

Evaluation of Rewarding and Developing Staff in HE initiative 2001- 02 to 2003-04

A report to HEFCE by KPMG LLP

Appendix

May 2005

This report contains 33 pages

KPMG 845

Contents

1	Evaluation fieldwork methodology	2
2	Baseline findings	8
2.1	HEI classification	8
2.2	Activity descriptions	11
2.3	Reported spending in the first round of R&DS funding	13
2.4	Activity by priority area and HEI type	15
3	Wider impacts	31

1 **Evaluation fieldwork methodology**

The evaluation was conducted using a research methodology which combined process and impact evaluation techniques. The approach included:

- a document review of baseline data held by HEFCE;
- a web-based questionnaire to all HR Directors in HEIs funded by HEFCE;
- a series of focus groups with different groups of staff from HEIs funded by HEFCE;
- a series of in-depth interviews with senior staff at a range of HEIs funded by HEFCE;
- a series of interviews with external stakeholders.

These research strands are described in the sections which follow.

1.1.1 **Document review**

A review of baseline data held by HEFCE was undertaken as the first research strand in the evaluation. The data reviewed were the introductions to the full HR strategies for each of the 126 HEIs funded by HEFCE in R&DS 1, along with the annual monitoring statements¹ (AMSs). Four HEIs were not included in the review on HEFCE's recommendation, either because they had been established during the funding period of the first round of the R&DS 1 initiative and so had insufficient information to cover the entire evaluation period, or because insufficient information was provided.

This data review was important in providing us with a baseline of information which we used to contextualise the other research strands. In addition, the review enabled us to record all the activities reported as being undertaken across the whole HEFCE-funded sector against the six priority areas, providing us with an understanding of the range of activities and the frequency with which they occurred.

The document review therefore enabled us to analyse and report on the levels and type of activity undertaken across the sector.

1.1.1.1 ***Data capture***

Information reported from the AMSs was analysed and entered into a data review framework. This detailed all the actions and activities reported by HEIs to have been undertaken under each of the priority areas. This was developed by reviewing a range of documents produced for R&DS 1 from a sample of HEIs. We focused on the AMS because it provided the most concise review of activities undertaken and money spent, over the three-year period. The use of a simple coding system for the information reported by HEIs allowed us to determine the stage institutions had reached with certain

¹ An AMS is a report submitted to HEFCE by the HEIs it funds to report the activities undertaken against a range of special funding initiatives. The R&DS initiative is one such initiative. HEIs are required to report on activities undertaken under each of the priority areas for R&DS, and to record how the allocated money was spent.

activities. We coded reported activities according to whether institutions had indicated that the activities were:

- “being considered”;
- “in their pilot stage” – ie being undertaken but not completed; or
- implemented and therefore in existence.

From this data review we were able to record:

- reported activities considered, piloted or undertaken as a result of R&DS 1²;
- spend by priority area (if stated by the HEI); and
- spend by activity (if stated by the HEI)

Based on the information reviewed, we were not able to report on:

- timescales for implementation;
- activities implemented by institutions as a result of R&DS 1 which were not documented in their AMS;
- the year in which activities were implemented;
- impact of an activity; or
- the progress of HR strategies.

1.1.1.2 *Analysing the data*

In populating the framework, we made informed subjective decisions about which priority area certain activities fell under. We applied a consistent approach across all data reviewed when applying activities to both priority areas and activity groupings. A complete list of the types of activities that fell under each priority area can be found in Table 2-2, Table 2-3 and Table 2-4.

A notable finding from our research was that not all institutions classified activities under the same priority area and this therefore produced inconsistencies in reporting. For example, we placed the active recruitment of certain minority groups under the priority area of “equal opportunities”. However certain institutions placed it under “recruitment and retention”.

All results from our analysis are based on information that was reported by HEIs. Sections 3 and 4 of the main report provide analysis and commentary on the document review.

1.1.2 **HR Directors’ questionnaire**

Using a web-based questionnaire, we conducted a survey of HR Directors to establish their views on the impact of the initiative in the context of their own HEI.

² All classifications were taken from the wording used in reporting in the AMS returns.

The questionnaire used a majority of closed questions with a rating scale (eg strongly agree, disagree etc) or drop-down boxes with pre-set answers. There were some open questions with free text to a set number of characters, for example asking for the top three impacts in each priority area.

Following discussion with the project board on the structure and aims of the questionnaire, and drawing on the gaps in information identified by KPMG during the document review, KPMG designed and agreed with HEFCE the questionnaire. In addition, in January, following analysis of the results, we contacted three HR Directors to verify the responses to key questions.

KPMG contacted all HR Directors by email, inviting them to participate and providing a short outline of the project, a link to the web-based questionnaire and a password to enable them to save their responses and re-enter the site at a later date.

In order to maximise the response rate, we:

- designed the questionnaire so it would take approximately 25 minutes to complete;
- included a KPMG contact name and number in case of problems or questions;
- gave respondents three weeks to submit the completed questionnaire and subsequently extended the deadline by a week;
- monitored the responses and reminded non-respondents by email after the first week, and a telephone call after the second week. An emailed reminder was sent by HEFCE to remaining non-respondents in the final week.

Of an invited 126 HEIs in England, 78 responses were received (a 62% response rate, overall, with varying response rates to individual questions).

1.1.3 **Focus groups with staff from HEIs**

To complement the quantitative research, KPMG undertook a series of focus groups with employees drawn from a range of HEIs. The objectives of the focus groups were to:

- gain an understanding from staff within HEIs of the initiatives that had been introduced, including testing out awareness of the initiatives and making a comparison with the situation four years ago;
- consider the extent to which staff have experienced the impact of the initiative on the organisation, their team/department and them as an individual;
- gather examples of good practice and lessons learned;
- obtain views on what further initiatives are required in order to ensure that HRM supports the institution's objectives and that HEIs continue to attract and retain high calibre staff.

Focus groups were held across the HEFCE regions and each group was targeted at a specific staff group. These were:

- HR staff;
- lecturers and research staff;

- support staff and technicians;
- female members of staff;
- staff from minority and ethnic groups.

In the majority of cases, participants were expected to have been working within the HE sector for the duration of the initiative, either at their current or another HEI.

The focus groups were not intended to provide us with a statistically representative sample of staff from all HEIs. Rather we were looking to gather a diverse selection of views and opinions about the impact of the R&DS 1 initiative. We therefore targeted individuals who were more likely to have been directly affected by the initiative.

The selected locations are illustrated in Table 1-1:

Table 1-1: Specific focus group and location

Specific focus	Location(s)
HR staff	North East South West
Lecturers and research staff	South East
Support staff and technicians	West Midlands East Midlands
Female staff	Eastern
Staff from minority/ethnic groups	London

Source: KPMG evaluation fieldwork 2004

1.1.3.1 *Selecting participants*

To ensure that a diverse sample of participants attended each focus group, we contacted all 130 HR/Personnel Directors by email and followed up with telephone calls. Each HEI was invited to nominate attendees based on the type of people we wished to consult, taking into account criteria such as gender, ethnicity, level, tenure and role type.

In total, 22 HEIs nominated participants and seven focus groups were held. At focus groups there was an average of seven participants per group with an average of three HEIs represented per group.

1.1.3.2 *Focus group content*

To ensure consistency and enable comparison of the participant responses, the same topic areas were covered in all the focus groups:

- the general HR situation in 2000;
- the major initiatives that have been implemented in their HEI over the last three years in each of the priority areas;
- the impact HR staff feel the R&DS 1 initiative and funding have had on their HEI;

- best practice case studies;
- the status of HR in their HEI and how it has altered over the last three years;
- the issues HEIs are looking to address going forward.

In the focus groups with non-HR staff, we also considered perceptions of the HR function

1.1.4 **In-depth interviews with senior management at a range of HEIs**

We conducted a series of semi-structured in-depth interviews with senior management representatives at 12 HEIs. The objective was to obtain perceptions on the impact to date of the initiative within each institution, with a view to identifying good practice case studies and exploring how the R&DS 1 funding has impacted on the HE sector as a whole. Typically, we conducted two separate interviews at each HEI in order to obtain a cross-section of views, as follows:

- a group interview with the Head of Institution, Academic Dean and Corporate Senior Manager;
- a one-to-one interview with the HR Director.

The HEIs were selected based on discussions with HEFCE and as an output of the document and data review. The sampling strategy was discussed at the first project board meeting and HEIs were identified on the basis of a) HEI type or mission, b) geography and then c) particular HR initiative or focus. HEIs with representatives on the project board, or which had been interviewed as part of the interim evaluation³ were not included within the sample. We identified a long list of over 20 HEIs on this basis and contacted them to see if they would like to be involved in the evaluation. The interviews were conducted between November 2004 and January 2005 with the following institutions:

- Bolton Institute of Higher Education;
- College of St Mark & St John;
- Keele University;
- Nottingham Trent University;
- Royal Northern College of Music;
- University of Arts London;
- University of Bristol;
- University of Huddersfield;
- University of Leicester;
- University of Newcastle;
- University of Portsmouth;
- University of Wolverhampton.

³ HEFCE commissioned an interim evaluation of the first round of R&DS 1 funding in 2001.

1.1.5 **Interviews with key external stakeholders**

We conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with representatives of a range of key stakeholders to obtain external perspectives on the impact of the R&DS 1 initiative. The interviews were conducted in person or by telephone. The list of stakeholders was discussed at the project initiation meeting with HEFCE, and by the project board. It included representatives of the employer associations, unions and other agencies involved in the R&DS 1 initiative. They were:

- Amicus;
- Equality Challenge Unit (ECU);
- The Standing Conference of Principals (SCOP);
- National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education (NATFHE);
- Transport and General Workers Union (TGWU);
- The Universities and Colleges Employers' Association (UCEA);
- UNISON;
- Universities Personnel Association (UPA);
- Universities UK (UUK).

In addition, the Association of University Teachers (AUT) provided written answers to the questions used in the other semi-structured interviews in January, as it was not possible to arrange an interview within the timetable of the evaluation fieldwork.

2 Baseline findings

2.1 HEI classification

The table below shows the HEIs reviewed in the document review. This is taken from the HEIs funded in R&DS 1 set out in HEFCE publications 01/16 and 00/56.

Table 2-1: HEIs reviewed in document review by type and region

Institution (1)	Classification (2)	Region (3)
Anglia Polytechnic University	Post-1992	East of England
Arts Institute at Bournemouth	Specialist	South West
Aston University	Pre-1992	West Midlands
Bath Spa University College	UC	South West
Birkbeck College	Pre-1992	London
Bishop Grosseteste College, Lincoln	Specialist	East Midlands
Bolton Institute of Higher Education	Post-1992	North West
Bournemouth University	Post-1992	South West
Brunel University	Pre-1992	London
Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College	UC	South East
Canterbury Christ Church University College	UC	South East
Central School of Speech and Drama	Specialist	London
City University, London	Pre-1992	London
College of St Mark & St John	GC	South West
Coventry University	Post-1992	West Midlands
Cranfield University	Pre-1992	East of England
Cumbria Institute of the Arts	Specialist	North West
Dartington College of Arts	Specialist	South West
De Montfort University	Post-1992	East Midlands
Edge Hill College of Higher Education	GC	North West
Falmouth College of Arts	Specialist	South West
Falmouth College of Arts	Pre-1992	London
Goldsmiths College, University of London	Pre-1992	London
Harper Adams University College	UC	West Midlands
Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine	Pre-1992	London
Institute of Education	Specialist	London
Keele University	Pre-1992	West Midlands
Kent Institute of Art & Design	Specialist	South East
King's College London	Pre-1992	London
Kingston University	Post-1992	London
Lancaster University	Pre-1992	North West
Leeds Metropolitan University	Post-1992	Yorkshire and the Humber
Liverpool Hope University College	UC	North West
Liverpool John Moores University	Post-1992	North West
London Business School	Specialist	London
London Metropolitan University	Post-1992	London

Institution (1)	Classification (2)	Region (3)
London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine	Specialist	London
London South Bank University	Post-1992	London
Loughborough University	Pre-1992	East Midlands
Manchester Metropolitan University	Post-1992	North West
Middlesex University	Post-1992	London
Newman College of Higher Education	Specialist	West Midlands
Norwich School of Art & Design	Specialist	East of England
Nottingham Trent University	Post-1992	East Midlands
Open University	Pre-1992	South East
Oxford Brookes University	Post-1992	South East
Queen Mary, University of London	Pre-1992	London
Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication	Specialist	London
RCN Institute	Specialist	London
Roehampton University	GC	London
Rose Bruford College	Specialist	London
Royal Academy of Music	Specialist	London
Royal Agricultural College	Specialist	South West
Royal College of Art	Specialist	London
Royal College of Music	Specialist	London
Royal Holloway, University of London*	Pre-1992	South East
Royal Northern College of Music	Specialist	North West
Royal Veterinary College	Specialist	London
School of Oriental and African Studies	Specialist	London
School of Pharmacy	Specialist	London
Sheffield Hallam University	Post-1992	Yorkshire and the Humber
Southampton Institute	GC	South East
St George's Hospital Medical School	Specialist	London
St Martin's College	GC	North West
St Mary's College	GC	London
Staffordshire University	Post-1992	West Midlands
Thames Valley University	Post-1992	London
The Surrey Institute of Art & Design, University College	UC	South East
Trinity & All Saints	GC	Yorkshire and the Humber
Trinity College of Music	Specialist	London
UMIST	Pre-1992	North West
University College Chester	UC	North West
University College Chichester	UC	South East
University College London	Pre-1992	London
University College Northampton	UC	East Midlands
University College Winchester	UC	South East
University College Worcester	UC	West Midlands
University of Bath	Pre-1992	South West
University of Birmingham	Pre-1992	West Midlands
University of Bradford	Pre-1992	Yorkshire and the Humber
University of Brighton	Post-1992	South East
University of Bristol	Pre-1992	South West

Institution (1)	Classification (2)	Region (3)
University of Cambridge	Pre-1992	East of England
University of Central England in Birmingham	Post-1992	West Midlands
University of Central Lancashire	Post-1992	North West
University of Derby	Post-1992	East Midlands
University of Durham	Pre-1992	North East
University of East Anglia	Pre-1992	East of England
University of East London	Post-1992	London
University of Essex	Pre-1992	East of England
University of Gloucestershire	Post-1992	South West
University of Greenwich	Post-1992	London
University of Hertfordshire	Post-1992	East of England
University of Huddersfield	Post-1992	Yorkshire and the Humber
University of Hull	Pre-1992	Yorkshire and the Humber
University of Kent	Pre-1992	South East
University of Leeds	Pre-1992	Yorkshire and the Humber
University of Leicester	Pre-1992	East Midlands
University of Lincoln	Post-1992	East Midlands
University of Liverpool	Pre-1992	North West
University of London	Pre-1992	London
University of Luton	Post-1992	East of England
University of Manchester	Pre-1992	North West
University of Newcastle upon Tyne	Pre-1992	North East
University of Northumbria at Newcastle	Post-1992	North East
University of Nottingham	Pre-1992	East Midlands
University of Oxford	Pre-1992	South East
University of Plymouth	Post-1992	South West
University of Portsmouth	Post-1992	South East
University of Reading	Pre-1992	South East
University of Salford	Pre-1992	North West
University of Sheffield	Pre-1992	Yorkshire and the Humber
University of Southampton	Pre-1992	South East
University of Sunderland	Post-1992	North East
University of Surrey	Pre-1992	South East
University of Sussex	Pre-1992	South East
University of Teesside	Post-1992	North East
University of the Arts London	Specialist	London
University of the West of England, Bristol	Post-1992	South West
University of Warwick	Pre-1992	West Midlands
University of Westminster	Post-1992	London
University of Wolverhampton	Post-1992	West Midlands
University of York	Pre-1992	Yorkshire and the Humber
Wimbledon School of Art	Specialist	London
Writtle College	Specialist	East of England
York St John College	GC	Yorkshire and the Humber

Source: (1) and (3): HEFCE Regional Profiles, 2004; (2) Pre-1992 = Pre-1992 university and Post-1992 = post 92 university (provided by UUK); UC = University College, GC = HE General Colleges (provided by SCOP); and Specialist = specialist institution (provided by SCOP or taken from HEFCE 00/56)

Some institutions were not reviewed as part of the document review. We were advised not to review the Conservatoire of Art and Dance, the Courtauld Institute of Art and the Birmingham College of Food, Tourism and Creative Studies as these HEIs were formed during R&DS 1. In addition, information was not available from HEFCE at the time of the document review for the Northern School of Contemporary Dance and the University of Exeter.

Some HEIs changed their name during R&DS 1, these were: Cheltenham and Gloucester College of HE (became University of Gloucester), King Alfred's College, Winchester (became University College Winchester), London Guildhall University and University of North London (became London Metropolitan University) and The London Institute (became University of the Arts London). These HEIs were reviewed.

2.2 Activity descriptions

The following tables provide information on the activities reported by HEIs that were used in the document review. They correspond to the in activity descriptions used in the figures in Sections 2.4.7 and 2.4.8 and provide examples of the types of activities reported.

Table 2-2: Equal opportunities, and staff training and development – activities reported in the document review

Equal opportunities (EO)	Staff training and development (T&D)
Job evaluation - e.g. the process of undertaking job evaluation	Other (T&D) - e.g. health and safety training, recruitment training. Any other training that is not specified
Awareness and education of EO - e.g. workshops for staff	Management T&D - e.g. management development programmes
EO monitoring - e.g. reviewing data collected	Improved HR databases - e.g. a new pay-link modeller system, or a new HR database purchased
EO data collection	T&D for IT - e.g. training on IT, or for IT staff
Use of evaluation tools - e.g. HEI stated they have bought HAY or HERA evaluation tools	T&D for scholarship and research - e.g. training courses provided for researchers and academics to improve their skills
Review EO policy against existing legislation	Review of HR policies - e.g. produced staff handbook, harmonised terms and conditions
Measures to encourage disabled individuals - e.g. stated aims, plans in place, gained the two tick symbol	T&D for accredited frameworks for professionals - e.g. providing support and assistance towards gaining ILTHE memberships
Salary structures or re-grading process - e.g. adjustments to the pay spine, re-grading and adding discretionary points	Active targeting used to increase the numbers receiving T&D - e.g. action plan put in place for T&D. Targets to increase T&D spend
Measures to encourage ethnic staff - e.g. springboard initiative, race equality policy/action plans	Leadership T&D
Measures to encourage women - e.g. springboard programme, review of the number of women employed	Support mechanisms in place to assist T&D - e.g. monitoring, new infrastructure, learning centres, action groups
EO Audit	Investor in People status - e.g. methods put in place to either achieve Investor in People status or HEI has already gained it

Equal opportunities (EO)	Staff training and development (T&D)
EO Advisory Group - e.g. a group meets to discuss EO issues	HR web-based access by staff - e.g. online access to all the T&D opportunities available, staff policies detailed online
Equal pay review - e.g. a review to ensure individuals performing the same job receive equal pay	Staff development manager recruited to assist T&D
Work/life balance policies - e.g. parental leave, healthy working policies	Individual career review planning and advice - e.g. individual learning plans
Flexible working policies - e.g. flexitime, paternity/maternity leave	Policies for contract staff - e.g. measures to convert part-time staff to full time, training, support networks
EO officer recruited	Online training available to staff - e.g. certain courses can be completed online
EO surveys and workshops	Open communication with HR - e.g. staff meetings, HR newsletters about T&D, communication strategy
Measures to encourage under-represented groups - e.g. deaf awareness training, any other measures aimed at a wide range of “under-represented groups”	Policies for administrative support - e.g. policies to improve working conditions, training, rotations around departments
Stress policy	Exchange of good practice - e.g. secondments, conferences, regional management networks
Direct marketing to under-represented groups - e.g. job adverts in the ethnic minority press	Career Development Fellowships - e.g. incentive scheme to help professors become fellows
Links with local community	Succession planning - e.g. consideration and planning of the development needs of the workforce and the future training requirements
Age discrimination consideration - e.g. policies in place to prevent discrimination	Dissemination of development opportunities - e.g. training policies and bulletins produced

Source: KPMG document review 2004

Table 2-3: Recruitment and retention, and review of staffing needs – activities reported in the document review

Recruitment and retention (R&R)	Staffing needs
Data collection on R&R	Strengthen HR department - e.g. recruitment of any other staff into the HR function which are not already specified
Market supplements - e.g. salary incentives for hard to fill vacancies, pay increments to ensure pay is in line with the market	Regular reviews of staffing needs - e.g. skills audit, workforce planning
Non-pay related benefits - e.g. childcare, pensions, travel to and from work, extended parental leave	Staff restructuring programme - e.g. restructuring programme within the HEI, realigning staff to better suit the needs of the institution
Staff surveys - e.g. staff attitude surveys reported	Funds allocated for severance and redundancy
Redesign recruitment process - e.g. introducing assessment centres to recruit to senior positions	Staffing needs reflected by market demands - e.g. monitoring external trends, skills audit of specific groups of staff such as IT staff
Retention payments - e.g. long service awards, discretionary pay	Retraining and redeployment of staff programme - e.g. in light of restructuring
Exit procedures - e.g. exit questionnaires, interviews	Enhanced early retirement policy
Alterations to recruitment advertising	Staffing allocation is aligned to student demand

Enhanced relocation schemes	HE expansion policies impact on staff needs - e.g. where institution has stated that it is looking at staff in relation to expansion
Web-based application process	
Equal pay benchmarking - e.g. external reviews within the sector or local economy or industry	
Excellence awards - e.g. one off teaching distinctions, retirement awards	
Reform leave policy - e.g. changes to annual leave, maternity leave, career breaks, sabbaticals	
Marketing HEI as a desirable place to work	
Measures to encourage and attract a global workforce - e.g. policies developed, overseas recruitment campaigns	
Golden Hellos	

Source: KPMG document review 2004

Table 2-4: Action to tackle poor performance, and annual performance review – activities reported in the document review

Poor performance	Annual performance reviews
Support mechanisms to assist poor performance - e.g. counselling and coaching	Performance system has been reviewed - e.g. changes or revisions to the review system
Absence procedures	Performance related pay or merit or contribution scheme - e.g. financial incentives for increased responsibility, good practice and performance related pay
Training managers on poor performance procedures - e.g. how to address poor performers	Annual appraisals are conducted - e.g. where an institution stated they conducted appraisals
Disciplinary or probation procedures	Management training on appraisals system
Capability procedures	Competency frameworks used to assess performance
Occupational health workers	Performance reviews linked to organisational goals - e.g. clearly stated that performance needs to be aligned to organisational goals
Monitoring procedure	Percentage of staff getting an appraisal
Key performance indicators are collected and analysed - e.g. absence days, discipline and grievance procedures.	

Source: KPMG document review 2004

2.3 Reported spending in the first round of R&DS funding

Table 2-5 shows the reported spend by priority area, and this spend as a proportion of the total reported allocation of R&DS 1 funding relating to the 126 HEIs reviewed as part of the document review. The caveats in the main report should be noted here when analysing this information. It should be noted that total spend across the priority areas does not match the amount of R&DS funding allocated by HEFCE. This is due to some HEIs carrying forward funds.

Table 2-5: Reported institutional spend by priority area as a proportion of total reported allocation over R&DS 1

	Recruitment and retention	Staff training and development	Staffing needs	Equal opportunities	Poor performance	Annual performance review	Total reported allocated
Spend	£72.9m	£87.4m	£61.7m	£47.3m	£15.1m	£20.8m	£371.9m
% of total	20%	24%	17%	13%	4%	6%	

Source: KPMG document review 2004. Note 1) the total of R&DS 1 allocated refers to the 126 HEIs reviewed as part of the document review. 2) Total spend across priority areas does not match total R&DS funding allocated due to carry forward of R&DS 1 funds by some HEIs.

Tables 2-6 and 2-7 show the reported spend by priority area, and this spend as a proportion of the total reported allocation of R&DS 1 funding by institution type.

Table 2-6: Reported institutional spend by priority area as a proportion of total reported allocation over R&DS 1, by type of institution

Institution type	Recruitment and retention	Staff training and development	Staffing needs	Equal opportunities	Poor performance	Annual performance reviews	Total reported R&DS1
General HE college	£2.3m	£4.0m	£1.2m	£1.2m	£0.2m	£1.2m	£10.4m
Post-1992 universities	£21.9m	£32.1m	£31.9m	£17.8m	£3.3m	£4.1m	£134.8m
Pre-1992 universities	£43.3m	£43.5m	£24.0m	£24.6m	£11.0m	£14.2m	£196.1m
Specialist institution	£3.4m	£3.3m	£3.6m	£1.5m	£0.2m	£1.0m	£18m
University college	£2.0m	£4.5m	£0.9m	£2.2m	£0.4m	£0.4m	£13.0m
Entire HE sector	£72.9m	£87.4m	£61.7m	£47.3m	£15.1m	£20.8m	£371.9m

Source: KPMG document review 2004. Note 1) the total of R&DS 1 allocated refers to the 126 HEIs reviewed as part of the document review. 2) Total spend across priority areas does not match total R&DS funding allocated due to carry forward by some HEIs.

Table 2-7: Reported institutional spend by priority area as a proportion of total reported allocation over R&DS 1, by type of institution

Institution type	Recruitment and retention	Staff training and development	Staffing needs	Equal opportunities	Poor performance	Annual performance reviews
General HE college	22%	39%	12%	11%	2%	11%
Post-1992 universities	16%	24%	24%	13%	2%	3%
Pre-1992 universities	22%	22%	12%	13%	6%	7%
Specialist institution	19%	18%	20%	8%	1%	5%
University college	16%	34%	7%	17%	3%	3%
Entire HE Sector	20%	24%	17%	13%	4%	6%

Source: KPMG document review 2004

Table 2-8 shows the reported amounts of R&DS funding spent on HRM infrastructure.

Table 2-8: Reported institutional spend on HRM infrastructure as a proportion of reported allocation in R&DS 1

Infrastructure	Improved HR databases	Strengthening HR department	Total reported allocated
Reported spend £	£9m	£12m	£372m
Percentage of total spend	2%	3%	

Source: KPMG document review 2004. Note 1) the total of R&DS 1 allocated refers to the 126 HEIs reviewed as part of the document review.

2.4 Activity by priority area and HEI type

The figures in section 2.4.7 show the different focus placed by different types of HEI on activities. The information presented in each figure shows the number of HEIs reporting an activity as a percentage of the total number of institutions of that type. For example, 34 out of 43 or 80% of pre-1992 universities reported implementing or piloting job evaluation. All priority areas are ordered by the frequency each activity was reported, for example “job evaluation” was reported by more institutions than “reviewing equal opportunities policy against existing legislation”.

2.4.1 Equal opportunities

Table 2-12 shows the percentages of HEIs in the different institutional types that reported implementing equal opportunities activities. In all except specialist institutions, the most commonly implemented activity was job evaluation, implemented by over 80% of institutions in each sector. In specialist institutions just under 80% reported piloting or implementing job evaluation.

Flexible working policies were reported by:

- around 60% of general colleges;
- between 41% and 60% of pre-1992 universities and university colleges;
- around 30% of post-1992 universities;
- between 1 and 20% of specialist institutions;
- over 20% of the sector as a whole.

2.4.2 Staff training and development

Table 2-13 shows the different focus placed by different types of institution under the priority area of staff training and development. There was consistency across all types of institution in their focus on management training and development and other general courses: these were implemented by over 80% of pre-1992 universities, post-1992 universities and university colleges, and over 60% of specialist and general HE colleges.

A higher percentage of university colleges reported implementing more activities. 80% of university colleges reported six activities, compared to two activities reported in post-1992 and pre-1992 universities.

2.4.3 Recruitment and retention

There were very few differences in the percentage of HEI types undertaking the different reported activities under recruitment and retention, as Table 2-14 shows. A higher percentage of pre-1992 universities had put in place retention payments compared to the sector as a whole or other HEI types. 64% of pre-1992 universities reported they had put in place retention payments, compared to the sector as a whole. This constituted 27 of the 50 HEIs (54%) who reported this activity. 60% of pre-1992 universities had altered their recruitment process when compared to the sector as a whole, and this represented more than half of the 52 HEIs who reported this activity.

Market supplements were a common activity for post-1992 and pre-1992 universities, but were not as widely reported by the other institutional types. This is shown in Table 2-9.

Table 2-9: Use of market supplements grouped by type of HEI

Type of institution	Market supplements	Total no of institutions	% of HEIs reporting market supplements
Post-1992 university	23	36	64%
Pre-1992 university	20	43	47%
Specialist	6	28	21%
University college	6	11	55%
General HE college	3	8	38%
Total	58	126	46%

Source: KPMG document review 2004

2.4.4 Tackling poor performance

Table 2-15 shows the different focus placed by different types of institution under the priority area of tackling poor performance. Reporting on poor performance was a low focus across all types of institution, with none of the activities being reported by more than 60% of the HEIs in the sector. The exception to this is that absence procedures were reported by seven out of eight general colleges. The most commonly reported activity was putting in place support mechanisms to assist poor performers; this occurred in 42% (15) of post-1992 universities and 57% (24) of pre-1992 universities, in comparison to 18% (2) of university colleges.

2.4.5 Staffing needs

Table 2-16 shows the different focus placed by different types of institution under the priority area of reviewing staffing needs. The table shows the low levels of reported activity across all institutional types for the priority area. The percentage of HEIs of different types reporting activities was similar. The exception was the lower reported levels of activity on strengthening HR departments from post-1992 universities in comparison to institutions from other types, as Table 2-10 shows.

Fifteen post-1992 universities reported allocating funds for severance and redundancy, which was implemented by less than 40% of pre-1992 universities, specialist institutions and university colleges.

Table 2-10: Strengthening the HR department, grouped by type of HEI

Type of institution	Number reported strengthening HR department	Total no of institutions	% of HEIs reporting strengthening HR department
Post-1992 university	13	36	36%
Pre-1992 university	30	43	70%
Specialist institution	19	28	68%
University college	7	11	64%
General HE college	5	8	63%
Total	74	126	59%

Source: KPMG document review 2004

2.4.6 Annual performance reviews

Table 2-17 shows the differences in focus placed by different types of institution under the priority area of annual performance reviews.

For annual performance reviews, there were low levels of reporting across all types of institutions. Performance related pay was the activity reported by the largest number of institutions, as shown in Table 2-11. The exceptions were the specialist institutions, where 16 institutions documented performing appraisals. Pre-1992 universities reported the largest number of activities under this priority area, with 28 out of 43 institutions reporting a performance related pay or merit scheme

Table 2-11: The use of performance related pay or merit schemes grouped by type of HEI

Type of institution	Number reporting performance related pay of merit schemes	Total no of institutions	% of HEIs reporting performance related pay or merit schemes
Post-1992 university	20	36	56%
Pre-1992 university	28	43	65%
Specialist institution	11	28	39%
University college	7	11	64%
General HE college	7	8	88%
Total no of HEIs reporting	66	126	52%

Source: KPMG document review 2004

2.4.7 Priority area activities grouped by type of HEI

Table 2-12: Equal opportunities activities grouped by type of HEI, showing percentage of HEIs undertaking different activities

Equal Opportunities						
	General (126)	Post 1992 (36)	Pre 1992 (42)	Specialist (29)	University Colleges (11)	General College (8)
Age discrimination consideration	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	0
Direct Marketing to under-represented groups	21-40	1 - 20	21-40	1 - 20	41-60	21-40
EO Advisory Group	41-60	21-40	41-60	21-40	21-40	21-40
EO Audit	41-60	21-40	41-60	21-40	41-60	41-60
EO Awareness and education	61-80	61-80	61-80	61-80	81-100	61-80
EO Data collection	61-80	61-80	81-100	61-80	61-80	61-80
EO Monitoring	61-80	61-80	81-100	81-100	61-80	81-100
EO Officer recruited	21-40	21-40	41-60	1 - 20	41-60	1 - 20
EO surveys and workshops	21-40	21-40	41-60	21-40	41-60	1 - 20
Equal pay review	21-40	41-60	41-60	21-40	21-40	21-40
Evaluation tool used for job evaluation	61-80	41-60	61-80	61-80	61-80	61-80
Flexible working policies	21-40	21-40	41-60	1 - 20	41-60	61-80
Job Evaluation	81-100	81-100	81-100	61-80	81-100	81-100
Links with local community	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40	21-40
Measures to encourage underrepresented groups	21-40	21-40	41-60	21-40	41-60	21-40
Measures to encourage disabled individuals	41-60	21-40	41-60	41-60	41-60	41-60
Measures to encourage ethnic staff	41-60	21-40	41-60	41-60	41-60	21-40
Measures to encourage women	41-60	21-40	41-60	21-40	41-60	21-40
Review EO policy against existing legislation	61-80	41-60	61-80	41-60	61-80	61-80
Salary structures or re-grading process	41-60	41-60	41-60	21-40	41-60	41-60
Stress policy	21-40	21-40	21-40	1 - 20	41-60	0
Work or Life balance policies	21-40	21-40	41-60	21-40	41-60	21-40

Source: KPMG document review 2004

Table 2-13: Staff training and development activities grouped by type of HEI, showing percentage of HEIs undertaking different activities

Staff Training and Development						
	General (126)	Post 1992 (36)	Pre 1992 (42)	Specialist (29)	University Colleges (11)	General colleges (8)
Active Targeting used to increase the numbers receiving T& D	41-60	41-60	21-40	61-80	41-60	61-80
Career Development Fellowships	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	41-60	21-40
Dissemination of Development opps	1 - 20	21-40	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40	21-40
Exchange of good practise	21-40	21-40	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40	21-40
HR Web based access by staff	21-40	21-40	21-40	21-40	21-40	21-40
Improved HR Database and payroll	61-80	61-80	61-80	41-60	81-100	61-80
Individual career review planning and advice	21-40	41-60	21-40	21-40	21-40	1 - 20
Investor in People Status	21-40	41-60	21-40	1 - 20	81-100	41-60
Online Training available to staff	21-40	41-60	21-40	1 - 20	21-40	21-40
Open communication with HR	21-40	21-40	21-40	1 - 20	21-40	21-40
Other T&D	81-100	81-100	81-100	61-80	81-100	61-80
Policies for Admin support	21-40	1 - 20	21-40	1 - 20	21-40	0
Policies for contract staff	21-40	1 - 20	41-60	21-40	1 - 20	21-40
Review of HR policies	41-60	41-60	41-60	41-60	41-60	61-80
Staff Development Mgr recruited to assist T&D	21-40	21-40	21-40	21-40	41-60	1 - 20
Succession Planning	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40
Support Mechanisms in place to assist T&D	41-60	21-40	41-60	21-40	81-100	41-60
T&D for accredited frameworks for professional	41-60	41-60	41-60	41-60	41-60	61-80
T&D for IT	61-80	61-80	41-60	61-80	81-100	41-60
T&D for leadership	41-60	41-60	41-60	21-40	21-40	21-40
T&D for management	81-100	81-100	81-100	61-80	81-100	61-80
T&D for Scholarship and Research	41-60	41-60	41-60	21-40	61-80	61-80

Source: KPMG document review 2004

Table 2-14: Recruitment and retention activities grouped by type of HEI, showing percentage of HEIs undertaking different activities

Recruitment and Retention						
	General (126)	Post 1992 (36)	Pre 1992 (42)	Specialist (29)	University Colleges (11)	General colleges (8)
Alterations to Recruitment Advertising	21-40	21-40	21-40	41-60	21-40	41-60
Data collection on R&R	41-60	41-60	41-60	41-60	21-40	41-60
Enhanced Relocation Schemes	21-40	41-60	21-40	21-40	41-60	21-40
Equal pay benchmarking	21-40	21-40	21-40	21-40	21-40	1 - 20
Excellence Awards	21-40	21-40	21-40	21-40	21-40	1 - 20
Exit Procedures	21-40	21-40	21-40	41-60	21-40	41-60
Golden Hellos	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40
Market Supplements	41-60	61-80	41-60	21-40	41-60	21-40
Marketing HEI as a desirable place to work	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40	1 - 20	21-40	0
Measures to encourage and attract a global workforce	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40	1 - 20	0
Non-pay related benefits	41-60	41-60	41-60	21-40	21-40	41-60
Redesign recruitment process	41-60	41-60	61-80	41-60	41-60	41-60
Reform leave policy	21-40	21-40	21-40	21-40	41-60	1 - 20
Retention Payments	21-40	21-40	61-80	1 - 20	41-60	21-40
Staff surveys	41-60	41-60	41-60	21-40	21-40	41-60
Web-based application process	21-40	21-40	21-40	1 - 20	41-60	61-80

Source: KPMG document review 2004

Table 2-15: Tackling poor performance activities grouped by type of HEI, showing percentage of HEIs undertaking different activities

Poor Performance						
	General (126)	Post 1992 (36)	Pre 1992 (42)	Specialist (29)	University Colleges (11)	General colleges (8)
Absence Procedures	41-60	21-40	41-60	21-40	41-60	81-100
Capability Procedures	21-40	21-40	41-60	1 - 20	41-60	61-80
Disciplinary or Probation procedures	21-40	21-40	21-40	21-40	41-60	41-60
KPIs are collected and analysed	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40	21-40
Monitoring procedure	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20
Occupational Health Workers	21-40	21-40	21-40	1 - 20	41-60	21-40
Support mechanisms to assist poor performance	41-60	41-60	41-60	21-40	1 - 20	21-40
Training managers on poor performance procedures	21-40	21-40	21-40	21-40	41-60	61-80

Source: KPMG document review 2004

Table 2-16: Review of staffing needs activities grouped by type of HEI, showing percentage of HEIs undertaking different activities

Staffing Needs						
	General (126)	Post 1992 (36)	Pre 1992 (42)	Specialist (29)	University Colleges (11)	General colleges (8)
Enhanced Early Retirements policy	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40	1 - 20	21-40	1 - 20
Funds allocated for severance and redundancy	21-40	41-60	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40
HE expansion policies impact on staff needs	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20
Regular reviews of staffing needs	41-60	41-60	41-60	21-40	41-60	61-80
Retraining and redeployment of staff programs	1 - 20	21-40	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40	21-40
Staff restructuring program	21-40	41-60	21-40	21-40	21-40	41-60
Staffing allocation is aligned to student demand	1 - 20	21-40	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40	1 - 20
Staffing needs reflected by market demands	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40	1 - 20	21-40
Strengthen HR department	41-60	21-40	61-80	61-80	61-80	61-80

Source: KPMG document review 2004

Table 2-17: Annual performance reviews grouped by type of HEI, showing percentage of HEIs undertaking different activities

Annual Performance Review						
	General (126)	Post 1992 (36)	Pre 1992 (42)	Specialist (29)	University Colleges (11)	General colleges (8)
Annual Appraisals are conducted	41-60	41-60	41-60	41-60	21-40	21-40
Competency frameworks used to assess performance	21-40	21-40	21-40	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40
Mgt training on appraisals system	21-40	21-40	21-40	41-60	1 - 20	21-40
Percentage of staff getting an appraisal	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20
Performance related pay or merit or contribution scheme	41-60	41-60	61-80	21-40	61-80	81-100
Performance reviews linked to organisational goals	1 - 20	1 - 20	21-40	1 - 20	1 - 20	1 - 20
Performance system has been reviewed	61-80	41-60	41-60	41-60	41-60	41-60

Source: KPMG document review 2004

2.4.8 By institutional type

The tables below show the percentage of all HEIs reporting an activity by type of institution.

Figure 2-1: Percentage of all HEIs undertaking activities reported across the six priority areas

Job Evaluation	81-100	Other T&D	81-100						
Awareness and education of EO	61-80	Management T&D	81-100						
EO Monitoring	61-80	Improved HR Database and systems	61-80						
EO Data collection	61-80	T&D for IT	61-80						
Use of Evaluation Tools	61-80	T&D for Scholarship and Research	41-60						
Review EO policy against existing legislation	61-80	Review of HR policies	41-60						
Measures to encourage disabled individuals	41-60	T&D for accredited frameworks for professional	41-60	Data collection on R&R	41-60				
Salary structures or re-grading process	41-60	Active Targeting used to increase the numbers receiving T&D	41-60	Market Supplements	41-60				
Measures to encourage ethnic staff	41-60	Leadership T&D	41-60	Non-pay related benefits	41-60				
Measures to encourage women	41-60	Support Mechanisms in place to assist T&D	41-60	Staff surveys	41-60				
EO Audit	41-60	Investor in People Status	21-40	Redesign recruitment process	41-60				
EO Advisory Group	41-60	HR Web based access by staff	21-40	Retention Payments	21-40				
Equal pay review	21-40	Staff Development Mgr recruited to assist T&D	21-40	Exit Procedures	21-40				
Work or Life balance policies	21-40	Individual career review planning and advice	21-40	Alterations to Recruitment Advertising	21-40	Strengthen HR department	41-60		
Flexible working policies	21-40	Policies for contract staff	21-40	Enhanced Relocation Schemes	21-40	Regular reviews of staffing needs	41-60	Support mechanisms to assist poor performance	41-60
EO Officer recruited	21-40	Online Training available to staff	21-40	Web-based application process	21-40	Staff restructuring program	21-40	Absence Procedures	41-60
EO surveys and workshops	21-40	Open communication with HR	21-40	Equal pay benchmarking	21-40	Funds allocated for severance and redundancy	21-40	Training managers on poor performance procedures	21-40
Measures to encourage under-represented groups	21-40	Policies for Admin support	21-40	Excellence Awards	21-40	Staffing needs reflected by market demands	1 - 20	Disciplinary or Probation procedures	21-40
Stress policy	21-40	Exchange of good practise	21-40	Reform leave policy	21-40	Retraining and redeployment of staff programs	1 - 20	Capability Procedures	21-40
Direct Marketing to under-represented groups	21-40	Career Development Fellowships	1 - 20	Marketing HEI as a desirable place to work	1 - 20	Enhanced Early Retirements policy	1 - 20	Occupational Health Workers	21-40
Links with local community	1 - 20	Succession Planning	1 - 20	Measures to encourage and attract a global workforce	1 - 20	Staffing allocation is aligned to student demand	1 - 20	Monitoring procedure	1 - 20
Age discrimination consideration	1 - 20	Dissemination of Development opps	1 - 20	Golden Hellos	1 - 20	HE expansion policies impact on staff needs	1 - 20	KPIs are collected and analysed	1 - 20
Equal Opportunities	% of institutions reporting	Staff Development and Training	% of institutions reporting	Recruitment and Retention	% of institutions reporting	Staffing Needs	% of institutions reporting	Poor Performance	% of institutions reporting

Source: KPMG document review 2004

Figure 2-2: Percentage of post-1992 universities undertaking activities reported across the six priority areas

Equal Opportunities	% of institutions reporting	Staff Training and Development	% of institutions reporting	Recruitment and Retention	% of institutions reporting	Staffing Needs	% of institutions reporting	Poor Performance	% of institutions reporting
Job Evaluation	81-100	Other T&D	81-100	Market Supplements	61-80	Regular reviews of staffing needs	41-60	Support mechanisms to assist poor performance	41-60
EO awareness and education for staff	61-80	T&D for management	81-100	Redesigned recruitment process	41-60	Staff restructuring program	41-60	Occupational Health Worker	21-40
EO Monitoring	61-80	Improved HR Database and payroll	61-80	Data collection on R&R	41-60	Funds allocated for severance and redundancy	41-60	Disciplinary or Probation procedures	21-40
EO Data collection	61-80	T&D for IT	61-80	Nonpay related benefits	41-60	Strengthen HR department	21-40	Training managers on poor performance procedures	21-40
Review EO policy against existing legislation	41-60	T&D for Scholarship and Research	41-60	Staff surveys	41-60	Staffing allocation is aligned to student demand	21-40	Capability Procedures	21-40
Evaluation tool used for job evaluation	41-60	T&D for leadership	41-60	Enhanced Relocation Schemes	41-60	Retraining and staff redeployment	21-40	Absence Procedures	21-40
Salary structures or regrading process	41-60	T&D for accredited frameworks for professionals	41-60	Exit procedures	21-40	Staffing needs reflected by market demands	1 - 20	KPIs are collected and analysed	1 - 20
Equal pay review	41-60	Investor in People Status	41-60	Equal pay benchmarking	21-40	HE expansion policies impact on staff needs	1 - 20	Monitoring procedure	1 - 20
Measures to encourage women	21-40	Active Targeting for T&D	41-60	Alterations to recruitment advertising	21-40	Enhanced Early Retirements policy	1 - 20		
EO Officer recruited	21-40	Online Training available to staff	41-60	Retention Payments	21-40				
Work or life balance consideration	21-40	Individual career review planning and advice	41-60	Reform leave policy	21-40				
Measures to encourage disabled individuals	21-40	Review of HR policies	41-60	Webbased application process	21-40				
Measures to encourage ethnic staff	21-40	HR Webbased access by staff	21-40	Excellence Awards	21-40				
EO Advisory Group	21-40	Support Mechanisms in place to assist T&D	21-40	Golden Hellos	1 - 20				
EO Audit	21-40	Staff Development Manager recruited to assist T&D	21-40	Measures to encourage and attract a global workforce	1 - 20				
Flexible working policies	21-40	Open communication with HR	21-40	Marketing HEI as a desirable place to work	1 - 20				
EO surveys and workshops	21-40	Exchange of good practise	21-40						
Measures to encourage underrepresented groups	21-40	Dissemination of development opps	21-40						
Stress policy in place	21-40	Succession Planning	1 - 20						
Direct Marketing to underrepresented groups	1 - 20	Career development fellowships	1 - 20						
Links with local community	1 - 20	Policies for Admin support	1 - 20						
Age discrimination consideration	1 - 20	Policies for contract staff	1 - 20						

Source: KPMG document review 2004

Figure 2-3: Percentage of pre-1992 universities undertaking activities reported across the six priority areas

	% of institutions reporting	Staff Training and Development	% of institutions reporting	Recruitment and Retention	% of institutions reporting	Staffing Needs	% of institutions reporting	Poor Performance	% of institutions reporting
EO Data collection	81-100	Other T&D	81-100	Retention Payments	61-80	Strengthen HR department	61-80	Support mechanisms to assist poor performance	41-60
EO Monitoring	81-100	T&D for management	81-100	Redesign recruitment process	61-80	Regular reviews of staffing needs	41-60	Absence Procedures	41-60
Job Evaluation	81-100	Improved HR Database and payroll	61-80	Data collection on R& R	41-60	Enhanced Early Retirements policy	21-40	Capability Procedures	41-60
Evaluation tool used for job evaluation	61-80	T&D for IT	41-60	Nonpay related benefits	41-60	Restructuring Program	21-40	Training managers on poor performance procedures	21-40
EO Awareness and education	61-80	T&D for Scholarship and Research	41-60	Staff surveys	41-60	Staffing needs reflected by market demands	1 - 20	Occupational Health Worker	21-40
Review EO policy against existing legislation	61-80	Leadership T&D	41-60	Market Supplements	41-60	Staffing allocation is aligned to student demand	1 - 20	Disciplinary or Probation procedures	21-40
EO Advisory Group	41-60	Review of HR policies	41-60	Exit Procedures	21-40	Funds allocated for severance and redundancy	1 - 20	Monitoring procedure	21-40
Measures to encourage women	41-60	Policies for contract staff	41-60	Alterations to recruitment advertising	21-40	Retraining and staff redeployment	1 - 20	KPIs are collected and analysed	1 - 20
Salary structures or regrading process	41-60	Support Mechanisms in place to assist T&D	41-60	Enhanced Relocation Schemes	21-40	HE expansion policies impact on staff needs	1 - 20		
EO Officer recruited	41-60	T&D for accredited frameworks for professionals	41-60	Webbased application process	21-40				
Measures to encourage ethnic staff	41-60	HR Webbased access by staff	21-40	Equal Pay Benchmarking	21-40				
Measures to encourage under-represented groups	41-60	Staff Development Mgr recruited to assist T&D	21-40	Excellence Awards	21-40				
EO Audit	41-60	Investor in People Status	21-40	Marketing HEI as a desirable place to work	21-40				
EO surveys and workshops	41-60	Policies assist Admin support	21-40	Reform leave policy	21-40				
Work or Life balance consideration	41-60	Active Targeting used to increase the number receiving T&D	21-40	Measures to encourage and attract a global workforce	1 - 20				
Measures to encourage disabled individuals	41-60	Individual career review planning and advice	21-40	Golden Hellos	1 - 20				
Flexible working policies	41-60	Online Training available to staff	21-40						
Equal pay review	41-60	Open communication with HR	21-40						
Stress policy	21-40	Succession Planning	1 - 20						
Direct Marketing to underrepresented groups	21-40	Exchange of good practise	1 - 20						
Links with local community	1 - 20	Career Development Fellowships	1 - 20						
Age discrimination consideration	1 - 20	Dissemination of Development opps	1 - 20						

Source: KPMG document review 2004

Figure 2-4: Percentage of specialist institutions undertaking activities reported across the six priority areas

Equal Opportunities	% of institutions reporting	Staff Training and Development	% of institutions reporting	Recruitment and Retention	% of institutions reporting	Staffing Needs	% of institutions reporting	Poor Performance	% of institutions reporting
EO Monitoring	81-100	T&D Management	61-80	Data collection on R&R	41-60	Strengthen HR department	61-80	Training managers on poor performance procedures	21-40
Job Evaluation	61-80	T&D Other	61-80	Alterations to recruitment advertising	41-60	Regular reviews of staffing needs	21-40	Disciplinary or Probation procedures	21-40
EO Data collection	61-80	T&D IT	61-80	Exit procedures	41-60	Staffing needs reflected by market demands	21-40	Support mechanisms to assist poor performance	21-40
EO Awareness and education for staff	61-80	Active Targeting used to increase the number receiving T&D	61-80	Redesign recruitment process	41-60	Staff restructuring	21-40	Absence Procedures	21-40
Evaluation tool used for job evaluation	61-80	Improved HR Database and payroll	41-60	Nonpay related benefits	21-40	Funds allocated for severance and redundancy	1 - 20	Capability Procedures	1 - 20
Measures to encourage disabled individuals	41-60	Review of HR policies	41-60	Staff surveys	21-40	Retraining and staff redeployment	1 - 20	Monitoring procedure	1 - 20
Measures to encourage ethnic staff	41-60	T&D for accredited frameworks for professionals	41-60	Excellence Awards	21-40	Staffing allocation is aligned to student demand	1 - 20	Occupational Health Workers	1 - 20
Review EO policy against existing legislation	41-60	T&D Scholarship and Research	21-40	Equal Pay Benchmarking	21-40	HE expansion policies impact on staff needs	1 - 20	KPIs are collected and analysed	1 - 20
EO Audit	21-40	Leadership T&D	21-40	Reform leave policy	21-40	Enhanced Early Retirements policy	1 - 20		
Equal pay review	21-40	Support Mechanisms in place to assist T& D	21-40	Enhanced Relocation Schemes	21-40				
EO Advisory Group	21-40	Staff Development Mgr recruited to assist T&D	21-40	Market Supplements	21-40				
Measures to encourage women	21-40	HR Webbased access by staff	21-40	Measures to encourage and attract a global workforce	21-40				
Salary structures or regrading process	21-40	Individual career review planning and advice	21-40	Retention Payments	1 - 20				
Measures to encourage under-represented groups	21-40	Policies for contract staff	21-40	Webbased application process	1 - 20				
EO surveys and workshops	21-40	Policies for Admin support	1 - 20	Marketing HEI as a desirable place to work	1 - 20				
Work or life balance consideration	21-40	Dissemination of Development opps	1 - 20	Golden Hellos	1 - 20				
EO Officer recruited	1 - 20	Succession Planning	1 - 20						
Age discrimination consideration	1 - 20	Open communication with HR	1 - 20						
Flexible working policies	1 - 20	Exchange of good practise takes place	1 - 20						
Direct Marketing to underrepresented groups	1 - 20	Career Development Fellowships	1 - 20						
Stress policy	1 - 20	Investor in People Status	1 - 20						
Links with local community	1 - 20	Online Training available to staff	1 - 20						

Source: KPMG document review 2004

Figure 2-5: Percentage of university colleges undertaking activities reported across the six priority areas

Equal Opportunities	% of institutions reporting	Staff Training and Development	% of institutions reporting	Recruitment and Retention	% of institutions reporting	Staffing Needs	% of institutions reporting	Poor Performance	% of institutions reporting
EO awareness and education	81-100	T&D for IT	81-100	Market Supplements	41-60	Strengthen HR department	61-80	Capability Procedures	41-60
Job Evaluation	81-100	T&D other	81-100	Retention Payments	41-60	Regular reviews of staffing needs	41-60	Absence Procedures	41-60
EO Monitoring	61-80	T&D for mangement	81-100	Enhanced Relocation Schemes	41-60	Staff restructuring programme	21-40	Disciplinary or Probation procedures	41-60
Evaluation tool used for job evaluation	61-80	Support Mechanisms in place to assist T& D	81-100	Webbased application process	41-60	Staffing allocation is aligned to student demand	21-40	Occupational Health Workers	41-60
Review EO policy against existing legislation	61-80	Investor in People Status	81-100	Redesign recruitment process	41-60	Retraining and staff redeployment	21-40	Training managers on poor performance procedures	41-60
EO Data collection	61-80	Improved HR Database and payroll	81-100	Reform leave policy	41-60	Enhanced Early Retirements policy	21-40	KPIs are collected and analysed	21-40
EO Audit	41-60	T&D for Scholarship and Research	61-80	Alterations to recruitment advertising	21-40	Staffing needs reflected by market demands	1 - 20	Support mechanisms to assist poor performance	1 - 20
Measures to encourage disabled individuals	41-60	Career Development Fellowships	41-60	Nonpay related benefits	21-40	Funds allocated for severance and redundancy	1 - 20	Monitoring procedures	1 - 20
Measures to encourage under-represented groups	41-60	T&D for accredited frameworks for professionals	41-60	Equal Pay Benchmarking	21-40	HE expansion policies impact on staff needs	1 - 20		
Work or Life balance consideration	41-60	Active Targeting used to increase the numbe receiving T&D	41-60	Data collection on R&R	21-40				
Measures encourage women	41-60	Staff Development Mgr recruited to assist T&D	41-60	Staff surveys	21-40				
Measures to encourage ethnic groups	41-60	Review of HR policies	41-60	Excellence Awards	21-40				
EO Officer recruited	41-60	Leadership T&D	21-40	Marketing HEI as a desirable place to work	21-40				
Direct Marketing to underrepresented groups	41-60	Online Training available to staff	21-40	Exit Procedures	21-40				
EO surveys and workshops	41-60	Open communication with HR	21-40	Measures to encourage and attract a global workforce	1 - 20				
Flexible working policies	41-60	HR Webbased access by staff	21-40	Golden Hellos	1 - 20				
Salary structures or regrading process	41-60	Policies for Admin support	21-40						
Stress policy	41-60	Dissemination of Development opps	21-40						
Equal pay review	21-40	Exchange of good practise takes place	21-40						
EO Advisory Group	21-40	Individual career review planning and advice	21-40						
Links with local community	21-40	Policies for contract staff	1 - 20						
Age discrimiantion consideration	1 - 20	Succession Planning	1 - 20						

Source: KPMG document review 2004

Figure 2-6: Percentage of general HE colleges undertaking activities reported across the six priority areas

Equal Opportunities	% of institutions reporting	Staff Training and Development	% of institutions reporting	Recruitment and Retention	% of institutions reporting	Staffing Needs	% of institutions reporting	Poor Performance	% of institutions reporting
Job Evaluation	81-100	Management T&D	61-80	Webbased application process	61-80	Regular reviews of staffing needs	61-80	Absence Procedures	81-100
EO Monitoring	81-100	Other T&D	61-80	Altertions to recruitment advertising	41-60	Strengthen HR department staffing	61-80	Training managers on poor performance	61-80
Review EO policy against existing legislation	61-80	T&D for accredited frameworks for professionals	61-80	Nonpay related benefits	41-60	Staff restructuring program	41-60	Capability Procedures	61-80
EO awareness and education	61-80	Active Targeting used to increase the number receiving T&D	61-80	Data collection on R and R	41-60	Staffing needs reflected by market demands	21-40	Disciplinary or Probation procedure	41-60
EO Data collection	61-80	T&D for Scholarship and Research	61-80	Exit Procudures	41-60	Funds allocated for severance and redundancy	21-40	Support mechanisms to assist poor performance	21-40
Flexible working policies	61-80	Review of HR policies	61-80	Staff surveys	41-60	Retraining and staff redeployment	21-40	Occupational Health Worker	21-40
Evaluation tool used for job evaluation	61-80	Improved HR Database and payroll	61-80	Redesign recruitment process	41-60	Staffing allocation is aligned to student demand	1 - 20	KPIs are collected and analysed	21-40
EO Audit	41-60	T&D for IT	41-60	Market Supplements	21-40	HE expansion policies impact on staff needs	1 - 20	Monitoring procedure	1 - 20
Measures to encourage disabled individuals	41-60	Support Mechanisms in place to assist T & D	41-60	Golden Hellos	21-40	Enhanced Early Retirements policy	1 - 20		
Salary structures or regrading process	41-60	Investor in People Status	41-60	Retention Payments	21-40				
Equal pay review	21-40	Leadership T&D	21-40	Enhanced Relocation Schemes	21-40				
Measures to encourage women	21-40	Dissemination of Development opps available	21-40	Reform leave policy	1 - 20				
Measures to encourage under-represented groups	21-40	Online Training available to staff	21-40	Excellence Awards	1 - 20				
EO Advisory Group	21-40	Career Development Fellowships	21-40	Equal Pay Benchmarking	1 - 20				
Direct Marketing to underrepresented groups	21-40	Open communication with HR	21-40	Marketing HEI as a desirable place to work	0				
Measures to encourage ethnic staff	21-40	Policies for contract staff	21-40	Measures to encourage and attract a global workforce	0				
Links with local community	21-40	Succession Planning	21-40						
Work or Life balance consideration	21-40	Exchange of good practise	21-40						
EO Officer recruited	1 - 20	HR Webbased access by staff	21-40						
EO surveys and workshops	1 - 20	Staff Development Mgr recruited to assist T& D	1 - 20						
Age discrimination consideration	0	Individual career review planning and advice	1 - 20						
Stress policy	0	Policies for Admin support	0						

Source: KPMG document review 2004

3 Wider impacts

Table 3-1: Percentage and number of institutions which recognise the importance of good HRM

Type of institution	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neither agree nor disagree		Agree		Strongly agree		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Pre-1992 university	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	8.7%	11	47.8%	10	43.5%	23	100.0%
Post-1992 university	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	36.8%	10	52.6%	19	100.0%
University college	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	5	100.0%
General colleges	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	4	100.0%
Specialist institution	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	8	44.4%	9	50.0%	18	100.0%
Total	2	2.9%	2	2.9%	3	4.3%	30	43.5%	32	46.4%	69	100.0%

Source: KPMG questionnaire analysis 2004

Table 3-2: Percentage and number of institutions reporting embedding HR planning within their strategic planning framework

Type of institution	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neither agree nor disagree		Agree		Strongly agree		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Pre-1992 university	0	0.0%	2	8.7%	2	8.7%	12	52.2%	7	30.4%	23	100.0%
Post-1992 university	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	7	36.8%	9	47.4%	19	100.0%
University college	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	2	40.0%	5	100.0%
General colleges	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	4	100.0%
Specialist institution	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	38.9%	11	61.1%	18	100.0%
Total	2	2.9%	4	5.8%	3	4.3%	29	42.0%	31	44.9%	69	100.0%

Source: KPMG questionnaire analysis 2004

Important notice from KPMG about this report

We were engaged by HEFCE to conduct a study consisting of an evaluation of the first round of R&DS funding covering the period 2001-2 to 2003-04 (“the study”) and to report to HEFCE on our findings, details of which appear in this document (our “report”). The terms and conditions of our engagement by HEFCE and HEFCE’s requirements are set out in a contract between us (“the contract”). In order to provide this report, we have carried out the relevant work as specified in the contract. Our work did not amount to an audit conducted in accordance with auditing standards and does not give the same level of assurance as an audit. In performing our work we relied on information supplied from various sources. We did not attempt to verify the accuracy or completeness of any such information.

This report has been prepared for HEFCE solely in connection with and for the purposes of the study. It has been released to HEFCE on the basis that it shall not be copied, referred to or disclosed in whole (save for HEFCE’s own internal purposes or to its advisers in connection with the study) or in part, without our prior written consent. We have consented to its disclosure in full on HEFCE’s web-site and to third parties on condition that this important notice appears prominently in full.

This report was designed to meet the agreed requirements of HEFCE and particular features of the engagement of KPMG determined by HEFCE’s needs at the time. This report should not therefore be regarded as suitable to be used or relied on by any person or organisation other than HEFCE for any purpose or in any context. Any person or organisation other than HEFCE who or which obtains access to this report or a copy and chooses to rely on this report (or any part of it) will do so at its own risk. To the fullest extent permitted by law, KPMG will accept no responsibility or liability in respect of this report to any other person or organisation.