

# University of St Andrews

## Longitudinal Analysis of St Andrews CROS and PIRLS results

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1. This report presents analysis the 2013, 2015, 2017, and 2019 CROS and PIRLS surveys. The report looks at sections of both surveys that cover recognition and value and compares the results between the two surveys over time.

### 2. Background

- 2.1. The CROS and PIRLS surveys are biennial surveys run by Vitae covering Principal Investigators (PIRLS) and Research Staff (CROS).
- 2.2. This analysis looks across the two surveys to compare the views of the two cohorts focussing on the recognition and value sections.

### 3. Findings

#### 3.1. PIRLS (Appendix A)

- 3.1.1. Overall, the PIRLS survey has shown only small changes in the results since 2013.
- 3.1.2. Over the 4 years there was consistently high value placed on research activity, with over 90% of respondents agreeing that academic collaborations, advancing research areas, good research conduct, research outputs and securing research funding are very important activities in being a successful research leader in each year of the survey. However, collaborations outside HE were less valued by respondents.
- 3.1.3. When asked about institutional recognition respondents agreed that the institution recognises the contributions research leaders make to research outputs (94.6%, 2019) and securing research funding (93.4%, 2019), however there was less recognition for the other areas, although still typically over 80%.
- 3.1.4. The leadership and management sections found similar results with constantly over 90% over respondents agreeing that building a research group, leading a research group, motivating individuals, career development within HE, and all management activities were very important activities for research leaders. Career development outside of HE was less valued however (80.1%, 2019).
- 3.1.5. Notably the respondents felt that all of these activities were less valued by the institution than research activities with at most c80% agreeing the institution valued the contributions made to these leadership and management activities. The one exception to this was supervising research students, which was viewed as being valued by the institution.

3.1.6. The engagement and impact section saw engagement activities valued less by respondents as important part of the roles. Conversely contributions to these activities were considered to be more highly valued by the institution.

### **3.2. CROS (Appendix B)**

3.2.1. Respondents to the CROS survey have given a fairly consistent view on institutional recognition of their contributions as a researcher. Public engagement (90.4%, 2019), funding applications (80.0%, 2019) and knowledge transfer activities (79.5%, 2019) are all viewed as being valued by the institution, with peer reviewing (52.9%, 2019), budget management (56.8%, 2019) and research supervision (53.3%, 2019) viewed as less valued activities by the university.

3.2.2. A significant majority of CROS respondents agreed they were treated fairly in comparison to other staff for all aspects except for the opportunities for promotion and progression (50.0%, 2019). In addition, the majority of respondents agreed they were integrated in to the departmental and institutional research communities, and the wider communities in general.

3.2.3. Overall CROS respondents believe the institution encourages them to take responsibility for their own career development (95.3%, 2019) and encourages them to engage in personal development (84.1%, 2019). However, lower numbers have a clear career development plan (62.5%, 2019) and maintain a formal record of continuing professional development (61.4%, 2019).

### **3.3. Comparing Results**

3.3.1. Comparing across the two surveys show some interesting findings. In both PIRLS and CROS the results show that the institution places high value on research outputs and securing research funding. However there are also some differences with PIRLS respondents placing less value (and institutional recognition) on outreach, impact and knowledge transfer activities than those who completed CROS. This probably reflects that those doing the outreach activities are primarily early career researchers.

3.3.2. Additionally, whilst in PIRLS research leaders place a significant value on career development, responses gathered from CROS suggest career development is left up to the individual.

## **4. Further information**

4.1. More detailed analysis can be found in the appendices.