. The committee will look to see if there are ways that we can help improve any of these issues within the Department.

SECTION 3: STAFF APPRAISALS (2017, 2016 and 2015)

Q15. Have you had a recent appraisal (in the last year)?

Yes: 18/33 = 55%   (2016: 21/38 = 55%; 2015: 15/40 = 38%)
No: 15/33 = 45%   (2016: 17/38 = 45%; 2015: 25/40 = 62%)
(Skipped: 4/37 = 10.8%)

Q16. If no, why? (e.g., recently started as post-doc?)

Of those who responded (14), 2 were not caused by new starting/appraisal not applicable.

Q17. Did the appraisal meet your expectations? Please describe how/why in as much detail as possible.

Thank you to everyone who responded. ***Anonymised feedback has been passed to the Academic Staff Committee for their consideration***
Positive responses: 11/13 (85%); Negative responses 2/13 (15%)

Q18. Did you find the appraisal process useful?

Yes: 18/20 = 90%   (2016: 21/28 = 75%;   2015: 11/15 = 73%)
No: 2/20 = 10%   (2016: 7/28 = 25%;   2015: 4/15 = 27%)
(Skipped: 17/37 = 46%)

Outcomes:
Feedback based on the survey responses has been raised directly at the latest Academic Staff Committee for their consideration. Whilst many postdocs reported finding the appraisal process helpful, some concerns were raised about the appraisal process from the postdoc perspective. These have been highlighted to the Academic Staff Committee.

SECTION 4: POST-DOC COMMITTEE (2017 and 2016)

Q19. Are you aware of the post-doc committee in the department?

Yes: 31/32 = 97% (2016: 30/32 = 94);
No: 1/31 = 3%   (2016: 2/32 = 6%)
(Skipped: 5/37 = 14% Assume this means 'no'?)

Q20. What would you like the post-doc committee to do for you?

Thank you very much to the many postdocs who responded to this one!
Here's what you told us:

#	RESPONSES
1	support with publications
2	React to post-doc concerns, act as a channel between the post-doc 'community' in the dept. and the departmental organising committees.
3	provide support, provide a place where issues and ideas can be discussed, ensure that the postdoc voice is heard.
4	To form a hub to share and develop professionally and personally and to connect people.
5	To represent the views of postdocs within the department on department-wide decisions that postdocs get a say in. To facilitate connections between postdocs in different research groups and to promote informal information/resource sharing between groups. To help advertise the opportunities available to postdocs within the university. To organise, or facilitate the organisation, of events or activities of particular interest to postdocs.
6	bring together postdocs at scientific and personal level
7	Provide information on training events for post-docs, and on any other event of interest from a career progression point of view.
8	To raise postdoc issues
9	I think it's function should be (and is) a mixture of advocacy and social
10	Pressure the department to improve its behaviour and facilities, and to publish useful details about how things work: the intranet is currently very minimal with a bad layout. In particular, there is no evidence of the department having been cleaned in the last year - why is there no policy on cleaning frequency/standards, and why isn't it done? This is unacceptable, we need to act!
11	Facilitating informations from the Department and Universities to the postdocs. Contact point for help and informations about living in Cambridge in general. Sharing experiences i.e : grant writing, career options, mentoring. Socialising platform as well!
12	Represent the interests of postdocs across the Department and University, a network support to reach out when in need (sometimes anonymously or with confidentiality), and a channel to meet peers and like-minded people.
13	Pointing out important (non-obvious) information that are relevant for postdocs.
14	perhaps more social events/college dinners for pdras?
15	The committee should continue building a strong postdoc community (postdoc lunches are great, beer hours), that is inclusive of all in the department. As such, the postdoc committee will be in a strong position to represent the interest of the postdocs at the staff meeting and argue for changes.
16	I think the postdoc committe is doing a good job. Satisfied by the efforts.
17	Provide social outlets for post-docs
18	Conduit between Postdocs and other dept groups. Think committee has made big improvements on behalf of postdocs
19	organize more acadamic activities
20	I think the lunches are a really good opportunity to network among the postdoc community. It could be interesting in the future, if funds were available, to think about a postdoc retreat with focus on career development or/and scientific discussions outside the department could be held. A retreat could be beneficial also to strength the interaction among postdocs inside the department.
21	To help elevate the voice of postdocs within and outside of the department. To seek out interests of postdocs within the department and take steps to facilitate activities to encourage these interest. The committee should also be there to help the department admin communicate with the postdoc community.

Q21. Would you be interested in joining either the post-doc committee or another departmental committee?

Yes: 16/28 = 57% (2016: 16/31 = 52%)
No: 12/28 = 43% (2016: 15/31 = 48%)
(Skipped: 9/37 = 24%. Again, assume 'no'?)

Outcomes:
In the coming year the Postdoc Committee will be working to see if we can improve our performance based on your expectations. Volunteers to help us with this are always welcome!

SECTION 5: POST-DOC LUNCHES

Q22. Which of the monthly post-doc lunches have you attended in the last year?

Non-themed: **17/32 = 53%**   **(1st)**
Teaching: 11/32 = 34%   (2nd)
Mentoring: 11/32 = 34%   (2nd)
College affiliations: 9/32 = 28%   (3rd)
Work-life balance: 8/32 = 25%   (4th)
Research Initiatives: 6/32 = 19%   (5th)
None: 9/32 = 28%
Unaware: 1/32 = 3%
(Skipped: 5/37 = 14%)

Q23. If none, what is your reason for not attending?

Not here long enough: 1/16 = 6%
Too busy: 9/16 = 56%
Topics not interesting: 0/16 = 0%
Other: 7/16 = 44%
(Skipped: 21/37 = 57%)

*Other reasons postdocs gave included **lack of time**, **not being around on Fridays** and **lunch topics not feeling relevant to them***.

Q24. Which of these themes would you attend regularly (i.e. once a year)?

Research Initiatives: ==13==**/31 = 42%**   **(1st)**
Work-life balance: ==7==/31 = 22%   (2nd)
Non-themed: ==6==/31 = 19%   (2nd)
Policy: 4/31 = 13%   (3rd)
Teaching: ==4==/31 = 13%   (3rd)
Mentoring: 2/31 = 6%   (4th)
College affiliations: 0/31 = 0%   (5th)
None: 0/31 = 0%
(Skipped: 6/37 = 16%)
==(Adjusted using comments from Q25 below)==

Q25. What other themes would you like to see covered at the post-doc lunch, or other events, in the future?

#	RESPONSES
1	Post-doc support services, maybe?
2	Post-doc perspective: How to structure/balance your independent research project with ongoing research and what post-docs should expect form PIs when preparing to establish their own research group. PI's perspective: What are post-docs allowed to take with them when they leave. How much time can be allocated to post-docs to develop independent research
3	The question 24 won't allow me to select more than one option, so my answer to that question is that I would attend to all them when my work allows it
4	I would also attend regularly: teaching, info about initiatives, work-life balance.
5	If the postdoc committee are invited to attend departmental meetings, then some feedback from those would be good (the department intranet only seems to have a calendar but no minutes). There must be relevant things going on in the department that don't make it into newsletters.
6	Question 24 does not accept more than one answer. From that list, I would also attend: - non-themed lunch - work-life balance
7	Living in the UK (quirks that are different to other countries or general useful info i.e. tax, USS, child-care etc).
8	It would be great if from time to time former postdocs are invited to come and discuss their experience after leaving the department a few of them are still around in Cambridge...
9	Making into Academia
10	Fellowship applications
11	sport activities and facilities in Cam University
12	Project management could be interesting. Also about funding opportunuities, e.g. travel grants, etc.
13	A lunch about different committees in the department and who our postdoc reps are on those committees and what they do.

Outcomes:
Thank you to everyone for their feedback! The Postdoc Committee will work to see if the Postdoc Lunch topics and timings can be targeted to benefit more people.

SECTION 6: POST-DOC RETREAT (2017 only)

Q26. Would you attend this event?

Yes: 27/32 = 84%
No: 1/32 = 3% (but 4 'No' responses in Q27...)
Unsure: 4/32 = 13%
(Skipped: 5/37 = 14%, but see 'No' responses in Q27.)

Q27. If no, what are your reasons?

Not interested: 1/4 = 25%
Too busy: 2/4 = 50%
Other: 1 = 25%
(Skipped: 33/37 = 89%)

Other reasons given:
1. Childcare

Q28. Are there specific training opportunities you'd like to see offered at the retreat?

Thank you to everyone who responded. Your suggestions were passed to the sub-committee organising the Post-Doc Retreat

Outcomes:
Your feedback was used to show post-doc support for the Post-doc Retreat initiative with the Department and University, helping to make it happen. The Postdoc Committee have tried to take on board as many of your suggestions for the event as they could.

SECTION 7: TRAINING (2017 only)

Q29. Are you aware of the training opportunities offered by different providers within the University?

Careers Service: 29/32 = 91%
RDP: 16/32 = 50%
PPD: 17/32 = 53%
IT: 12/32 = 38%
OPdA: 27/32 = 84%
None: 1/32 = 3%
Other: 0/32 = 0%
(Skipped: 5/37 = 14%)

Q30. Have you had any problems getting onto any university training courses and, if so, which ones?

Yes: 4/30 = 13%
No: 26/30 = 87%
(Skipped: 7/37 = 19%)

The problems that you raised all highlighted a lack of availability for highly popular courses (mostly IT).

Q31. How do you inform yourself about research funding/training opportunities available for post-docs?

Dept. emails: 27/31 = 87% (1st)
Dept. newsletter: 26/31 = 84% (2nd)
Word of mouth: 15/31 = 48% (3rd)
Training providers newsletter: 12/31 = 39% (4th)
Self-seeking: 10/31 = 32% (5th)
Other: 2/31 = 6%   (6th)
(Skipped: 6/37 = 16%)

Other methods highlighted were last-minute reminder emails and social media.

Outcomes:
We have passed your feedback to the different training providers of the University to help them improve their advertising for courses, and to highlight the demand that exists amongst postdocs for some specific types of training course

SECTION 8: MENTORING (2017 and 2016)

Q32. Do you have a mentor?

Yes, (one):	7/31 = 23%	(2016; 4/33 = 12%)
Yes (>1):	4/31 = 13%	(2016; 3/33 = 9%)
Total 'yes':	11/31 = 35%	(2016; 7/33 = 21%)
No:	20/31 = 65%	(2016; 26/33 = 79%)
(Skipped:	6/37 = 16%)	

Q33. If yes, do you consider your PI as one of those mentors?

Yes:	10/17 = 59%
No:	7/17 = 41%
(Skipped:	20/37 = 54%)

Q34. If you do not have a mentor, would you like to have one?

Yes:	14/22 = 64%
No:	8/22 = 36%
(Skipped:	15/37 = 40.5%)

Q35. If yes, what are the reasons that have prevented you from getting a mentor?

Other:	7/16 = 44%	(1st)
Low priority:	6/16 = 38%	(2nd)
Unsure how to get one:	5/16 = 31%	(3nd)
Not thought about it:	2/16 = 13%	(4rd)
Couldn't find one:	0/16 = 0%	(5th)
(Skipped:	21/37 = 57%)	
(Adjusted using comments from Other reasons given below)		

Other reasons given included a lack of time, difficulty in navigating the process to acquire one/finding who to ask, and not being sure about what benefits a mentor would provide.

Q36. Are you aware of the post-doc mentoring scheme within the department?

Yes:	23/31 = 74%	(2016: 25/33 = 76%)
No:	8/31 = 26%	(2016: 8/33 = 24%)
(Skipped:	6/37 = 16%)	

Q37. Are you aware of the university-wide OPdA mentoring scheme?

Yes: 18/31 = 58%   (2016: 22/33 = 67%)
No: 13/31 = 42%   (2016: 11/33 = 33%)
(Skipped: 6/37 = 16%)

Outcomes:
Your feedback has been passed on to organisers of mentorship schemes at the department level and the OPdA to help them to improve access to mentors to those who wish to make use of these services.

SECTION 9: CAMBPLANTS HUB (2017 only)

Q38. Are you familiar with the CambPlants Hub initiative?

Yes: 19/30 = 63%
No: 11/30 = 37%
(Skipped: 7/37 = 19%)

Q39. Do you feel represented by the CambPlants Hub initiative?

Yes: 10/17 = 59%
No: 7/17 = 41%
(Skipped: 20/37 = 54%)

Q40. In which ways would you like the CambPlants Hub initiative to help you in the development of your research career?

Thank you to everyone who responded. Suggestions raised included greater direct engagement with the postdoc community and making more information available

Outcomes:
Your feedback and suggestions have been passed on to the organisers of the CambPlants Hub initiative.

THANK YOU TO EVERYONE WHO TOOK PART IN THIS SURVEY!

Please get in touch with your nearest Postdoc Committee member (or email arp74@cam.ac.uk) *if you have any suggestions for questions for next year.*