

Golden hello evaluation survey

List of respondent HEIs

Arts Institute of Bournemouth
Aston University
Bishop Grosseteste College, Lincoln
Bournemouth University
Brunel University
Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College
Canterbury Christ Church University
City University, London
Conservatoire for Dance and Drama
Coventry University
Dartington College of Arts
De Montfort University
Edge Hill College of Higher Education
Imperial College London
Institute of Education
Keele University
Kings College, London
Lancaster University
Leeds Metropolitan University
Liverpool Hope University College
London School of Economics
London South Bank University
Loughborough University
Manchester Metropolitan University
Middlesex University
Newman College of Higher Education
Nottingham Trent University
Open University
Oxford Brookes University
Sheffield Hallam University
Southampton Solent University
St Georges University of London (Hospital Medical School)
St Martins College Lancaster
St Marys University College
Staffordshire University
Thames Valley University
University College London
University College, Northampton
University of Bath
University of Birmingham
University of Bolton
University of Bradford
University of Brighton
University of Bristol
University of Cambridge
University of Central England
University of Central Lancashire
University of Chester

University of Derby
University of Durham
University of East Anglia
University of East London
University of Essex
University of Exeter
University of Greenwich
University of Hertfordshire
University of Huddersfield
University of Kent
University of Leeds
University of Leicester
University of Lincoln
University of Liverpool
University of London
University of Luton
University of Manchester
University of Newcastle Upon Tyne
University of Northumbria at Newcastle
University of Nottingham
University of Oxford
University of Portsmouth
University of Reading
University of Salford
University of Sheffield
University of Southampton
University of Sunderland
University of Surrey
University of Sussex
University of Teesside
University of the West of England
University of Warwick
University of Westminster
University of Winchester
University of Wolverhampton
University of York
Writtle College

Research findings

HEIs

**Golden hello funding allocated
and being used**

1.1 Year funding was first allocated		1.2 Year golden hellos were first paid	
2003-04	2004-05	2003-04	2004-05
54	5	38	21
91.5%	8.5%	64.4%	35.6%

(b) Reason for delay (if applicable)
Respondent has been at this University for 18 months. The policy was drafted in 2004 and a candidate first received a golden hello in January 2005. Prior to that they did not have candidates who met the criteria.
I don't believe that we recruited anybody in year one who was eligible for the golden hello scheme, so although we were participants in the scheme, we didn't draw down any of the funding. I would have to go back to source data to check which would take about half a day of someone's time.
Difficulty of identifying candidates who met the qualifying criteria of the scheme who could be granted the additional payments without unacceptable distortion of local pay scales and the potential for equal pay claims.
1. Long lead in time between offer and contract start date i.e. golden hellos offered in 03/04 but staff did not begin employment until 1 August 04. 2. Until the regulations were relaxed, it was difficult to find eligible people.
No requirement to apply supplement until 2004/2005.
It took some time to agree internal allocation criteria.
We wanted to ensure internal guidance on eligibility and criteria were clear to ensure allocation was evidence-based and justifiable.
03/04 money received in 04/05.
Appointments offered in 03/04 for commencement at beginning of 04/05 academic year.
The original eligibility criteria were problematic - new recruits inevitably have previous teaching experience. The subsequent relaxation of the criteria by HEFCE gave greater scope to use the funding.
We vired our allocation for 2003/4 to 2004/5 (a) because we wanted to incorporate golden hellos as part of our wider reward strategy and (b) there was no one eligible in 2003/4.
We needed time to be clear about the key areas within the University where we would use the golden hellos money.
Delayed until scheme was relaxed in January 2004.
In the first year there were significant restrictions on how the funds could be allocated - for example the scheme guidelines limited the range of disciplines that were eligible for funding. These were not areas where we had particular recruitment difficulties and either no suitable vacancies arose or, where they did, the posts were filled from within the Sector
The Institution embarked on an ambitious programme to recruit established world class individuals and appointments made did not satisfy the criteria for the golden hello scheme.
We opted into the scheme in the final quarter of 2003/04, therefore, we did not start using the funding until 2004/05.
Implementation issues causing delay. Some resistance to the scheme.
We did not use the funding in 2003-04 because the conditions were too narrow to be of use to us. We would not have been able to meet the conditions when they were first published.
There were no requests for support forthcoming prior to the 2004-2005 session.
We got the money in the first year and started to spend it in year 2. Not strictly on golden hellos. Initially, in the consultation period, we said, no, we didn't want funding because of the strict criteria. We were also concerned about being unable to defend our position in, for example, a tribunal because data on skills shortages was not available from HEFCE to back it up. They sent us some money anyway and a few months later the criteria were relaxed so we used it as a recruitment and retention device for our Legal Practice Course within the Law School.
Started payments in the last three or four months. Delay was due to the fact that we were very, very unhappy with the significant constraints on the funding. We were hamstrung in our use of the funding. Our recruitment issues are not around the areas designated by the HEFCE. Our problems are in appointing senior academic staff from overseas. We have no problem in appointing junior staff or people who are new into teaching in HEI.

1.3 Subject Areas in which the golden hello scheme has been used						
Education	Maths	IT	Engineering	Business	Clinical Medicine	Other
30	18	18	21	38	9	15

Other:
Physics, History of Science, Technology and Medicine, Biological and Medical Systems
Business School Sport and Leisure
Clinical Pharmacy and Pharmacology
Sports Therapy
Senior Public Health appointment
Professions allied to health
Geography
Health (2)
Law, Computing, Nursing
Psychology & Sport Sciences
Pharmacy
Science
Geography; Bioscience
Politics

Comments
Education: Two senior lecturers in Foundation Degrees in Teaching Studies and Primary Education. Plus one other in September 2005 for something similar in primary or secondary education. They were moving from teaching in schools into lecturing.
Definitely business and possibly computing. Again I would need to go back to source data to check.
All maths has been within Education. We have also on a voluntary basis extended the scheme to Allied Health Professions within our Health Faculty.
Still difficult to give to clinical staff because of focus on research in their early years of appointment.
In health we have two supplements - one for physiotherapy and one for occupational therapy. In education four have been for primary teaching and one for secondary.
Locally our main subject areas for recruitment / retention issues are currently Education and Health.
Although we identified various subject areas as eligible and advertised as such, it is a coincidence that the funding was absorbed solely by the Education faculty.
Limited application so far. However, we are now (Oct 05) rolling out a more flexible procedure potentially open to any of our academic departments, so would expect take up to increase.
Specified subject areas could not make use of the funding under the original criteria. Subsequently the funding could be made available to underwrite the costs of recruitment of new staff in those areas.
Initially we used in Law and Computing (2 posts). More recently we have used to attract lecturers into nursing where we have major difficulties in attracting staff when in competition from the NHS
Following the lifting of the restriction on the subject areas where the supplements could be offered, we now make them available for any subject area, providing it can be demonstrated that there has been a recruitment difficulty. The scheme has been incorporated as part of our Market Supplement policy and Managers must demonstrate a need for the supplement e.g. by demonstrating that a recruitment advertisement has not attracted a suitable range of applicants and it has not been possible to make an appointment to a vacancy as a result.
Adverts have been placed including the golden hello scheme in Engineering and Clinical Medicine, however, appointees did not meet the golden hello criteria.
We will potentially be using 2005/06 funding in relation to Education and areas of Art & Social Sciences.
We opened a new School of Pharmacy in October 2004.
We also offered an additional 17 golden hellos within the Faculty of Medicine which we underwrote. Nine appointees met the eligibility criteria and were awarded University of Sheffield-funded golden hellos.
We used it for the Legal Practice Course because we have a couple of other local predatory providers who had been poaching staff. We used the golden hello money to supplement the pay of everyone teaching on the LOP (not just new recruits!)

Initially we used the funding for the HEFCE shortage areas which covered marketing subjects in the Business School and engineering subjects. We have potentially widened it this year, but have probably not implemented it in practice yet. HEFCE's subject shortage list didn't match our needs here. We are pleased to have the ability now to offer it in other areas and we plan to use the funding more widely. For example, we have someone in Materials Engineering from the Netherlands who is a potential recipient of a golden hello if he accepts our offer. To date we have used it more often than not for people from overseas. It has been useful in addressing the issues of attracting and relocating people from countries like the USA and Australia.

We are very conscious of the constraints.

We pretty much started using golden hellos straight away. Primarily for posts in education.

We did make appointments in other areas earmarked as eligible but the candidates were not eligible as they came from another HEI.

2.1 New Teaching Staff Recruited under the golden hello scheme by Subject Shortage Area

Education	Maths	IT	Engineering	Business	Clinical Medicine	Other	Total
19.7%	9.8%	7,5%	18.1%	24.8%	10,8%	9.3%	100%

Figures are based on responses from 50 of 58 respondents

Other:
Physics, History of Science, Technology and Medicine, Biological and Medical Systems
Professions allied to medicine
Health
Sport and Leisure Business School
Pharmacy and Pharmacology
Law, Computing, Nursing
Sports and Exercise Science
Psychology & Sport Sciences
Pharmacy
Biochemistry
Politics

Comments
I don't know exactly. Again I would need to go back to source data. I would estimate that the total allocation would have provided four golden hellos. We probably drew down the funding for three.
Because the original criteria were so constraining we did not feel able to refer to golden hellos in our advertising; we could not publish the criteria in the ad and felt that advertising an attraction premium that may or may not be available, depending on the precise profile of the applicant risked creating expectations we may have found ourselves unable to meet.
The period 2003-2005 has not been typical for the University in terms of recruitment activity as we have been through a corporate restructuring. We will need to look at planned recruitment activity for the next 12 months to identify how many might be eligible for golden hellos.
Equivalent to 9.5 FTE.
It is not possible to say which staff were recruited under the scheme as it was not used as originally intended.
Data not readily to hand.
Definitely for maths, possibly for dentistry and maybe others. We have recruited a handful of people under the golden hello scheme - I would guess at a total of six.
There is one further appointment in Pharmacy in the pipeline that is likely to attract a payment.
This data is not immediately available. Not big numbers. Guesstimate would be 12 people in total (maximum) across the University. Unable to give a breakdown.
Two further posts were offered - one in engineering and one in business - and were not accepted despite the offer of a recruitment and retention supplement.
Not applicable. The issue was more about retention than recruitment. We took a different approach and used the funding 100% for retention purposes.
Computing and IT were the principal areas (8 or 9 people). Also for one person in Education. It wasn't used for Business studies. We used it largely for relocation purposes and to enable us to offer more competitive salaries. They were all fairly senior staff.
This is a guess. Only a small number - less than 10 - predominantly in Engineering and one or two in Business.
Over the period, 15-20 people maximum of which three were in bioscience. I know that we made four payments in total in the first year.
The golden hello funding is set at such a low level that it has little impact on recruitment or retention - it is not a driving factor.
Don't know - could not estimate.

2.2 Percentage of New Staff Recruited under the golden hello scheme still in post by Subject Shortage Area							
Education	Maths	IT	Engineering	Business	Clinical Medicine	Other	Total
93.8%	89.6%	91.9%	94.4%	96.7%	100%	97.8%	95.1%

Figures are based on responses from 50 of 58 respondents

Other:
Physics, History of Science, Technology and Medicine, Biological and Medical Systems
Professions allied to medicine
Health
Sport and Leisure Business School
Pharmacy and Pharmacology
Senior Public Health appointment
Law, Computing, Nursing
Sports and Exercise Science
Psychology & Sport Sciences
Pharmacy
Biochemistry
Politics

Comments
One of the three has not yet started.
I don't know exactly. Again I would need to go back to source data. As far as I am aware they are all still in post.
All of them (2)
All bar one who left after just under 1 year
Data not readily to hand
Probably all of them. We set retention targets of 90% over two years which we have met historically.
All. Not aware of any that have left. Our annual turnover rate for academics is 8%.
Probably all of them
All of them as far as I am aware. It appears to be having a positive impact on retention so far.
Both are still in post after three months!
All 15-20 are still in post apart from 1. They are in golden handcuffs for two years!
Don't know - could not estimate.

2.3 New Teaching Staff Recruited without the benefit of golden hello funding by Subject Shortage Area

Education	Maths	IT	Engineering	Business	Clinical Medicine	Other	TOTAL
25.2%	5.6%	9.2%	13.7%	25.2%	18.3%	2.9%	100%

Figures are based on responses from 41 of 58 respondents

Other:
Non clinical appointments at Lecturer level
Health
Sports and Exercise Science

Comments

There were a total of eleven posts and eight of those were not eligible for funding. They comprised: Head of ITT; Head of Science Education; Senior Lecturer in Initial Teacher Training in Education. Five others coming in September.

We did not actively advertise golden hellos.

Non clinical appointments at Lecturer level only. We have appointed many clinical senior lecturers but the focus on research makes it difficult to use the golden hello scheme.

Sorry, not got time to analyse this information. We have had vacancies in these areas but most staff were not new to teaching and so the scheme was not applicable

Difficult to say. Some posts were advertised with the golden hello initiative to help attract appropriate candidates in the first instance and the response rate was better than response rates when the golden hello initiative was not advertised. However, not in all cases was the successful candidate eligible to receive the award i.e. they came from other HE Institutions.

Although we filled all of the posts there was an issue over the quality of the candidates

Of the appointments under the heading Clinical Medicine and Dentistry, 3 of these were in Dentistry, all of which were eligible for and awarded a supplement. This is an area of particular recruitment difficulty.

The data necessary to answer this question is not readily available. However, it is certain that more appointments were made in these disciplines without the benefit of golden hello funding than with it.

A handful over the period 2003-05. Perhaps three or four.

The majority have not qualified for golden hellos. We have recruited a total of 25-30 people in these subject areas of whom 12 (or less) might have been eligible.

All eligible Lectureship & Senior Lectureship posts of 12 months duration or longer were advertised with a golden hello. The numbers provided indicate appointees who did not meet the eligibility criteria for the award.

Within school but outside shortage areas or temporary posts.

None, as all Heads of Schools were aware of the initiative and thus wanted to access the funds available

Within the Law School in general (not just the Legal Practice Course) we have filled around six posts without golden hellos. Probably one of those was in LPC.

We "topped" up golden hellos so staff did not know they were not included in HEFCE scheme which we feel would have been bad for morale.

Around the same numbers were recruited without golden hellos. Quite a few staff came in during that period in the IT and Computing area.

A total of 20 people

Lots! I would guess somewhere between 30 and 40. A few more in Engineering than in Business.

Don't know (10)

Approximate figure

We have recruited a number of staff in Education, Computing and Business areas but relatively few meet all the criteria to receive payments under the scheme.

2.4 Ongoing Recruitment Difficulties		
Yes	No	No response
37	19	3
62.7%	32.2%	5.1%

(b) What are they?
Finding suitably qualified applicants interested in a long-term academic career.
We get a lot of applications but not always from the right people. We needed to recruit six new staff in September 2005 and we got six.
There are few high quality British applicants; we rely heavily on European applicants. The market is very competitive and our salaries are relatively low. The golden hellos help us compete with foreign universities.
The six shortage areas have changed since 2001/02. Some shortages are in nursing school. NHS salaries are increasing for practitioners where ours are not. Law is also a shortage subject for us. We are a small Institution located thirty miles outside London, but don't have the benefit of London weightings. We don't have the kudos of the bigger HEIs.
Not consistently - varies between discipline and area of specialism.
Salaries are more competitive in the Schools sector.
The London factor in the main. Lack of female applicants in spite of various measures to address this.
In some areas, as we want to attract experienced staff in the shortage areas not just those new to teaching.
A shortage of candidates of high calibre.
We still experience some difficulty in health recruitment as NHS salaries in some areas are higher e.g. radiography.
Some problems are still being experienced in Business and Management subject areas. It is difficult to translate the offer into an acceptance.
As a high proportion of our courses are Education related, we are competing with school teacher rates of pay, which are higher than the national pay rates in higher education.
We still face recruitment difficulties.
Some areas remain difficult to recruit to because of relatively small numbers / high competition for the high quality people we need.
Like other HEIs, we experience difficulties in recruiting from time to time across a range of subject areas.
We have still had 2 posts in Education and one in Business where we've had to re-advertise. However, the introduction of golden hellos has overall reduced the need to re-advertise.
Not too bad. The relaxation of the criteria from the 'stated' shortage areas has helped. Whilst these were deemed as National shortage areas, on a local basis they were not; in fact we were making some redundancies in the shortage areas! Where we could not recruit into roles, despite advertising several times, we used the golden hello initiative as advised above. The problem may well be in retention once the 3 years payments have elapsed!
Our current funding does not permit us to pay sufficiently high salaries in areas of significant competition.
Senior Public Health recruitment (1 post) not successful.
Accounting - but they chose not to take up the scheme because of impact on existing staff
Recruitment difficulties vary greatly from post to post. This is not only dependent on the broad subject area as described in the golden hello categories but, in the case of Lectureships with both a research and a teaching element, also on the more detailed requirements of individual posts which are often related to the research element. As a University with a strong research culture and an emphasis on teaching in the context of an individual's personal research, this can be a significant factor in the ability to attract an appropriate field of candidates. Where there is a scarcity of specialists either nationally or internationally, the golden hello scheme will not necessarily address the recruitment problem.
Our recruitment difficulties have tended to be at senior level where we are seeking to appoint academics with an established track record. Where we have had difficulties recruiting at more junior level, where the golden hellos might be applicable, it is because we have still not attracted candidates who could demonstrate the necessary potential for high quality research.
Clinical Medicine, Veterinary Science and Engineering.
Particularly in shortage areas such as high tech engineering, structural and civil engineering, informatics.
For a number of roles in this group the additional money of £9K does not compensate for the opportunity cost of working in industry, chambers etc.
As a generalisation, no, although we still have occasional difficulties. The previous scheme was successful overall. It worked and it was also looking at people who were new to HE. We also offered other non-pay benefits. Our New Directions Scheme continues to operate and we plug in golden hello funding where the people and subject areas are eligible for it.

Not tremendous recruitment difficulties. We don't get a great deal of choice, but we have been able to make appointments and have filled vacancies.
A number of posts advertised with golden hellos were not filled. This was particularly a problem for teaching posts within the Faculty of Medicine, an area in which we traditionally have recruitment difficulties.
Feedback from Maths is that there is still a shortage because the potential field of applicants remains small, especially in Statistics and OR.
Being based in central London it is difficult to recruit and retain professional support staff (not academics) in areas like accountancy, estates, HR, computing, where we are competing with the commercial world. We also have recruitment and retention difficulties in some areas of Business, Statistics and Marketing.
Shortage of econometricians
We didn't really have any in the first place apart from in computing where pay was an issue in senior appointments at the time. It had more to do with the strategy we adopted in the Computing Department. The problem has largely gone away now in computing but it is still difficult to get good practitioners into education from the schools sector. In the business school there's an internally generated market in terms of people moving around between HEIs and it's quite competitive.
There are still recruitment difficulties in Economics; all Engineering; and Clinical disciplines.
In some areas, particularly at Professorial level we have a couple of Chairs in Engineering that are proving very difficult to fill. The person from the Netherlands I referred to earlier is a Professor. There is a real shortage in this area. We have our own relocation schemes and the golden hello has added to that.
It's OK up to senior lecturer level but we have difficulty recruiting top stars and world class talent into Professorial positions. There are no problems with particular subjects.
We have unfilled posts. The difficulty is about quality not quantity - people who meet our standards - there is a limited pool of people who can fill these posts. Very specialist areas such as Islamic law are difficult. We always say here "Better a good vacancy than a bad appointment".
We have to work very hard to recruit junior academic staff in the areas of Economics and Accounting & Finance.
Recruitment issues are changeable. We have problems getting senior management people from schools. Also in Health because of the Agenda for Change and its impact on salaries in the sector. Recruiting physics is worse than nurses. Lawyers can be difficult to find. On occasion, we have had to go to a search organisation to recruit Deans.
For more experienced staff in Education and Business.
Many of our academic staff in Education come from schools and earn more money than our grades allow.

2.5 Any Increase in Number of Applications due to golden hello			
Yes	No	DK	No response
16	26	15	2
27.1%	44.1%	25.4%	3.4%

(b) Why?
Short term salary/remuneration is not the issue
The availability of a golden hello wasn't advertised. It has helped people to make the transition from teaching to lecturing because salary levels in HE are lower than in schools.
We did not actively advertise or publicise the scheme. We have used it as more of a bargaining tool once candidates are at the interview. The academic trades union here (NATFHE) didn't like it because it was seen as inequitable. They want to see higher salaries across the board. It was the EO argument. Also, I can't remember which, but one of the criteria was particularly unclear.
More competitive.
Because we didn't advertise them, for the reasons given above.
Golden hellos did not increase the number of applications but what they did do was almost certainly increase the number of acceptances.
We were able to recruit from Europe where candidates' salary expectations were relatively high.
Opportunity to enter education and also to receive a competitive market rate.
In many areas salaries paid in the private sector mean that HE cannot compete to attract new academic staff.
We were able to attract more experienced practitioners from schools.
Generally yes, although it is difficult to be precise about the impact of the golden hello scheme as a single variable. The scheme provided additional salary.
Increased retention available in support of appointments
Most of our academic appointments tend to be people who already have UK HEI teaching experience and so are not eligible for the scheme. Also we have not yet rolled out our more flexible interpretation of the scheme which will potentially open it up to more departments.
Data was not available on application rates prior to this time.
The availability of a golden hello has served as an incentive to applicants wishing to make the transition from teaching and the professions into higher education.
We kept a record of the number of applicants that applied with a HE background and those without. For some roles all applicants were from a non HE background. We also asked people if they applied because of the golden hello. Quite a few have told us they only applied because of the scheme, although some said they would have applied anyway.
Lessen the gap between current salary in private sector and move into HE.
I think that the level the golden hellos were aimed at i.e. new teachers etc. is the wrong level. The real recruitment and retention difficulty occur where Universities seek to recruit experienced staff within the areas of expertise identified - not rookies.
It did seem to attract some interest from individuals from other sectors who might otherwise have been reluctant to consider a post at the University.
My perception is that, in some of the disciplines, starting salaries without the golden hellos are not uncompetitive and other factors are instrumental in whether an individual applies for an academic post or not. In other disciplines, where starting salaries are uncompetitive, the golden hello doesn't match the salary gap.
A more competitive salary could be offered.
We have used the funding as part of our new Graduate Tutors/Post Graduate Assistant recruitment aimed at attracting newly qualified graduates into teaching. The higher level of salary and payment of Post Graduate tutors' fees has helped to make these rates more attractive and competitive.
We do not have comparative data to monitor this.
I don't really know because we didn't publicise these posts as attracting golden hello funding as such.
Applications for an academic post are influenced by many factors, salary levels being just one.
I believe so because we were at pains to make reference to the availability of a golden hello at the advertising stage. We have tried to ensure that it has increased the number of applications and level of interest.
We have seen a significant increase in applications for all categories of posts during the last 2 years, therefore it is not possible to determine if part of this rise is attributable to the golden hello initiative.
"There is no way of knowing if the scheme increased the number of applications or their quality as we don't know who responded due to the fact it was mentioned in the advert."

Few people who applied for the jobs knew of the scheme.
Because it allowed us to pay salaries more in line with the NHS.
It's difficult to say whether there was a link between cause and effect. The golden hello scheme was not advertised as such although we were able to promote our ability to pay good salaries for these positions.
Difficult to assess directly over a relatively short two year period.
Too early to tell. To-date we have used it at the negotiating stage as an inducement, but we have recently become more proactive in promoting the golden hello incentive and have started advertising the availability of these supplements
Not as far as I know. The term golden hello was used in the ad for the Computer Science post but not for the Clinical post.
The golden hello scheme was not promoted as such because of potential inequality and affordability issues.
We are having to compete with the US and European markets for highly qualified and able candidates.
Increasingly people do not read the application packs very well; perhaps it should have been made clearer.

2.6 Any Increase in the Quality of Applicants			
Yes	No	DK	No response
11	23	22	3
18.6%	39.0%	37.3%	5.1%

(b) How?

There was a slight increase in the number of applicants with doctorates, which is a requirement for an academic appointment at this University.

No, because it wasn't actively advertised. Our traditional advertising medium - the Times Higher Supplement - is not ideal for attracting new blood.

Instead of newly qualified candidates, we received more applications from those with relevant experience.

An increase in the number of posts offered would seem to suggest that candidates are appointable.

Applicants view the move from school into HE as a career development opportunity.

Feedback from an outstanding candidate for Education post that the golden hello influenced their decision to accept the appointment.

I don't feel the scheme increased the quality but it did increase the quantity.

It is difficult to attribute recruitment trends to any one factor. The University has continued to attract high calibre candidates and the nature of the University's HEFCE-authorized, customised golden hello scheme makes it particularly difficult to evaluate in these terms.

Yes there was an increase in the quality of applicants.

Data was not available on application rates prior to this time.

I wouldn't necessarily say the quality of applicants has improved as we have very strict appointment criteria. In the past, the ones who have been really keen to make the transition to H.E. have taken a drop in salary.

Difficult to say about the quality. Given that we appointed people it would suggest that they were considered the best candidate, and it did increase the pool from which to select. This was not the case of selecting the best from a poor bunch, we are not having performance issues which would suggest that the quality is of acceptable standard! It did highlight that we had well qualified people, but not necessarily with all the other attributes we were looking for, in particular where some experience may have been required within the role.

More interest from the private sector.

New recruits to a profession are generally and have been for years, recent post-graduate entrants, former research assistants/associates or young scientists etc from the private sector. They are generally attracted by aspects of University life that will further their career or are interested in developing an academic profile. Salary may not be their sole consideration. However in vocational disciplines where individuals seek a career and life change and are in existing and well established career paths there might be a place for recruitment incentives. There is no evidence that our recruitment amongst this group has been assisted by golden hellos.

This was due to being able to offer a more competitive salary and career development opportunity.

We were very happy with the quality of the people we got through our New Directions Scheme. It probably did help.

I really couldn't comment.

It's not possible to say, as we have no way of recording the quality of applicants. However, we asked recruiting departments if they felt that the golden hellos initiative was a key factor in filling their posts, and 29% (5 out of 17) said yes.

At this University we tend to attract good people anyway.

Inevitably, the effect of the golden hello supplement would have a positive impact on attitudes towards recruitment here. However, the main impact of the scheme is one of assisting the transition towards establishing a career at this HEI and living in London. Potential employees contemplating an academic career are not likely to be wholly influenced by an extra £9k gross over three years. They are making much broader considerations in relation to the development of their research interests and the extent that can be developed with a University like this one. The simple fact remains that living in London is an expensive business. Also, this University has a sufficiently strong reputation to attract quality lecturers across all disciplines.

I think it has enabled us to get one or two of those good quality people.

No, because we are not using golden hellos in any systematic sense.

I think that we got people we might not have got otherwise because we've been able to offer better relocation allowances.

More attractive financially for qualified teachers to leave primary and secondary education sector.

2.7 Golden hello Influence on Applicants			
To Apply	To Accept	Other	No response
13	25	13	15

Other:
Not known (3)
Helped towards costs of relocation.
No evidence
None (2)
To some extent
Not applicable
Little or no influence over the applicant's decision.
Other offers from universities; development of research interests across the department and faculty; cost of living in London; and above all the reputation of this University for its strength and depth of research knowhow across the board.
In the case of the Computer Science post it probably helped, but for the Clinical post we would have paid a supplement anyway.
No, unfortunately I have no evidence of people actually registering the information that some applicants might be eligible. I had no queries in spite of mentioning it in the further particulars and sending out the code of practice.

Comments
Anecdotal evidence only; some appointees have indicated that the incentive was crucial in accepting our offer above that of a competitor.
No evidence to support any of the above.
It helped the applicants to make a decision when accepting the offer as it makes the salary more attractive.
It did help once people were at interview. Small sums are involved but it represents a bit more money that can tip the balance at the offer stage. It might attract people but it doesn't help to retain them. I have no concrete evidence but it is my view that it did encourage people to accept the offer.
In April 2005 we conducted our own research into the success of the golden hello scheme and questioned the 11 staff who were recruited and awarded the monies. 8 out of 11 responded and I've provided details of our findings.
Our City location makes it expensive to relocate to the area. Our golden hello scheme helped to facilitate this.
The ability to offer the golden hello to the Maths lecturers we appointed directly influenced their decision to accept the offer.
We know that recruits experience problems with the costs of relocation (with which we try to provide some assistance). However, to some extent recruitment is helped by the strength of the brand. It is difficult to know which influences candidates the most.
It has been included in our adverts and applicants have indicated pay was a factor in their application.
I have had no indication at all that the golden hello scheme influenced applicants one way or another.
No, I cannot answer this.
I don't know. We had some concerns that with the money decreasing to zero over three years it could be interpreted negatively. People coming into post could say that it's a funny way of showing that we value their loyalty. We clearly explained the rules of the scheme to candidates up front to try and counter any negative spin.
Again we don't know if the scheme influenced applicants' decisions to join us, but it was certainly helpful for the Head of School when negotiating salary etc. with successful candidates.
Little or no influence over the applicant's decision.
It may have made a difference at the negotiating stage. It probably helped to tip the scales.
There is clear feedback from Heads of Departments that the effect of the scheme was influential in enabling a candidate to accept an offer. There is of course a range of other factors, however, the scheme was certainly one of them.
We have internal 'rules' here about the level of the allowances we can provide to help recruits with relocation costs. This has been an issue in the past. The golden hello scheme meant that we could 'break' those rules and offer people bigger allowances through the back door with a clear conscience!

We attracted staff but that was because of our existing market supplement system.

It had no impact because to recruit in these areas you have to match the salaries being paid in the marketplace.
--

The scheme is geared to staff new to academia and we are not recruiting many staff new to academia.

2.8 Impact of Ending of golden hello funding on Recruitment
May make us less attractive to some candidates.
I'm not sure it would have an impact.
I cannot quantify this but, for example, two excellent recent appointments (starting in December) would not have joined us.
It would probably not have a great impact because we are currently implementing a pay modernisation framework by 01/08/06 which includes full job evaluation, a new grading structure and new reward strategy. The golden hello criteria were quite strict and if that funding ceased or the criteria changed we would do something ourselves that was more flexible, more appropriate to our own needs to reflect the changed subject shortage areas.
Adverse.
This is uncertain. We only became aware relatively recently that the original guidelines had been relaxed and HEFCE have confirmed that the funding should be used to support teaching staff new to the profession, but that the other guidelines are relaxed. We are currently consulting with schools on how to do this effectively.
We would need to find the money to offer incentives to fill these vacancies and this would need to be included as part of the New Pay Framework.
We have implemented our local pay regime and so the golden hellos are used as a further "sweetener" - they help enormously to try and get over the high costs of working and living in the capital
Limited impact. (2)
We would have to find other means of supplementing basic salary for shortage areas.
Recruitment in the areas highlighted would continue to be difficult where decisions by applicants are based on salaries.
Limited, in areas where practitioners are sought, the golden hello may help in attracting people into HE. This is not, however, applicable to all areas.
Yes
Very little (2).
This would significantly impact on one of the University's major growth areas within the Faculty of Health and Well Being. We have recently won a major tender for nurse education which will increase staff numbers by around 400. In this subject area we face competition to attract and retain teaching staff from clinical practice.
None (2)
The Dean of Education feels that it would have a negative impact as their main issue is attracting staff from schools where salaries tend to be higher than in HE.
The impact would be greater to roll it out. It has created great cynicism and resentment.
The City is a very expensive area to relocate to. The withdrawal of golden hello funding would impact our ability to offer competitive relocation expenses and, hence, attract the most able candidates.
Lack of flexibility to offer inducement to enter academic career.
Difficult to gauge at the moment, but may well make it more difficult to recruit in some areas, especially as this is a relatively expensive place to live.
It would reduce the amount of money available to provide recruitment incentive payments. However, the need for separate targeted funding will reduce across the sector as new arrangements (many of which will have provision for market pay) for pay and grading are introduced.
In real terms the impact would be limited if all employers did not have access to the funding. More importantly is the level of reward in basic pay as determined by job evaluation.
It would remove the incentive for applicants from teaching and the professions to move into higher education, thereby reducing the pool of talent available to us.
I would anticipate we would struggle to recruit into nursing and other health related posts.
In a situation where funding is very limited then it is always problematic to lose any source of funding. However, such funding needs to be flexible so that we can meet the needs of the University in a manner that is consistent with other recruitment practices.
Funds would need to be found from elsewhere to continue incentive payments.
It is useful to have as an option. There could be a detrimental effect if it were taken away.
The scheme has been of particular value in attracting Dental Practitioners to teach within the Dental Institute, which has been a major problem in the past. This has also been the case with regard to attracting business professionals to teach in the Business School where a lot of the teaching workload is to part time students/delegates who are employed in business (e.g. undertaking a part-time MBA). It is important that the Lecturers have credibility with such people and the golden hello scheme has helped to attract a wider range of applicants than before.
This is difficult to quantify as the Institution has a number of recruitment initiatives in addition to the golden hello as part of its HR Strategy, including flexible benefits, additional relocation support, health insurance

and flexible pension provision.
Added incentive would no longer be applicable which may stop new academics considering UOL.
In certain shortage areas, it would make it more difficult to secure key appointments. It has been a useful addition to the package we can offer, especially when competing for scarce talent with industry.
We would possibly have to scale down the number of posts we can offer.
Candidates who find the salary offer attractive due to the golden hello may not be persuaded to join us.
I think it would affect our ability to achieve a new appointment in one of the shortage areas. It helps us a bit. Its 10% of the annual salary - not a lot of money really.
Negligible (2).
It would have a negative impact because it constitutes a fairly high percentage of our recruitment target numbers.
The initiative has allowed us to offer an addition to salaries in a competitive market. Removal of the funding would end this benefit.
Schools would have to find the resources themselves. We are at present reviewing our use of market supplements and obtaining more robust market data to help target University resources in the future.
Frankly I doubt it would have much influence.
We would not be able to complete as effectively with the NHS.
The impact would not be that great because our usage of the funding has been so limited.
Little if any impact.
I don't think it would because we would continue with the more generous package. As part of our Pay Modernisation strategy we will be introducing market supplements. I would say that the golden hello scheme has helped to raise our awareness of the tools that are available to support recruitment and retention.
It would certainly make it more difficult for Engineering Departments in particular. The main impact would be in making the transition into an academic career that more difficult. The fact this would be in an expensive city like London would merely make that even more difficult. Not all of our appointments satisfy the HEFCE criteria, but where they do they certainly help.
It would not have a huge effect. The cost would be passed to the University because we would fund the additional allowances internally. For some senior level appointments from overseas it has made us realise just how expensive it can be to relocate people to this country. It focuses us on the support packages needed to get people here and that issue is ongoing. We want to recruit star people from overseas.
Not a huge impact. The amount of money available was relatively small. If the funding ended it would just mean that there would be a greater drain on our core resources.
No impact as such because we have made the recruitment and retention of high quality staff a high priority for the next three years. We would probably do that anyway from our own funds which would be diverted from elsewhere in the University.
We already have some pre-existing mechanisms for salary flexibility. We would have to use more of our own resources to deal with acute recruitment difficulties if the golden hello funding were to end.
None at all. The level of funding is so small that it has minimal impact.
Difficult to assess.
It would make no difference.
That is hard to anticipate, especially with a modernised pay and grading structure. Market supplements may need to be introduced and targeted advertising trialled.
It would have a negative impact.

3.1 How the Scheme was Administered and Tailored to HEIs' Requirements

<p>We advertised all relevant posts with golden hello and applied it to all successful candidates who met the funding criteria. Demand did not exceed supply.</p>
<p>Our main criteria followed the HEFCE Code of Practice. We have got a policy in place. The golden hellos will be paid according to the guidelines (£4k; £3k; £2k). The Code has been relaxed.</p>
<p>The money was allocated on a first come first served basis subject to qualifying for the golden hello scheme.</p>
<p>I informed all Senior Managers and Deans that the funding was available for candidates meeting the criteria. It became part of the Planning Cycle. We followed the HEFCE recommendation in allocating the funds over three years (£4k; £3k; £2k).</p>
<p>Established a policy on the HEFCE model. Appointment process modified to identify eligible posts at the outset of recruitment.</p>
<p>So few recruits met the initial criteria that it was a case of applying the money to posts for which there were qualifying candidates.</p>
<p>HR administered in consultation with Deans of Faculty. Post selected against labour market information</p>
<p>Schools had to make a case for the funding to the pro vice chancellor who had the final decision on the allocation.</p>
<p>We used data on shortage areas and information from senior academics to determine which posts to target.</p>
<p>Did not wish to use it at all. Only did so as an opportunity presented itself in the law school.</p>
<p>Departments had to demonstrate the need for the supplement against rigorous laid down criteria. Allocation of the supplement was decided by the University staffing committee.</p>
<p>Departments were identified which covered the subject areas identified in the national scheme.</p>
<p>We identified specific posts and allocated the funding.</p>
<p>Discussion with Deans and HR.</p>
<p>We administered the scheme within the HR department, linking it to the recruitment planning process and identifying areas where there were recruitment difficulties / local shortage areas. HR produced guidelines to ensure business case for paying golden hello satisfied eligibility criteria and to monitor allocation. We are currently considering how this links into our development of a policy and procedure for using Attraction and Retention Premia under the Framework Agreement for Pay Modernisation.</p>
<p>Using the Code of Practice supplied originally. Decisions being made by Senior Management Team as to subject areas etc. The scheme was set up by Personnel and administered by Personnel. Money is allocated by each Faculty as appropriate following confirmation with Personnel on the appropriateness of the subject area.</p>
<p>A working group was formed.</p>
<p>Just applied the criteria as it was stated.</p>
<p>We approached the HEFCE for authorisation to use the funds to enhance our relocation packages. This reflects both the high house prices locally and the concerns expressed by our local union representatives about golden hello guidelines.</p>
<p>We operated the scheme in accordance with HEFCE guidelines. Funding was allocated on a first come, first served basis.</p>
<p>We did some work to look at indicators of recruitment and retention for the University. Found that those subject areas where it seemed to be more difficult were spread widely across our different Faculties. We therefore decided that we would not limit the scheme to just certain subject areas. Therefore appointment committees in any subject area can potentially put forward a case for a golden hello, if the individual meets the eligibility criteria. We will then centrally monitor the overall allocation of golden hellos.</p>
<p>Posts were basically self selecting due to code of practice. Applied to academic posts only but potential period had to be completed before payment made. Therefore first 6 months no payment, if probation completed lump sum of £2,000 then remaining first year payment paid in equal monthly instalments.</p>
<p>We developed an Institutional policy based upon HEFCE's Code of Practice. Despite the relaxation in the Code in 2004 we adhered to the policy we had developed. Our portfolio includes 4 of the 6 identified shortage subject areas. However, since 2003/4 we have only had need to recruit to 2 of the shortage subject areas of Education and Business. The money was allocated to staff who met the criteria.</p>
<p>We initially only considered the posts within the 'shortage areas'. When the guidance on criteria was relaxed, we used the scheme to attract into posts that we couldn't fill.</p>
<p>We identified the key areas for the University, and used the funding to ensure that the starting salaries were more competitive and attractive</p>

<p>Posts identified as attracting a Market Premium were eligible for the golden hello scheme if the person appointed came from outside the HE Sector. The amount of premium payment is the same as if the person was recruited from inside the sector. Posts selected on the basis of documented recruitment difficulties (e.g. evidence from past recruitment campaigns, salary surveys, similar vacancies elsewhere).</p>
<p>Managers were invited to put individual cases forward.</p>
<p>We followed precisely the HEFCE guidance.</p>
<p>The golden hello scheme has been incorporated as part of a Market Supplement Policy developed during work on the implementation of a new pay and grading structure for the University. As a result, the supplements may only be offered where there is a proven recruitment difficulty e.g. where a post has been advertised at least once and it has not been possible to make an appointment. This fits in with our policy of ensuring equal pay for work of equal value by making sure that the payments to an individual can be defended in this respect.</p>
<p>Golden hellos were allocated on a "first come first served" basis as posts in the eligible disciplines were released for recruitment.</p>
<p>Posts identified in difficult to recruit areas with some posts being considered for re-advertisement because of poor initial response and some specific areas where salary was an issue due to competition from industry.</p>
<p>Department had to submit a case to Director of HR stating reasons why they had difficulty recruiting and provide evidence of recent attempts.</p>
<p>We decided to run the scheme initially as per the HEFCE code of practice.</p>
<p>Posts were identified by the respective School Deans as part of their business plans. Funding was allocated on the basis of a set fee per vacancy.</p>
<p>Money allocated on a first come first served basis.</p>
<p>The way we have done it has been slightly different from the way in which it was originally couched. We have used the golden hello funding to support new appointments in new areas of curriculum growth. (i) Tailoring what the scheme described as shortage areas with our strategic recruitment plans. For example we have just opened a new teaching school for dental nurses and hygienists which formerly would not have attracted Golden Hello funding. (ii) Areas we want to develop in and wanted to make the ongoing employment package positive. When the golden hello scheme came in we already had a scheme in place called New Directions for appointments in areas of subject growth, in line with the strategic plan, which had some commonality with golden hellos. We pump primed these appointments. Latterly we have used golden hello money to support ongoing salaries.</p>
<p>Heads of School and other relevant managers were informed of the existence of the additional funds and the relevant criteria. They were invited to make a case for a golden hello via the University's existing "Staff Request Forms", used to ensure requests for new and replacement posts are properly authorised. Where cases were made the advice of the Director of Personnel was sought.</p>
<p>Basically we didn't play around with the Code of Practice very much. We produced our own manual on the scheme. We didn't deviate from the HEFCE guidelines but added some clarification and admin content. We fleshed it out a bit as to how it interfaced with our own systems. We strictly followed the guidelines and didn't mess with the £4k; £3k; £2k split.</p>
<p>All eligible posts in areas of key shortage, as identified in the HEFCE Code of Practice, were allocated a golden hello. The maximum award of £9,000 was made to eligible appointees to full-time posts of more than 3 years duration, and this was reduced for part-time posts and those of a shorter duration. The money was released in three instalments: £4,000 on the date of appointment, £3,000 on the first anniversary of this date, and £2,000 on the second anniversary of this date (the amounts were reduced proportionately for awards below £9,000).</p>
<p>Schemes developed by Remuneration Team in liaison with Schools. Administered by RDSI team in liaison with Remuneration Office. Principles were in line with other market pay schemes in operation. We wrote to all potential eligible Heads of School. Bids received only from Education and Maths.</p>
<p>All Heads of Schools were notified of the scheme and invited to use the funds for suitable posts. The Director of HR and Finance Director determined the acceptability of a post for the funding.</p>
<p>We reflected on the salaries required to attract candidates to the University for particular posts and decided if it was appropriate to add to the salary on offer.</p>
<p>We used it 100% for retention not recruitment.</p>
<p>Allocated to departmental budgets not to named individuals. Individuals treated exactly the same.</p>
<p>Over the three year period we have used the funding to top up our recruitment budget largely to support recruitment into Computer Sciences. The relaxation of the Code of Practice was quite helpful and we turned it into more of a relocation package. We adopted a flexible approach to help people make the transition. We used it to top up relocation packages and / or salaries to competitive levels, typically taking the form of an upfront payment spread over a couple of years. We didn't go for the £4k/£3k/£2k split. The amount of money given to individuals varied according to their personal needs.</p>
<p>We followed the HEFCE guidelines in a more or less orthodox manner. This is after all the application of publicly accountable money. The funding was targeted at the hard to recruit departments with liaison with</p>

Departmental Heads.
We have been paying the money in a variety of different ways. We originally decided to pay it in instalments phased in over the first year because we felt that was a good compromise. Typically we have stuck to our instalment schedule which is £2k in month 3; £3.5k in month 12; £2.5k in month 24; and £1k in month 36. However, where people have come from overseas, in rare circumstances, we have given them £5k or £6k up front because they've had immediate moving expenses.
One individual who was appointed to a job at lecturer level in Computing Science was given £10k, I believe, split £5k/£5k over two years because we were competing with the City. A clinician got £20k over two years. Our projected spend was £40k, but we have used only £30k because one individual in computing was not appointed.
What we have done bears no resemblance to the golden hello scheme. We looked at the needs of the individual and have made one-off lump sum payments (of varying amounts) to help with relocation costs.
Recruitment of academic staff is undertaken by the academic divisions, not centrally. Divisions were given full details of the scheme including shortage subjects. Politics was also included with the agreement of the Chairman of the Personnel Committee to ease particularly acute recruitment problems. The money was held centrally and allocated to divisions on a first-come, first-served basis as they made appointments.
A single faculty Institution, therefore no need to select posts.
We used the funding against additional costs. We have not reduced salaries over the three year period as proposed by HEFCE and will continue to pay them at the higher level.
The application of the scheme was agreed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Deans and the Head of HRS. The scheme can be used for any posts in the shortage areas which were interpreted locally.
Sums were very small so I analysed the eligible academic areas and monitored recruitment by offers made against the background of candidates. As it happened money available equalled eligible numbers. I then offered a variation of contract adding the code of practice outlining the benefits and the terms and conditions of the additional payment.
The posts were selected on the basis of the HEFCE criteria i.e. in Education. We assumed that the funds would be mainly allocated on that basis.
Incorporated it into the funds provided already for Recruitment Incentive Payments (including relocation packages).

number of respondents (59)

3.2 Funding Enhancement		
Yes	No	No response
14	44	1
23.7%	74.6%	1.7%

(b) Comments
Applied to Allied Health professions in Faculty of Health.
But, as above, salaries are higher anyway.
We did not increase the amount, however our own policy also covered support staff posts, albeit had the need arisen we would have paid for this with other Institutional funding i.e. not the ring-fenced golden hello funding. So far we have not however needed to use market supplements for support staff posts.
In some cases we added some funding to support removal expenses.
The University supports a generous recruitment and retention package which means that it faces annual salary inflation costs of around 6%. The University believes that its members of staff are its greatest asset and is therefore prepared to invest in them. It will always make every effort to provide a remuneration package to attract the best quality candidate to a vacant post.
Only in terms of meeting additional employers costs in respect of pension and NI contributions.
The amounts paid are 10% of agreed salary maxima and are not higher in the first year.
No enhancements made to the golden hello scheme, however, other additional packages are provided including flexible benefits, additional relocation support, health insurance and flexible pension provision.
We haven't stepped down the salaries. They have gone up as the recruits gain experience. The University picks up the ongoing cost once the £9k is spent (i.e. monies attached to an individual post - not a person). The funding is used to offset the cost of that post.
We have a market-related premium payment scheme on the stocks which has been agreed by our Trades Union but it has not been used in earnest yet. It is separate from the golden hello scheme. We now feel we were being too inflexible - 10% cap - may be too prescriptive.
As the initiative did not cover teaching posts which were funded by the Department of Health but would otherwise be eligible, we underwrote golden hellos for these posts, and administered them in the same way as other posts included in the initiative. 17 posts were underwritten, and 9 appointees were awarded golden hellos funded by the University.
We have separate schemes but nothing was added to these payments.
We paid more money to individuals by enhancing their relocation package in line with the NHS relocation packages which are anywhere between £6,000 and £10,000 more generous.
The University will continue to top up these individuals' packages in the future, so they won't lose out.
We have not agreed to run it beyond three years and would resist this.
We had already diverted £170k from Rewarding and Developing Staff money for the purpose of enhancing relocation packages.

3.3 Main Advantages and Benefits of the Scheme

Securing candidates.
Our candidates were eligible because they were moving from a school to an HE environment. The funding does provide the opportunity to make the transition easier. We try to match salaries but sometimes they come to us from senior positions in schools. It can help with a move into a new area.
Some excellent recent appointments and helping us to compete with foreign universities.
We did recruit but it's difficult to know whether or not the golden hello scheme helped. I would be hard pushed to define a specific benefit.
Improved recruitment and retention.
Supported Institution in attracting suitable candidates.
Allows us to minimise high London costs.
Useful to give additional money to staff in a difficult to recruit area.
None at all.
Application of the scheme enabled us to recruit staff in areas where the national salary scales were not high enough to attract candidates from other sectors.
We managed to secure candidates in some areas which are difficult to recruit to.
Quality of applicants.
Some marginal upwards flexibility in starting salaries.
Giving the University facility and funding to attract teaching staff in key areas.
Possibly retention.
It attracted a higher quantity of applicants in a highly competitive market place.
The scheme provided much needed additional resource to fund the recruitment of high quality candidates.
Flexibility in providing a competitive benefits/remuneration package which is underpinned by career progression and development opportunities as encouraged by HEFCE.
More attractive initial pay package.
Additional financial support for Recruitment Incentive Payments.
Supported recruitment in particular areas.
The ability to attract and recruit into nursing which we would otherwise have struggled with.
Having some additional funding was very helpful.
Additional funds to assist with hard to fill posts. A good means of retention.
Lessened the pay gap with private and some public sector organisations.
There were very few advantages. It was for example difficult to decide whether a former researcher recruited as a lecturer would qualify under the previous teaching rule. Similarly if somebody had carried out some sessional lecturing would they qualify? However, given that there was no discernable difficulty in recruiting and retaining staff at the level golden hellos were directed the biggest problem was equal treatment and equal pay.
The ability to offer an incentive to those who might otherwise not have considered applying for a University position.
No discernible benefits.
It gave greater potential to attract candidates who may not have otherwise applied in the subject shortage areas.
Applicants considered this institution more favourably with the golden hello scheme on offer. It is also a fantastic financial incentive for all new academic staff.
The fact that the money was ring-fenced for this use made it easier to gain agreement. The fairly tight criteria made it easier to run in the first instance.
The opportunity to augment the funding set aside to establish more Graduate Tutors/Post Graduate Assistant posts in areas of growth.
Persuading candidates to join us who would not have done so otherwise.
Supporting the strategic direction that we want to develop in the University's curriculum.
It has been useful, in the context of the launch of our new School of Pharmacy (at a time when similar enterprises were taking place elsewhere in the sector), as a further tool in persuading candidates to choose this University.
It enabled us to recruit good people who might not have come into the profession without it.
The initiative has allowed us to offer enhanced salaries in a competitive market. The initiative may also result in increased retention of eligible appointees, as 33% (10 out of 30) appointees who were awarded golden hellos have indicated that the award means that they are more likely to remain in their post until they have received all instalments.
It provided central funding as opposed to Schools having to find their own resources.
We could see little benefit from a scheme which was so prescriptive in its rules - for instance we have no

problem in securing Maths lecturers of the right quality, or indeed Business lecturers.
Being able to pay some extra money to attract candidates.
Could make offer more attractive.
Added funding.
The flexibility it offered once it opened up.
The scheme is relatively straightforward to apply. The main advantage is simply in terms of the money itself and the pressure it takes off invariably young lecturers as they find their feet in a new department and city.
The main benefit has been attracting people we could not otherwise have appointed, especially from overseas.
More money is available for recruitment and retention.
Able to offer more flexible relocation packages.
It has provided useful additional funding to assist with acute recruitment problems.
As a post-graduate Institution most applicants are already experienced teachers in the HE sector.
None - it was a complete waste of time. We don't want ring-fenced money from HEFCE.
Limited benefits.
On a larger scale it may help recruitment but as a small Institution we need to include all on-cost from the additional payment (e.g. NI employer and pension cost).
The scheme was clear and designed to attract applicants in hard to recruit areas - for this University that has been the area of teacher training in particular due to the level of salaries in the primary and secondary education sectors.

3.4 Main Shortcomings in Implementing the Scheme

No significant difficulties.
Being clear on what the rules are. We tried to look at the HEFCE website and find anything on golden hellos. Issues around membership of the HE Academy needed clarification. There was some confusion.
Possibly some sort of advertising however it would need to be quite wordy to ensure that there was no room for any inequalities/discrimination claim.
The main drawback for us I suppose was the rigidity of the criteria because it had to be closely monitored. It involved a lot of effort for a relatively small sum of money.
Initially criteria were restrictive but it then became clear that we could relax these. Criteria set nationally were not always clear or appropriate. Local criteria would have been better.
Fewer constraints at the outset and clear, unambiguous notification that these had been relaxed.
Until we were able to offer the golden hellos to a wider range of people, we could not give them away! Additionally, to all intents and purposes, the criteria meant that we could only offer them to people who were not British as they were the only ones who had not taught over here for the most part.
More flexibility in the use of the funding would have made it easier, particularly being able to use it to attract more senior experienced staff
The guidelines were too prescriptive. We actually applied the supplement in a more flexible way than that described in the HEFCE scheme.
Why not just stick to market supplements which every Institution is free to apply, without all the constraints.
When the scheme was first introduced HEFCE confirmed that payments were pensionable. As a result it will be more difficult to withdraw a supplement after three years, although this has now been relaxed our supplements are pensionable.
There can sometimes be a shift in the market which has an effect if using golden hellos. For example, we advertised a vacancy in Computing with a golden hello. The market in this subject has changed, which led to a very large number of applications. Also the scheme excludes teaching experience outside the UK which may mean that an experienced academic from overseas can benefit from a golden hello.
Not comprehensive and not maintained over the long term for the individual post.
We would like more focus on retention as well as recruitment and apply to existing teaching staff in shortage areas. Potential for negative impact on existing staff. In some ways this appears to have contributed to relatively low take-up.
Equalities issue and restrictions initially with subject areas and how the money could be allocated.
Equal opportunities issues. Limited funding - by the time candidates were appointed there was no funding left for people who would have qualified, therefore a negative perception, although we advised people that funds were allocated on a first come, first served basis. When advertising for several eligible posts at once, this was an inevitable outcome in a situation where funding is limited.
Created resentment because we were not able to use it in the areas the University felt was lacking.
The University was grateful that the HEFCE authorised a local implementation strategy associated with relocation expenses as this enabled us to address the concerns of our local union representatives.
Allocation - internal issue which is being reviewed.
Identifying which areas the scheme should cover (now decided not to limit it); Developing simple administrative procedures; Likely to be limited take up because we tend to appoint people who already have UK HEI teaching experience.
Prescriptive nature of the original scheme.
No main difficulties. The scheme runs OK. Thus far, the number of vacancies we are looking to fill and use the scheme is within the budget funds allocated. We have not had to 'prioritise', although the funding allocation is now getting tight
The scheme originally put in place was too rigid, and did not sit at all well with our existing processes and practices. We also had concerns on Equal Pay issues.
Initial restrictive nature of the scheme. Flexibility at the outset for HEIs to administer in a way which is still in the spirit of the scheme, but best suited to their circumstances.
Originally it was limited to certain areas. Unhelpful to restrict to staff new to lecturing (although I understand the reasons why).
It was an ill thought out initiative with no regard for the impact on morale of colleagues who were ineligible.
The initial restrictions, e.g. on the subject areas in which it could be offered, made it difficult to identify suitable vacancies. It also made it difficult internally for the staff in the Recruitment Team to remember which posts were eligible and to ask Managers whether they wished to use it. Once the restrictions were removed and the supplements could be applied to any subject area, this has become an integral part of the recruitment process, particularly where a post has to be re-advertised. This means that Managers are made aware of it more reliably than in the early stages.
Implementation, from an administrative point of view, wasn't overly difficult.
Directed at a defined number of subject areas with initial criteria being fairly rigid.

Found the scheme easy to implement.
There was some debate at first as to whether the shortage areas were the most relevant to us as an Institution, and in developing the scheme further we will want to review this and incorporate into a wider market supplements policy.
Initially the rules on the use of the funding were too prescriptive.
Some were sold as pensionable but USS refused to make any lump sums pensionable. This should have been properly addressed with USS prior to the scheme being launched. Additional flexibility would have made the scheme more attractive rather than the fixed structure of £4k, £3k and £2k over 3 years. I appreciate you wish to make it a retention payment but we don't have an issue of retaining once people are here but were unable to maximise benefit of scheme within our local context.
We had a lot of misgivings about the scheme in this area i.e. the reducing income over three years. The constraints initially - at the outset we saw it as a pain in the neck to administer and thought that we would not be able to work within those constraints - but the new flexibility has made it workable for us. It has now become an accounting exercise really. The identification centrally [by HEFCE] of the shortage areas was limiting. It was not available across subject areas that WE were having problems with.
The initial criteria were too restrictive, as was the range of shortage subject areas. During the consultation exercise we asked that Institutions be allowed to use golden hello funding for local niche areas. The subsequent "loosening" of the rules helped us to make a greater call on the funding.
A potential difficulty was that people already established could be upset that others with less teaching experience were getting the benefit of it. However, no intelligence has reached my ears that this has been a problem in practice. We felt sore about HEFCE wanting Institutions to individually justify why it was giving certain people that money when we could be at risk of an equal pay for equal value claim. If we were now or in the future required to justify how we allocated the funding we would refer to these being national skills shortage areas and use that as the basis for our introduction of the scheme.
(a) Although HEFCE's guidelines were intended to be flexible, this meant that we needed to consult them on a regular basis to ensure that we were meeting their requirements in our interpretation of the guidelines. (b) Appointees to eligible posts who did not meet the eligibility criteria expressed disappointment that they did not receive a golden hello. (c) Several appointees to teaching posts in areas of key shortage who started in the immediate period before the initiative began expressed dissatisfaction that they did not receive a golden hello.
Restricted to shortage areas defined outside the University.
As above. The scheme was too prescriptive - one member of staff described it as back-seat driving for the organisation's recruitment effort.
The scheme was very restrictive and difficult to use operationally. Our strong preference would have been to consolidate the funding into RDS funds for recruitment and retention. Consolidation would help us to recruit in competition with the commercial sector. Recruitment and retention difficulties vary enormously by geography, marketplace etc. One size fits all does not enable us to address the real issues. We would like more scope to create our own initiatives. For example, we would like initiatives to help with travel costs particularly for part time staff who find it difficult to bear travel costs in London. Also housing costs for full time staff.
Lack of equity.
Funding was not linked to growth in staffing numbers.
Limited to specific disciplines due to political pressures which was slightly divisive. Initially the implementation of the scheme was too tightly defined.
No difficulties.
The subject areas were initially too restrictive. The more relaxed attitude will help, for example for Sports subjects.
The funding cannot be used tactically or strategically to meet our needs. It is too restrictive. We didn't go near it until they relaxed the restrictions. We did an analysis and couldn't see how the scheme could be useful.
The initial HEFCE Guidelines and constraints would have meant that we wouldn't have been able to operate the scheme. It was riddled with flaws. We recruit academic staff who get involved in a lot of research activities. The shortages didn't apply to us. We don't have much trouble recruiting newly qualified HE teachers because they are typically part of a fairly mobile pool of individuals who are relatively easy and cheap to relocate. The people we need most, and need the golden hello money for, are in mid-career. We have problems recruiting experienced, older teachers who tend to have established homes and families elsewhere and have relocation cost issues. £8k is the maximum amount that we can pay for relocation tax free. That £8k is usually swallowed up with Stamp Duty and Estate Agents fees on a £250k house. We have therefore used the funds as we need them - to attract experienced teachers from Education to the south west.
We would have preferred to be given money for recruitment incentives and allowed to implement them in ways which met our needs, rather than being restricted by the scheme as to which subject areas and which applicants were eligible. Uncertainty as to whether the funding will be recurrent or not has not helped.
It has not been difficult to implement the scheme as our new Economics lecturers are usually from outside

the UK and have not taught previously in HE.

The amounts were small and potentially insufficient to meet demand. The incentives were based on a decreasing salary. It is an example of HEFCE micro-managing HEIs.

The restriction of the requirement not to have taught in the UK previously.

To be fair, the code of practice was not too onerous and was relaxed a bit later.

Very few The scheme is straightforward, but at this stage we do not know how the ending of golden hello payments to staff under the scheme will impact i.e. whether staff will return to the education sector.

3.5 Effect of Code of Practice on Ease of Implementation					
Very Easy	Reasonably Easy	Neither	Reasonably Difficult	Very Difficult	No Response
5	24	11	10	7	2
8.5%	40.7%	18.6%	16.9%	11.9%	3.4%

(b) Why?

It would be nice to have a standard letter to send out to people setting out expectations on both sides.

It seemed very straightforward and the Web site was/is useful.

It was so limiting. The underlying reasons behind the scheme made sense but the criteria were very limiting.

Because of the constraints on qualifying staff.

It was clear but the reasons above say why we could not implement.

Unnecessary bureaucracy.

The scheme was straightforward but the pension issue is a problem.

It required the same degree of application as other HEFCE-funded schemes.

Short, clear and concise if not a little restrictive initially on subject areas for our University.

There were clear guidelines on eligibility criteria.

Adverse union response to our initial implementation plans.

The guidance note was comprehensive.

Because initially too prescriptive on eligible subject areas.

Guidance fairly clear.

Very clear Code of Practice - no ambiguity. Clear guidance and rationale.

Guidelines helpful. No problem in implementing; usual problems over the communication of the awareness of the scheme.

Too inflexible.

It said very little of practical help.

The initial restrictions caused a problem. Once these were removed and the policy was incorporated in our local market pay policy it has become easier to identify eligible posts and to make sure that the supplements are offered.

The restriction to appointees who had no previous teaching experience in a UK HEI proved to be a major factor in limiting the number of awards that were made.

Three of the original shortage areas did not apply to this institution and therefore the scheme was not flexible to those areas we were experiencing difficulty in recruitment and retention.

Shortage areas already defined. Criteria already defined.

It was reasonably easy once some of the initial prescription was lifted.

In general the philosophy behind it was OK. The detail was over-prescribed and over the top.

The rules were clear (albeit restrictive).

It gave us clarity.

A number of issues arose which required clarification from HEFCE e.g. if posts funded by any source were eligible for awards.

Clear to follow. Enabled Schools to understand what would or would not be paid.

A sensible and pragmatic approach.

Once the Code was relaxed it became relatively easy to implement but prior to that it was quite difficult and I had problems persuading the Institution to take it on.

The Code was relatively easy to administer. In a large heterogeneous University, the HEFCE disciplines do not always neatly fit into the way in which we organise our Departments and Faculties.

Reasonably easy in practice.

Initially it was pretty much impossible.

The scheme as originally envisaged excluded a lot of the people we recruit to academic posts, many of whom have already taught in HE in the UK. It is highly unlikely that anyone would be appointed to an academic post at this University with no teaching experience whatsoever.

It was fairly easy for us because by chance we offer those subjects.

The Code gave a good template which we adapted to meet our specific needs.

3.6 Effect of the Code being Relaxed
It became more useful, given our University's portfolio of disciplines.
I don't know. I wasn't here then. Possibly we bought into it at that point and actioned the scheme later on.
We did not have anybody starting on the scheme until April 2004, so do not know.
It was a factor in our implementation of the scheme and taking up the funding in the second year.
Made it easier.
We were unaware of this at the time. We spent a substantial amount of time in the 2004 calendar year trying to develop local criteria that reflected the requirements of the Code. We even spoke to HEFCE during that time, but were not told that it had been relaxed and here was no such notification on the website. We only became aware of this in May 05 and are still consulting on local guidelines.
None / no impact / no change (14)
I could then.
Given us more flexibility in subject areas.
None as we had already decided to implement in a less rigid way.
Due to minimal take up in the first instance.
It meant we could use the funding to cover other areas. So far we have not needed to do so.
Very little.
More appropriate for University to identify own shortage areas. We were hesitant about introducing the scheme based on initial Code of Practice which was more prescriptive.
No significant effect.
We had already sought approval to customise the scheme.
The Scheme continued to focus on teaching staff who had not taught in UK/HEIs previously.
Able to tailor more to our specific needs.
Enabled us to use the money. (2)
We did not relax our scheme at the time, which had been based on the original Code of Practice. However, we are in the process of developing our own recruitment and retention scheme to reflect our current priorities.
Much easier to implement.
Greater flexibility i.e. a real opportunity to use the funds.
Easier to implement. (20)
Not much.
No discernible difference - it was too little too late.
Enabled the Institution to apply the criteria to an extended number of posts.
Very flexible to implement now that we can review locally which departments to consider.
We wanted to wait until we had further developed a wider policy on market supplements, so we left the scheme running as per original code of practice. However, it will prove useful once we are at that stage.
Allowed us to use the funding in a more creative way by means of Graduate Tutors/Post Graduate Assistant scheme. This prevented us having to make potentially divisive awards of additional salary to individuals in similar roles.
Was better when relaxed.
HEFCE's greater flexibility in Year 2 enabled us to use the golden hello funding effectively.
It allowed greater flexibility and the opportunity to concentrate on local needs as opposed to those general areas of difficulty as identified by national surveys.
As far as we were concerned we let sleeping dogs lie. We didn't change anything from the original structure.
The area of Clinical Medicine and Clinical Dentistry was extended to incorporate all teaching posts in the Faculty of Medicine, as we traditionally have difficulty recruiting to posts in these areas.
The relaxation of the rules was appreciated.
We were able to develop more appropriate local guidance on how the scheme money could be used.
We used it for retention purposes on the Legal Practice Course.
Positive.
When it was first launched we thought it would be difficult to implement, but the take up was relatively so small it was not an issue. Once we established our scheme it went well. We have had one or two interesting discussions with heads of departments who have taken a purist view about inequality issues.
We can use it much more flexibly. We are always very conscious of the subject areas we can address, but we are using the funding 'within the spirit rather than the letter of the scheme'.
To be honest, we took the view that we would use it as we wanted to 'attract staff' and improve the quality of people coming into HEI.

It made it less restrictive and much more useful - we were able to use it for a wider range of applicants and to include a subject area which did not appear on the original list but which was giving us recruitment difficulties.

We did not start using the scheme until the academic year 2004/05.

number of respondents (59)

3.7 Issue of Equality		
Yes	No	No response
29	28	2
49.2%	47.5%	3.4%

(b) How did you overcome it?

We have not considered it in that way. It doesn't matter about gender or race - that has not been an issue.
There were two areas: (i) EO for those being attracted in by advertising because the vast majority of applicants are male in computing and engineering. However, this was not a significant issue. (ii) The scheme is inequitable because someone new into teaching in a shortage area gets more money than a teacher already in post who has some experience. The problem stems from the criteria in the Code of Practice i.e. not having previously taught in an HEI.
Having clear rules.
Effective communication and clear and open decision on how the scheme would be applied.
This point was raised by the Trade unions and other staff. The explanation is the market rate argument and the fact that the payment is made as an allowance. There is still an underlying feeling of potential inequity which may be why not many heads of schools have expressed a wish to use the scheme.
Tried not to use it at all.
In general terms it is an issue. To date we have not experienced specific problems and will review arrangements as we move through our job evaluation programme.
Concerns have been raised by NATFHE. Our response has relied on recruitment and retention difficulties, and the fact that golden hello is a national scheme, by way of explanation.
We handled cases with great care.
Evidence-based justification for allocation but still concerns re inequalities for existing staff in same subject areas as mentioned above.
It was an issue of concern prior to implementation for all Deans and Personnel. It has restricted the publicity for the scheme.
Only one applicant was recruited using the golden hello funding.
It was easier for us to implement a scheme involving one-off relocation expenses than a scheme with recurrent cost implications.
Not really overcome, but an acceptance that certain areas will receive payment and others do not. The explanation of why the scheme is in position in the main addressees the concern.
We had to use the money flexibly in a way that did not conflict with our existing practices.
As long as it mirrored our general market premium payment scheme it was as acceptable as any such scheme might be.
Managers have been reluctant to take up the scheme because of the inequalities it creates with existing staff.
We are currently asking colleagues to reflect on the value of market supplements and where we should apply them.
We have not managed to do so and there is still an overwhelming concern about this which is why there has been resistance to using the scheme in this way.
The scheme is inequitable in terms of people in post versus newcomers to teaching. There are also issues around the loss of the additional allowance over the three year period. There were no Equal Opportunities issues as such but we could have had problems if we had implemented the scheme in the way it was written. It was a bit in your face. There is different gender participation in the different subject areas and potentially an indirect effect. You would need lots of data to defend your position at a tribunal!
Yes it had built in potential for an EO claim.
(a) Current staff and new appointees who did not receive the award were dissatisfied. (b) The areas of key shortage are those where we traditionally have a low number of female applicants and appointees. It could be perceived that HEFCE only provides additional incentives for male-dominated subject areas. Further consideration is required as to how such benefit schemes integrate business/competitive needs within equality/diversity principles. However, it should be noted that in practice for our University 56% (29) of awards were made to males, and 44% (23) to females.
We ensured that payments would only be made to very clearly defined staff categories and for specific time periods.
Yes, but not this scheme. Incentives would be reflected in (a) one off golden hello payments (b) higher starting salaries (c) better relocation allowances

We had concerns about the unions and the potential for tribunals. We didn't advertise the golden hello scheme. We used it as a retention tool for ALL teaching staff working on the Legal Practice Course.

Have kept information discreet, and numbers were small.

By treating all staff the same using internal funding.

We did not have any issues because we were topping up all salaries and location packages across the board, whether it came from golden hello funding or was internally funded. Irrespective of the scheme, we would have spent the additional money to get those people. Golden hello funding meant we could be a bit more flexible and generous.

Not in practice. It was a concern initially and occasionally we may be recruiting for two or three people at the same time which could throw these issues into starker relief. Recruiting for individual posts (one at a time) is easier.

This is always an issue with recruitment and retention premia irrespective of golden hellos. It is easier with recruitment than retention because you can make the arguments about a competitive marketplace.

Equality is an important factor to observe and ensure no bias creeps in. We tried to ensure documentation was full, showing a genuine market factor which would benefit every eligible candidate. That being said, you never know until there might be a challenge.

3.8 Continuation of a Recruitment Incentive Scheme					
Yes	Probably	Possibly	No	DK	No Response
27	11	9	2	8	2
45.8%	18.6%	15.3%	3.4%	13.6%	3.4%

Comments
If HEFCE continued to fund it we will continue to operate the scheme, but we couldn't fund it internally.
Very probably - a recruitment and retention premium funded in-house.
Unlikely without central funding.
Will avoid if possible.
It may be useful when seeking to attract practitioners.
We will widen the eligibility.
The market will force us to continue to offer competitive relocation packages.
Don't know. Depends upon funding availability.
We are currently asking colleagues to reflect on the value of market supplements and where we should apply them.
We have run a recruitment and retention scheme in parallel with golden hellos since 2002. However, this scheme is targeted at senior appointments and is mainly used to retain high performing academic staff, but has been used to provide recruitment incentives to attract such staff to our University.
Continuation of funding would enable us to expand the scheme to areas pertinent to our locality.
Yes, if funded by HEFCE. No, if the University has to find money internally.
Now we have a more flexible golden hello scheme we will. We would prefer it to be mainstreamed into the University or HR Department. We have a workable way of using it now.
It is highly likely that from time to time we will have to respond to specific recruitment difficulties, but there should be room for flexibility and innovation in making such a response.
Yes, if HEFCE continued to fund it. If HEFCE pulled the plug we would focus on our own mainstream market supplement (premium) scheme in local relevant areas. National subject shortage disciplines do not necessarily correlate to the shortages we experience in our own area.
Possibly, subject to HEFCE funding.
We are actively looking at market supplements across the board.
Yes, but not this scheme. Incentives would be reflected in (a) one off golden hello payments (b) higher starting salaries (c) better relocation allowances.
Golden hellos for industrial employers can be one of a range of things in the toolkit but should be tailored to individual recruitment and retention problems. One needs to look at the nature of the difficulty first. We commonly use a market supplement across all staff in skill shortage areas.
In context of framework agreement, we might take a different look at various recruitment issues.
Because of our Payment Modernisation strategy it is part of our normal practice now to look at market data and offer market attraction premia.
The scheme, allied with the HEFCE funding is a valuable tool to support the transition to this University.
I doubt if we would mimic golden hellos but we would have to pay higher salaries to some people to be competitive. It depends what is seen to be more competitive.
Absolutely, because of international competition. We are using market supplements to attract senior staff which we fund ourselves. We have formal recruitment and retention proposals in front of the Unions at the moment based on UCEA guidance.
We allocate all the money to faculties who are all budget holders for the Rewarding and Developing staff monies etc. They are expected to follow specific guidelines set down by this University. Relocation allowances are part of University policy. We have to be looking creatively at these kinds of recruitment and retention schemes all the time. We are using golden handcuffs (annual bonuses rolled up and enhanced over a period of three years) a lot more than golden hellos. We want to hold onto the people we have got.
We have had, since 2001, some flexibility in academic staff salaries with the possibility for the Vice-Chancellor to approve the payment of additional salary above the top of the standard University lecturer scale in acute recruitment cases. This salary supplement continues for the duration of the individual's employment. We will continue to operate this regardless of the future of HEFCE golden hello funding.
We have implemented the framework and have our own market supplement policy. We have stabilised the scheme and it has now been incorporated into RDS 2 and our operational plans.
Need to integrate it with the implementation of the Framework Agreement and the design of a reward strategy

RESEARCH FINDINGS

HEIs WITH NO FIRST-HAND EXPERIENCE OF ALLOCATING GOLDEN HELLO INCENTIVES (26)

- (i) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme but funding not (yet) used (12)**
- (ii) Funding allocated but opted out of the scheme (9)**
- (iii) Not eligible - funding not allocated (5)**

1.1 Reasons for non-participation in the golden hello scheme

(i) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme but funding not (yet) used

Implementation deferred until 05/06. All funds carried forward. We are in the process of implementation.

Monies have not been used to date. Have not been able to meet strict criteria.

Launched in January 2005. I don't know the reasons for the delay. The organisation was going through a major restructuring - perhaps there were other priorities - the availability of the funding was flagged up last September. It had fallen through the cracks. The HEFCE Code of Practice had been relaxed and the money from year 1 was rolled over into year 2. No allocations to date.

Insufficient and inappropriate. HEFCE should allow universities to spend the money as they see fit locally for pay and reward.

The University did not participate in the scheme as it wished to address the issue of market supplements as part of the University's recruitment review and the implementation of the forthcoming national pay framework agreement.

To date we have made no golden hello payments and the funds have not been drawn down from HEFCE.

No one qualified for payment under the "rules" as they were known at the time.

(a) It is restricted to certain subject areas which did not match particularly well with the subject areas in which we have difficulties in recruitment and retention.

(b) It raised concerns over equal pay.

(c) We did not feel the initiative offered sufficient sums to entice new entrants from their professions into HE.

The criteria were too restrictive and did not meet the needs of a research based Institution.

Golden hellos are available but to date no payments have been made under the scheme.

Applicable to only a small number of subject areas in Institution.

Lack of empirical evidence to indicate that we needed to employ such a facility - PLUS, the knock-on effect of meeting subsequent potential equal pay claims from existing staff who may be disadvantaged from the introduction of such a scheme.

(ii) Funding allocated but opted out of the scheme

Organisational change when the scheme was first announced meant that resources were not put into making the Scheme work. As there was no crisis in recruitment it was not seen as a priority, although the following year it would have been useful for difficulties in recruiting to Education and Health.

Although we were awarded limited funding under the scheme in 2003-4, we decided not to participate for the following reasons.

1. The School was in a severe financial crisis at the time with a short-term need to reduce costs by at least £1.5m per annum. Recruitment was at a standstill. Accordingly there was no need at that time for a recruitment incentive scheme.

2. The mechanism of the scheme for additional payments to newly appointed individuals spread over 3 years was we felt difficult in terms of the equal pay for work of equal value legislation. Newly appointed people would be paid more for doing the same job in the same subject areas as existing members of staff.

3. The scheme for us was focused at clinical medicine. The salaries for staff in this area are in University terms very high, and the sums involved were not really much of an inducement. As far as more junior appointments are concerned, the NHS training requirements for staff mean that clinical lecturer posts with a focus on teaching are difficult to set up in a way that meets NHS requirements; it is difficult to configure such posts with a minimum of "10 hours lecturing" per week. Our recruitment problems focus on the lack of suitable staff in the market place and the very high cost of relocating to SW London.

4. The scheme did not apply to our non-clinical posts where it might have had more impact had we been recruiting.

The small sum which would have been allocated would not have been relevant, nor had significant impact. We did not have shortages in the designated areas.

The scheme was too restrictive, limited to a few subjects and the mechanism was too burdensome for the amount of money awarded.

We felt it unnecessary to make the payments because they would impact the equity of pay and add bureaucracy.

The University decided not to proceed with a scheme as it felt that the payments could cause other issues, more specifically a divisive payment system only open new recruits in the sector; possibility that would need to continue to use this to top up salaries from private sector recruits which could lead to salary drift and increased pay bill as a consequence; not much support from academic trade unions. All of this in the context of the discussions on pay equality which lead the University to believe that it would not be appropriate to introduce such a scheme at this time.

The Academic TUs were against their introduction on grounds of equity. We are now discussing the implementation of market-related supplements as part of the NFA.

We thought it was thoroughly misguided and too bureaucratic. It was not designed to help us to meet our business needs. The three year tapering was not a useful retention tool. A national approach to recruitment and retention is inappropriate. We are recruiting a lot from overseas - Australia, the US and Europe - and have a high international profile. Amending salaries is not only what it's about. The reasons for people joining will depend on what turns them on.

We didn't choose not to participate. We wanted to see what recruitment we were doing that would meet the terms of the scheme. We wanted to make it a bonus scheme but were told that HEFCE would only accept the payments being part of a superannuable salary payment on a selective basis. This is not a particularly wealthy University and we are not in a position to maintain the increased salary levels proposed by HEFCE.

(iii) Not eligible - funding not allocated

The categories for golden hello eligibility did not correlate to the courses we offer.

If I recall correctly, no funds were offered for Dance and Drama.

This College of Arts specialises in contemporary performance arts and the subject areas were inappropriate for us.

We employ no staff in the six scarcity areas.

The HEFCE money was going to be part of the Rewarding and Developing Staff Strategy and colleges had to sign up to say they were going to give golden hellos as part of their emerging strategies. We could have probably done it within Business but in 2003 we were fully staffed and had stable staff in that area, so we didn't put it into our proposals. The funding has been reducing in subsequent years and now it has come to the end of the funding period. So it seems as though we would not have been able to have access to it at that time.

1.2 Potential Advantages and Benefits of the Scheme

(i) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme but funding not (yet) used

To be identified once funds have been in use for some time.

The main advantage would have been that more money would have been available for research and training from individual budgets rather than costs being incurred on inflated salaries.

It will help us to recruit people from a non-academic (i.e. professional background). It has good vocational aspects and will add to the University's skill set. Academics are less well paid than people who are working in the outside world. The scheme will encourage people from business into teaching and into HEIs. It's an incredibly valuable tool to bring in new blood - a useful tool to have up your sleeve.

Potentially at best minor assistance in recruiting for some jobs.

It had the advantage of providing the University with the opportunity to enhance remuneration for some categories of staff. However, the University wished to progress with such a move on an integrated approach as part of the national pay framework agreement.

For us, nil.

None whatsoever.

It may provide an additional incentive for specific potential entrants into HE, who were already considering leaving their professions and joining HE.

Additional income but not too narrow in scope to be of any use.

Incentive for those covered.

Enabling greater financial flexibility in attracting and retaining required/desired staff to advertised posts in harder-to-fill vacancies.

(ii) Funding allocated but opted out of the scheme

Possibility of incentives in difficult to recruit areas.

None at present, although as we move into a more secure financial position together with some expansion, recruitment of academics will be starting again.

Pension.

Some obvious initial financial benefits to individuals although this would be eroded over time.

Advantages: competitiveness in marketplace for scarce skills. Disadvantages: potential unfairness and impact on motivation and/or retention of existing staff in scarce skills areas who would not be eligible. Need to have very robust criteria.

None.

(iii) Not eligible - funding not allocated

Potential advantage of attracting staff from industry into education.

None as far as we were concerned.

In attracting high calibre applicants.

1.3 Inequality a Barrier				
	Yes	No	Not applicable	No response
Funding not used to date	8	3	0	1
Opted out	7	2	0	0
Funding not allocated	0	0	5	0
	15	5	5	1
TOTAL	57.7%	19.2%	19.2%	3.8%

(b) Why?**(i) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme but funding not (yet) used**

Using the new flexibility to meet demonstrable local needs.

We are still trying to find posts which will meet the criteria, but expect to be able to now due to various changes in our structures and curriculum.

When I initially launched this scheme our EO person was involved and there was something about prorating payments for part time people which we did. There was a debate about backdating payments. We will be doing a race relations impact assessment but as the scheme has not been implemented, we cannot assess it yet.

Not a barrier really but it could be divisive.

Specifically regarding the potential inequalities for targeted staff.

The idea that a new recruit would be paid more than a long serving academic, and that their salary would then REDUCE with experience was misconceived as a recruitment incentive - we prefer a long term strategy for reward and we find that this is successful. Also our trade unions are opposed to differential payments to staff. Our research shows that it is the cost of living in the area which creates some recruitment difficulties and we would prefer to spend additional resources on relocation awards and additional pay to enable us to continue to attract high calibre staff.

Newly appointed staff with no previous HE teaching experience and possibly having only recently qualified or still working towards a teaching qualification, may receive a higher income than other staff who have more experience and qualifications.

Inequity between subject areas; restriction of recruiting individuals from outside HE.

(ii) Funding allocated but opted out of the scheme

Experience of the FE Institution with which we were to merge.

We did not want to differentiate when there was no need.

Although the rules around this scheme were relaxed, the initial scheme was based on national shortage areas, which may not have been justifiable at local level. As the scheme was only open to new recruits not having taught at a higher education Institution funded by a UK funding council, potential for inequalities and tensions between recruits from within the sector (possibly with little or part-time experience) and recruits from the private sector. If used as a top-up to salary for candidates from private sector, could possibly generate indirect discrimination issues given that in the UK workforce women earn less than men - so possibly more men would have a higher private sector salary to be matched than women?

The perception of TUs and some Managers. To date we have had no serious recruitment problems that have led us to change this view.

Not per se. We didn't like a formal scheme like this. Each Institution has individual needs. If you need to give recruitment and retention premia to meet market conditions, that's OK. We pay market premia every day in some subject areas. It depends on the market situation which is constantly changing.

We had some concerns about inequality issues. It became clear to us golden hellos were restricted to particular areas and that we would be paying selected people higher salaries in certain circumstances.

(iii) Not eligible - funding not allocated

Providing there was objective evidence of the need to use a golden hello supplement there would be no equality issues. It would be similar to a market supplement scheme.

The main barrier was that the subject areas did not apply to this College.

1.4 Did / Would changes in the Code enable / have enabled Participation				
	Yes	No	DK	No response
Funding not used to date	5	2	4	1
Opted out	4	3	2	0
Funding not allocated	1	3	1	0
	10	8	7	1
TOTAL	38.5%	30.8%	26.9%	3.8%

(b) What changes would have helped?

(i) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme, but funding not (yet) used

Changes made implementation possible bearing in mind equality issues.

Changes should have meant that we could have made more use of it, but to date we are still struggling to identify posts which will meet the relaxed criteria.

We have publicised the relaxation of the Code of Practice internally. The Code was useful in developing the process and we built on it from our Institution's perspective.

I think changes would have been beneficial in terms of local level determination for payments and areas. However, we would have been unlikely to progress this outside of the national pay framework.

It was not initially targeted at the correct areas.

No - by that time we had commenced discussions about the implementation of new pay and reward structures. Rules were rigid to start off with, and then relaxed without advance warning. Extremely confusing and unhelpful.

Remove restrictions on subject areas. Allow higher payments, over a longer timescale, where appropriate. Allow payments to existing, not simply new, staff. These difficulties may be overcome with the introduction of Attraction and Retention Premia as required by the Framework Agreement

(ii) Funding allocated, but opted out of the scheme

Allow the whole sum to be used as a genuine golden hello. A one-off recruitment incentive.

The principle was objected to rather than the operation. Introduction of market-related supplements to ease both recruitment and retention would appear to have greater support from the TUs.

The changes were insufficient and it remained too inflexible. Whilst we recognised that HEFCE dropped some of the bureaucracy when the Code of Practice was changed, the amounts involved were small, and in our view it remained an example of HEFCE going too far in terms of top slicing. Nothing would have been helpful because HEFCE's involvement in running the University in detail is inappropriate. It is up to the Executive to decide how to spend our funding, not HEFCE. We are big boys and girls and can judge for ourselves how we want to allocate funding and recruit people.

I didn't know that they had relaxed the scheme and that HEFCE were no longer monitoring it that closely. It would have given us more flexibility because pharmacy wasn't included in the initial shortage list and we had to pay quite high salaries in that area. I still feel awkward about it and exposed in terms of my relationship with the University. It's been a bit of a mess. I didn't want to run the risk of being caught out for not playing the game!

(iii) Not eligible - funding not allocated

Enable each Institution to ascertain the recruitment difficulties rather than making assumptions about the sector which have not enabled specialist Institutions such as ours to participate.

I have no recollection of the Code of Practice.

As this was not relevant we did not pursue the Code of Practice.

2.1 Recruitment Difficulties in golden hello subject shortage areas								
	Education	Maths	IT	Engineering	Business	Clinical Medicine	Other	TOTAL
Funding not used to date	3	1	2	2	5	0	4	17
Opted out	2	0	1	3	5	3	5	19
Funding not allocated	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	5	1	3	5	10	3	9	36

Other:
None (3)
Senior Administrators / Heads of Division
Health and Social Care
Research
Economics
Nursing, Pharmacy and Optometry

Comments

(i) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme, but funding not (yet) used

We still have problems with nursing and midwifery in particular.

We have great difficulty in attracting people from the NHS into teaching posts due to the disparity in pay. We have been fudging the issue by paying at the top of the pay scales.

Yes and no. We struggled with a Structural Engineering post. We referred to the availability of a golden hello in an advertisement for an educational post and managed to recruit but the candidate was not eligible for the funding. No other areas spring to mind.

Good quality applications for roles in all areas.

No major issues.

This understanding is drawn from soft rather than hard data - a situation we are now seeking to address.

(ii) Funding allocated, but opted out of the scheme

Not sure, though in some areas the salary differential between HE pay and the pay in the private sector may still prove a barrier.

It is focused on senior appointments in Medicine and Bioscience.

We did not have significant recruitment issues within HE. The golden hello scheme operating within FE does not solve the recruitment problems within the trade areas. A more fundamental issue is the overall salary and promotion structure - which we are currently working on.

In business subjects we have particular problems in finance, accountancy and marketing. It is always very hard work to recruit people of the highest quality in any discipline. We don't have unfilled vacancies. Under the new pay review, we are looking at adjusting salaries to make us more competitive. US universities pay higher salaries than the UK and we are competing with them.

(iii) Not eligible - funding not allocated

We are an Art Design and Media Institution and therefore the subject areas did not meet our need.

No idea

No.

2.2 Number of Staff HEIs were looking to recruit in these areas								
	Education	Maths	IT	Engineering	Business	Clinical Medicine	Other	TOTAL
Funding not used to date	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Opted out	16	0	13	6	67	15	183	300
Funding not allocated	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
TOTAL	16	0	18	6	67	15	195	317

Note: One HEI alone accounted for 199 of these vacancies in Art, FE-Agriculture, Media, Vice Chancellor Office, Research and Commercial Partnership; and one other for 80 in Health & Social Care

Many respondents were unable to respond to this question

Other:
Health
Contemporary performance arts
Nursing(2)
Economics
Pharmacy and Optometry

Comments

(i) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme, but funding not (yet) used

The perception within this University is that we always want to recruit people with teaching experience. To date it has not been used at all because, for one reason or another, our candidates' eligibility has not met the criteria. We have wanted to use it and have referred to the golden hello monies in four or five advertisements we have placed but nobody that has applied has been eligible. We are trying to use it at the moment because we have two structural build environment engineers from Malaysia who may be eligible candidates. They will be going through second interviews early in September. The criteria state that we have to meet requirements with regard to the teaching areas and that the candidates are new to teaching. The fact they are from overseas is not perceived to be a problem. We have not done an evaluation of the scheme as yet.

On-going difficulty in recruiting law lecturers.

Information not readily available. (2)

(ii) Funding allocated, but opted out of scheme

We have not done much academic recruitment in the last 2 years, but have had difficulties with senior clinical posts. Cash is not really the issue. Career structures for junior doctors in particular mean that there are not enough good candidates coming through the system. Our particular difficulties arose with a Chair in Psychiatry, and a clinical senior lectureship in Rheumatology.

5-10 in Education; 2-5 in Business; 5-10 in Nursing

I cannot give a figure. We are a big University and we will always be recruiting people. We just have to work harder at filling some vacancies than others and it may be difficult to get people of the right quality, especially in engineering.

Estimate 20-25 in total. In Engineering we often have to get work permits for people from overseas.

(iii) Not eligible - funding not allocated

Not applicable

2.3 Number of vacancies filled								
	Education	Maths	IT	Engineering	Business	Clinical Medicine	Other	TOTAL
Funding not used to date	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Opted out	15	0	4	6	52	8	90	175
Funding not allocated	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
TOTAL	15	0	9	6	52	8	102	192

Note: One HEI alone accounted for 82 of these vacancies in Art, FE-Agriculture, Media, Vice Chancellor Office, Research and Commercial Partnership; and one other for 75 in Health & Social Care

Many respondents were unable to respond to this question

Other:
Art, FE-Agriculture, Media, Vice Chancellor
Health & Social Care
Contemporary performance arts. These were academic posts in the subject areas of Music, Theatre, Visual Performance, Writing, Choreography, Arts Management - and a cross College role of Director of Research.
Nursing (2)
Pharmacy and Optometry

Comments

(i) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme, but funding not (yet) used

Unable to provide this information as it has not been recorded.

Information not readily available (2).

We successfully filled all vacancies but one or two required additional adverts.

(ii) Funding allocated, but opted out of the scheme

And the one we did fill took 2 campaigns.

All. The posts could be filled as the Institution has a good employer reputation in the locality, but we may have been able to attract higher calibre staff and / or reach a different professional market if we had introduced the scheme.

I cannot give a figure. We have no big holes. Some of the problems are about lack of supply. We need more people coming through the education system.

I think we probably filled all 20-25 positions although we do have some gaps at Professorial level.

(iii) Not eligible - funding not allocated

These were academic posts in the subject areas of Music, Theatre, Visual Performance, Writing, Choreography, Arts Management - and a cross-College role of Director of Research

2.4 Plans to operate a Recruitment Incentive Scheme for Teaching Staff				
	Yes	No	DK	No response
Funding not used to date	7	4	1	0
Opted out	4	5	0	0
Funding not allocated	1	3	0	1
	12	12	1	1
TOTAL	46.2%	46.2%	3.8%	3.8%

(b) How will it operate?**(i) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme, but funding not (yet) used**

We are still trying to find posts which will meet the criteria, but expect to be able to now due to various changes in our structures and curriculum. Yet to be finalized but will be used across a wider spread of disciplines.

We have never been able to identify any of our posts against the original strict criteria, but we did decide that we would use the £6k over three years in a £3k, £2k, £1k pattern in the hope that the schools / faculties would be able to absorb the increased costs after three years. Given the level of uptake so far, probably not operate a scheme if we have to fund it internally, but we will definitely continue with the golden hello scheme if the funding is available from HEFCE.

A process has been established and the scheme was launched on 13 January 2005. Our policy follows the Code of Practice quite closely including the difficult to recruit subject areas, the way the funding is allocated and the clawbacks if people leave. It is allocated on a first come first served basis. We draw down £9k in the year of recruitment and then trigger annual payments over the three year period. Payments are not backdated. We have linked the size of payments to the number of hours worked. We have defined the significant teaching commitment based on a tangible figure. The monies are taxable and subject to NI but not pensionable. We are subject to on-costs as employers. We were quite explicit about the proportion to be clawed back if someone leaves. We would possibly run our own scheme but not in this format. There are a few other stakeholders in the process (including finance who make the payments). There has been an element of stakeholder management but nothing difficult. I am quite confident that the scheme will be of benefit here.

This has yet to be determined as part of the national pay framework.

Will introduce market rate supplements as required by the Framework Agreement. Supplements will be paid where salary is a barrier to recruitment and retention, and sums to be paid will be determined by the local market and reviewed annually.

Currently under negotiation as part of wider talks on pay and terms and conditions but will include golden hellos and the use of time limited market rates supplements. This will be rigorously assessed to ensure consistency of implementation across faculties and to avoid any potential equal pay issues.

Available for each academic area to demonstrate the need for it.

We will be reviewing the situation, on-going, within Pay Modernisation. For example, we are considering introducing market supplements into our job evaluation and salary provisions.

(ii) Funding allocated but opted out of the scheme

Will need to consider market supplements as part of the framework agreement but have not got the details of this yet.

We offer, for key academic appointments only, one-off recruitment allowances of up to £20,000, to help people move to London. The arrangements are monitored by the Remuneration Committee.

We are looking at this in relation to the UCEA pay framework, and related market supplements, as well as a promotion ladder of opportunity to retain staff, and enable them to move between F & HE.

Not yet sure. Probably linked to market-related supplement discussions as part of NFA.

Not a recruitment incentive scheme as such. We have our own pragmatic approach to pay scales and a standard relocation package which we might have to tweak sometimes. We don't like 'schemes'. The package is also about things like research facilities, equipment and support. We end up giving people a 'dowry' to get research going.

We would do if we were having recruitment difficulties but we're coping at the moment.

(iii) Not eligible - funding not allocated

We may introduce our own Market Supplement Scheme, but this will be for all staff, based on objective market data.

Not at present but under review with our move to the new pay framework.

2.5 Will it be restricted to specific shortage areas?				
	Yes	No	DK	No response
Funding not used to date	2	3	1	2
Opted out	4	0	0	0
Funding not allocated	1	0	0	0
TOTAL	7	3	1	2

Comments

(i) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme, but funding not (yet) used

Will apply to all staff groups and will be determined by the local market.
--

Will be evidence based - looking at reasons for recruitment and retention difficulties before incentives considered for individuals or groups or sub groups of staff.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

HEIs

ALL RESPONDENTS

3.1 / 4.1 Impact on Attracting Teaching Staff into the Profession						
	Great Extent	Some Extent	A Little	Not at All	Other	No response
Funding being used	1	21	14	12	8	3
Funding not used to date	0	2	2	4	2	2
Opted out	0	0	2	2	3	2
Funding not allocated	0	0	1	0	1	3
TOTAL	1	23	19	18	14	10
	1.2%	27.1%	22.4%	21.2%	16.5%	11.8%

Other:
DK (7)
It is hard to disaggregate the impact of a single factor.
It helps us to attract new high research-quality teaching staff away from European universities
Not in our experience
No real evidence on which to base judgement - seem to be very few people advertising such schemes.
We have not yet introduced golden hellos.
Not aware of any statistics to date.
I don't know enough about the background of the people we have awarded them to.

Comments

(i) Funding Being Used
It helps us to attract new high research-quality teaching staff away from European universities.
It's difficult to say because I don't know how it has worked elsewhere. From our own experience it has had little or no impact. I don't know about the sector as a whole.
Not at all, but only because we did not use it to attract but to "secure"!
The primary effect has been on attracting staff from outside the UK rather than staff from industry.
Recruitment incentive programmes must help - the effectiveness of the golden hellos scheme is difficult to judge.
We have people lecturing now that weren't before and wouldn't have applied without the scheme operating.
The HEI sector can never truly match the salaries paid in the Computing and Accounting industries but can help ease the transition.
The decision to apply for and take up an offer of a post is a complex one in many cases. There is no doubt that the level of remuneration is one influencing factor and may, in some cases, be the deciding factor. Where the supplements have been offered I believe they have been a factor in the decision to accept the post. We do, however, have two instances of posts that were offered to individuals who were eligible for the supplement and who turned down the offer despite the additional remuneration represented by the golden hello supplement.
I think that people felt that they had to use it because the funding was available. Probably it has helped to attract people into the profession because there is more money in the system. However, the initial problems with the scheme were quite significant.
The limited funding, coupled with the (originally) restrictive criteria, was never going to be sufficient to make wholesale changes to the perception of academic employment..
In my view it is having a modest positive impact.
29% of recruiting departments felt that the golden hellos initiative was a key factor in filling their posts.
Maths seems to be the main beneficiary at this Institution.
Perhaps.
No affect with us, but I don't know whether the newer Universities would be in a different position.

(ii) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme but funding not (yet) used

Mainly because we have not been able to use it.

The scheme is aimed at people who are new to teaching. We are a vocationally-based University. We like to employ some people from a business or commercial background. It is also useful for people who are making their career in academia at an early stage. It is good for hard to recruit areas and gives us an extra carrot to dangle.

No idea how other Institutions see it.
--

Only very short term benefits and divisive in relation to new versus existing staff.
--

Greater exploration of the knock-on effects - equal pay issues, potential hidden costs, morale of existing staff, review procedures for such processes.

(iii) Funding allocated, but opted out of the scheme

I would be amazed if it had much impact at all.

I'm not sure that it has at all - I've not seen golden hellos promoted in any job advertisements - people would have applied anyway.
--

(iv) Not eligible - funding not allocated
--

Cannot comment on the scarcity areas.

3.2 / 4.2 Impact on Helping to Retain Teaching Staff in the Profession						
	Great Extent	Some Extent	A Little	Not at All	Other	No response
Funding being used	5	15	16	11	9	3
Funding not used to date	0	2	2	5	3	0
Opted out	0	1	1	4	3	0
Funding not allocated	0	1	1	0	1	2
TOTAL	5	19	20	20	16	5
	5.9%	22.4%	23.5%	23.5%	18.8%	5.9%

Other:
Some concern that staff may leave at end of period as relative salary decreases.
Don't know / not specified. (9)
It is too early to say at this stage. (4)
Our staff turnover is very low once we have recruited the right candidates.
We will need to offer competitive salaries to those in post who have completed the golden hello scheme.

Comments

(i) Funding Being Used
I cannot think that it would be a factor in our own case.
It is difficult to say, but the new staff recruited with the benefit of golden hellos are still in post.
Also need to look at the total package, other benefits etc.
I think it depends upon the salary progression opportunities that are available in the Institution. In skilled areas where we are in competition for staff, unless we can offer market salaries we will lose staff. What we try to promote is the 'total reward' package. Working at the University is not just about pay so we try to capitalise on the other benefits we offer and develop our reward strategy to reflect individual needs and introduce choice and flexibility etc
It is too early to be able to judge whether those who accepted posts which attracted a supplement will remain in those posts once it has ended. The assessment of this may not be straightforward since, during the period when the supplement applies, the individual may develop to a stage where they are able to successfully apply for promotion, which could result in a basic salary which is acceptable without the supplement. Alternatively, individuals choose to remain with, or leave an employer for a variety of reasons other than salary and it is difficult to assess accurately how much the golden hello will influence such a decision.
The golden hello scheme will help to attract a wider range of candidates to apply for posts and may have some impact in retaining teaching staff in the profession. However, other factors will also contribute to retention including appropriate development and review and career progression.
This will depend upon how new recruits develop and what HEIs put in place in terms of career progression arrangements.
As the code of practice was written - not at all - and might have run the risk of a negative impact. As it stands now it helps to some extent.
The funding was too limited and narrow in its potential application to have any significant long-lasting effect on the perception of academic employment.
Our turnover in academic staff is 8-10% pa. The golden hello scheme runs for only three years which is the time when we don't tend to lose them.
33% of appointees who were awarded golden hellos have indicated that this award means that they are more likely to remain in their post until they have received all instalments.
I am not sure about that one. It won't have a huge impact. I think that other things are probably more of an influence, for example the culture of the Institution.
New academics, once they make the decision to embark on this type of career will typically stay the course. The supplement will support the transition. The fact that it ends after three years will not in itself lead an academic to review their career options. Lecturers here tend to be highly marketable individuals, often recruited across Europe and beyond. What is a further risk is the issue of them leaving the UK University environment to go to another academic Institution overseas.
Based on a bit of speculation, I would say it probably would help. But what happens when the money runs out? Will they expect compensating pay rises?

Perhaps a little. This wasn't the case for us because we didn't use it for retention purposes and with the tight guidelines it was of limited help. But having said that, any money is always welcome. Salary packages at senior level are significant, especially in London where you are competing with the City for people who, for example, are in business and law. We also have a problem recruiting support staff.

Yes, in the short term, but over the long term it won't make any difference.

If we stop the scheme we do not know how it will be seen.

(ii) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme, but funding not (yet) used

No evidence available yet.

After 3 years, there is no premium at all, retention will be down to other factors.

Absolutely right. It's paid over three years. A gradual approach to the salary drop. It reduces the desire to leave.

Not at all because it's for recruitment not retention. Other factors will keep them long term.

For staff in receipt of golden hellos, the payment is for a limited term. After 3 years the pay will reduce and this is likely to encourage turnover, not retention, particularly from lower-paying Institutions to higher-paying ones. The scheme is also likely to demoralise existing staff if they are paid less, which will also work against retention.

(iii) Funding allocated but opted out of the scheme

None because of the tapering of the incentive. It brings people in under false pretences and potentially could lead to disillusionment.

It could do if it were used flexibly for retention. It helps individuals and gives them an incentive to stay. It could also be used to offset the costs of supporting someone new to teaching in HE which would help the attitudes of colleagues in their Departments.

3.3 / 4.3 Impact on Easing Recruitment Difficulties in the Sector Overall						
	Great Extent	Some Extent	A Little	Not at All	Other	No response
Funding being used	1	33	14	5	3	3
Funding not used to date	1	2	4	4	1	0
Opted out	0	3	2	1	2	1
Funding not allocated	0	2	0	0	1	2
TOTAL	2	40	20	10	7	6
	2.4%	47.1%	23.5%	11.8%	8.2%	7.1%

Other:

This is not clear yet.

Additional funding is to be welcomed, but must allow for determination at local level.

Don't know / not specified (4)

Depends on area of expertise and the nature of the Institution.

Comments**(i) Funding Being Used**

Not unless they are well publicised and people know in advance. Golden hellos are not available for everyone anyway. It is a finite allocation of funding, so it is difficult to advertise the availability of a golden hello up front because we may not be able to provide it.

They have the potential to do so if Institutions have a free rein.

Future schemes would need to be totally flexible in their interpretation at Institutional level.

Possibly assists in the sector as whole but can cause more other problems for organisations to solve, such as the equalities issues.

Providing Institutions have the autonomy to implement to business needs.

The impact of the scheme is limited by the size of the funding pot. We believe that salaries in the HE sector are still comparatively low.

It addresses a particular aspect of recruitment difficulty. However, there is a longer term problem in "selling" the academic career in the long term across the board and not only to those close to the market disciplines.

May ease initial difficulties, but once people start to work at the University, we need to engage them and maintain their desire to continue to work for us. Unless we can get the reward strategy and the other aspects of developing and rewarding staff in place, we will have a retention issue.

Yes! The real recruitment and retention problem is the general level of pay and in some areas the depressing influence of national pay bargaining. The additional restraint is the over preoccupation on salary scales and progression through service. More focus should be placed on performance for both determining career progression rates and for determining reward. Do I think this is going to happen? Not a chance.

It is only really possible to comment from the perspective of my own Institution, which is a pre-92, strongly research orientated Institution. The impact of the scheme could be significantly greater in Institutions which employ a higher proportion of "teaching only" staff. If, however, it is having a beneficial effect in my University it seems likely that this would be the case across the sector, and possibly to a greater extent in other Institutions.

There must be sufficient flexibility in any future HEFCE funded scheme so that Institutions can respond to the problems that they are facing, not some generic situation.

The golden hello scheme supports the recruitment initiative but must also be part of a wider range of recruitment and retention packages and good employment practices.

It can do. It can be useful but needs to be applied with sensitivity and flexibility.

But incentive schemes will need to be better funded and more appropriately customised to the needs of the host Institution.

Needs a far more systematic, roots and branch review.

Clearly it has had an effect.

The golden hello scheme is only focused on one strand of the recruitment experience across universities and it is important to remember that there are recruitment difficulties in non academic areas as well.

Probably has some positive impact. It is beneficial in a modest way.

If a reasonable amount of money was available without excessive restrictions for recruitment of high level teaching and research staff.

(ii) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme, but funding not (yet) used

Further funding will allow us to pay some sort of premium without the extra strain our existing budgets.

It absolutely does.

Not in this format.

"Pay" is but one dimension to a multi-faceted, complex set of questions. As with most HR matters, utilising only one tool will at best only address part of the issue. This may be an expensive and incomplete solution.

(iii) Funding allocated, but opted out of the scheme

Not sure, though in some areas the salary differential between HE pay and the pay in the private sector may still prove a barrier.

If it is more flexibly configured.

If we discovered it would be essential to use it, then we would review our practice. Currently we are examining other recruitment / retention improvement practices before we consider golden hellos.

Minimal impact. I have not heard any positive feedback about the golden hello scheme from the sector.

When students leave University they will have a debt of at least £9k. It would be a real incentive to come into teaching in HE if that debt were written off.

(iv) Not eligible - funding not allocated

It will only help to attract staff, not to retain them.

4.4 Final Comments

(i) Funding Being Used

It would be helpful if there was someone at HEFCE we could discuss questions with. We need a central contact point for queries.

We find the money very useful for the reasons stated above and, since the relaxation in the rules, they are given to new teaching staff in a range of subject areas. We know that we have not spent our allocation but would wish to retain the money until it is all spent - it provides us with an extremely useful piece of armory in our efforts to get people to join us in London. If the money were to continue, we would be extremely pleased to receive it.

We have not had to use the scheme extensively but where we have used it, it has enabled us to recruit in areas where it would otherwise have been difficult to do so.

Please see below the results of an internal evaluation conducted by a College in April 2005. Eight of eleven (73%) of employees in receipt of a golden hello returned the questionnaire. All vacant posts in Education were advertised as potentially being eligible for a golden hello award.

Question 1

4/8 (50%) of employees said the golden hello influenced their decision to apply.

Question 3

7/8 (88%) of employees said if the post had not attracted a golden hello they would have nevertheless applied.

Question 4

3/8 (38%) of employees applied to other Institutions as well as ours, and 4/6 (67%) of these offered golden hellos.

Question 5

4/8 (50%) of employees said if the golden hello had not been the sum of £9k, it would not have affected their decision to join our Institution.

3/8 (38%) said it may have made a difference

1/8 (13%) said it would have definitely made a difference

Question 6

7/8 (88%) of employees would have applied if the remuneration offered was only £7k

5/8 (63%) of employees would have applied if the remuneration offered was only £5k

4/8 (50%) of employees would have applied if the remuneration offered was only £3k

I think that Institutions are the best placed to decide their own remuneration strategy. A national strategy that suggests that the recruitment and retention issues are the same in the South East and the North East is obviously bonkers.

The golden hello scheme has been a great tool in our recruitment and the academics who have been awarded the scheme have benefited both financially and feel valued within UOL. We believe this scheme will attract new academics in the future to UOL.

We would certainly commend you to think about continuing the golden hello in one form or another.

Further initiatives such as this would be welcome.

The scheme was superficially attractive but the restrictions on implementation were too constricting initially. HEIs know where their areas of recruitment difficulty are and we would have preferred to have had more freedom in how funds could be used.

We sincerely hope that the HEFCE will mainstream this money into University funding as it has proved a welcome recruitment tool in 'hard to recruit' areas.

We would like the money to be mainstreamed.

One of the big concerns I have is this obsession with jam jar funding to fund specific initiatives. Rewarding and Developing Staff initiatives have been enormously beneficial. But the golden hello money is relatively very small and after three years it dries up. It would have cost us a lot of money to keep it going if we had used it as originally intended.

We would appreciate more consultation with the sector before new schemes are launched; this would help to make schemes easily workable from the outset.

We manage to recruit staff in these areas because of our market supplement scheme. The golden hello helped towards that, but was only a very small proportion of the total additional payments made to attract staff to this Institution.

Pressures to modernise pay and have a proper pay review such as teachers, nurses and the police, amongst others, have had would help pressures. Some grades are lagging behind and have been eroded

in absolute terms. We cannot fund them without government realising this.

I feel that in completing this questionnaire I was a bit negative about the golden hello scheme, but my frustration is that I don't have any critical mass: looking at the allocation I managed to use it for year one.

(ii) Funding allocated, opted into the scheme, but funding not (yet) used

The criteria did not reflect our local recruitment difficulties. Greater flexibility would have helped from the outset. No evidence available to date.

Initially the criteria relating to teaching staff were too strict for us to be able to make use of the funding. We now have to ensure that we have processes in place so that when we can use the funding it is made use of. Now that the rules have been relaxed, we intend to try to use the money which we have been allocated and therefore I would not want to lose it now.

My experience of HEFCE has been good. The Code of Practice has been very useful. It was a good starting point and basis for putting our own processes in place and gave us sufficient flexibility. I contacted Tracy Allan for data on uptake but nothing was available from HEFCE. I would not want to see it go. I still think that in the case of the structural built environment engineers from Malaysia it enables us to get people in.

Institutions need to be able to compete in a free market without the impediment of structured systems like golden hellos. If the funding ended it would have nil impact overall.

Need local flexibility to address the wider recruitment and retention issues.

If the funding ended there would be no impact.

Contents of letter to Tracy Allen: I must start with an overriding statement of our position. We fear that the whole approach is severely flawed. Additional money to help HEIs attract good academics to teaching is to be welcomed. However, golden hellos will, at best, be a small contribution to attracting and retaining staff in circumstances where rates of pay are unattractive in comparison to other career paths. Moreover, recruitment and retention problems are not confined to teaching staff in the 'shortage areas' described in the consultation document and the critical problem areas will vary between Institutions. Our view is that Institutions are in the best position to make judgements, through their HR strategies, about how best to recruit and retain staff in shortage areas.

We do not think it is at all appropriate for HEFCE to allocate small sums of money to Institutions, tied to a narrow and highly prescriptive national scheme which may not fit well with the HR strategies of individual Institutions. Neither the DfES nor the HEFCE should be intervening in the affairs of Institutions at such a detailed level. Recruitment and retention is a specific objective of the much larger sums allocated by HEFCE to support HR strategies. In our view the money intended for 'golden hellos' should be added to the HR strategy funds and Institutions would report on how the funds as a whole had been deployed to support the objectives of their HR strategies.

(i) We do not agree that HEFCE should prescribe how Institutions should aim to recruit staff at this level of detail.

(ii) It should be remembered that, in the case of the Open University, central academics' principal contribution to teaching will be through the writing of course units rather than by face to face tuition, which is delivered by our 7000+ part time Associate Lecturers (ALs). Our ALs are employed on contracts for the life of the course they are tutoring, subject to successful completion of a two-year probationary period and must therefore be deemed to be eligible for 'golden hellos'.

(iii) The scheme could be used to encourage the return of staff who have left higher education employment and not just new entrants.

(iv) [The suggested payment schedule over three years] is far too restrictive.

(v) Agree [that the operational implementation of the scheme will be the responsibility of the Institutions, based on guidance provided by HEFCE in a code of practice] but responsibility of the Institutions should not be restricted simply to the detailed implementation.

(vi) Profoundly disagree [that the incentive should be aimed towards six subject areas]. It must be for the individual Institution to decide how the funds should be distributed.

(vii) Agree [to a formal evaluation of the scheme's effectiveness in recruiting and retaining staff by August 2005] but as part of a normal review of HR strategy.

(iii) Funding allocated but opted out of the scheme

The golden hello scheme is hung up on the Association of University Teachers (AUT) Agenda. They argue that HE starting salaries have fallen behind. But the incentive of £9k would be insufficient to attract someone who was going to be a hedge fund manager in the City into a teaching career instead. The scheme represents a very poor return on investment and could have been much better spent in the Universities' block allocation of funding. It is ill conceived and ill founded. I wonder whether it is a sound investment of public money.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

RECIPIENTS OF GOLDEN HELLOS

Respondents	Institution	Number
Lecturers	Imperial College, London	4
Lecturers	Loughborough	2
		6

1.1 What attracted you to applying for this job in the first instance?

This is an amazing university ... the fact that they were very generous with their funding for our departments, made us really want to come.

This University is a drop-in centre for students and I wanted to work with students on a one to one basis.

I was working [abroad] with a colleague who said there was lots of action at the business school. I read about it on the web. I was just convinced about it from a professional point of view. The only thing that would have stopped me is the money and the huge cost of living in London, so I thought I would trade off and see how I could manage. It's been a year now, and it's good.

A lectureship. Jobs don't come up that often and I wanted to be a lecturer. Also reputation and location sold it to me.

I seemed to be qualified for the post. There are very few posts my field.

It is an interesting job in academia where I can do teaching and research at a well known and interesting University and [London] is also a nice city.

1.2 Were you aware of the availability of golden hello incentives for individuals new to teaching HE in this country prior to applying for this post?

Not aware	6
------------------	---

Comments

Only afterwards.

I wasn't aware of it. It wasn't mentioned at the time of the interview.

No, neither was the department that employed me.

We didn't know about it until after I had signed my contract.

1.3 At what stage were you *first* made aware of this recruitment and retention incentive at this Institution?

Application	Offer	Other
1	1	4

Other

After I signed the contract.

After my acceptance.

On receipt of the contract.

After I had started working here I suddenly became aware of it.

Comments

I only knew about it when I came [here].

I was told about it. I think they were informed then. The last time they hired a lecturer was 5 years ago. They had no need to know.

1.4 Did the incentive influence your decision to apply?

No influence	Not applicable
0	6

Comments

It was extremely hard and I would have agonised less ...I didn't know how far my basic salary in London would go.

I didn't know about it.

It was one of those situations where I would have applied anyway.

1.5 Did other Institutions to which you applied also offer golden hellos (or similar incentives)? If so, please give details.

No	Yes	DK	Other
3	1	1	1

Comments

I had applied to one other.

I never applied to any other Institution. I never heard of it.

One US-based University offered my husband [also a lecturer here] and myself the equivalent of £40,000 towards buying a house which was very attractive. Four different institutions had a range of things to offer. It's more common in the US. Every N. American university offers ten times more in 'start up funds' (buying computers, travel, housing etc.).

I haven't applied for any.

1.6 Why did you choose to take up a post at this Institution?

We were visiting here for a year and just really liked it. They are putting a lot of resources into both our departments.

In my field it was the best job that I had seen for a couple of years. There were seventy people who applied for it.

This Institution has a great reputation and it is a great opportunity to do research in science with stable funding. I can develop a career which will last for many years. I am young and can do this because I don't have a family to support yet.

I didn't choose it - it was an opportunity that fell into my lap. This is one of the best business schools and as this Institution is dominated by science and technology historically, the business school gets lost a bit but it is now creating more visibility. It's a fantastic, spectacular new building. The supplement helped me with my expenses.

I wanted to try a lectureship. I was attracted by the nature of the job and I was impressed by the staff. I knew one or two of them here and socially it is good.

I wanted to be involved in the maths support centre.

2.1 To what extent did the additional financial incentive influence your decision to apply for the post?

Not at All	Not Applicable
2	4

(b) Why/why not

Even if I had have known, it wouldn't have made any difference as I know people who are doing a similar job and earning a lot less.

It wasn't advertised and it's not advertised this year either.

Didn't know about it until afterwards (2)

It may have been an influence in taking it but not applying.

2.2 How was the golden hello presented to you?

Salary supplement over three years	5
Other	1

Other
Salary supplement over 4 years provided I took a teaching course.

Comments
Over 3 years added to my salary in 3 lump sum payments.
A bit every month on the salary.
Paid as part of the salary, I think monthly.
Spread over 3 years.
£9,000 over 3 years but taxed which I didn't realise. Relocation expenses were covered separately.

2.3 ... and to what extent did it influence your decision to accept the post?

Not at All	Not Applicable
4	2

Why/why not
I didn't know about it until after I had started (2).
Because I had already decided. It was a job that I really wanted.
It just made me feel better for accepting the position.
It helped in easing the pressure but I have always been an academic so it didn't make a difference.
If it wasn't there, I would still have accepted the place.

2.4 To what extent is the golden hello an incentive to your remaining in post?

A Little	Not at All
3	3

Why/why not
It's very nice but wouldn't influence my decision. It's a bonus.
It's just a nice bonus for me. It won't encourage me to remain in post.
Not too much because I am very young to be a lecturer and coming to London and working there is what it is all about for me. I find that is what is attractive about academia. You don't go into education if you want to make money.
There's no stipulation that you have to send it back if you leave early. I'm not planning to leave but housing is so expensive [in London] and it would have been helpful to have known about the golden hello incentive earlier.
It's doing a lot for me because it has made things easier while I wait for a promotion. It's not just the golden hello that makes me stay, just what the move is doing for me professionally. I found it a shock financially. I have taken a couple of steps back.
I had a period of probation and would expect to be here for 4 or 5 years as it takes 3 or 4 years to find my feet. The payment has an influence. I was on a similar salary as a researcher and had finished the research contract and the salary was slightly lower.

2.5 Would other types of incentive or employee benefits have been more attractive to you than additional monies?

Yes, some type of housing arrangement would have been welcome. Salaries haven't kept pace with housing. New people who come to this Institution are now living out in London zones 3 and 4 whereas those who have been here quite a while still live in zones 1 and 2.

It's a question of the lack of posts which is the main issue. Unless someone can create more jobs there's no need for incentives.

Freedom of research and the potential of working with good students is the attraction to me. You don't do research for money. If you want to earn money, you have to work in the city. Many of my friends and colleagues would rely on these incentives but I don't need that much money.

Given the context and that academics don't get paid much money, the school has set up good funding and grants for us because we do research.

In my view a higher salary is better than a golden hello supplement because it puts you in a stronger position when re-negotiating a mortgage.

No, of no interest to me at all.

3.1 To what extent do you believe that the scheme has helped to attract new teaching staff into the profession?

To a Great Extent	To Some Extent	A Little	Not at All	DK
1	1	2	1	1

Comments

If people knew about the availability of golden hellos, it would make the College more competitive internationally. It might also attract people if they knew the College was spending more money on research and not teaching.

There's no shortage of people who want teaching jobs. I know people who are working for very little money and who will apply for jobs regardless of salary.

Most people who are teaching have to think about a family and it makes a difference. Maybe some Institutions advertise it.

We have never talked about contract issues. We just don't discuss it. We have to deliver on research and teaching. So I can't tell you how it will attract new staff.

I have only known it here and people here just want to be lecturers, nothing else seems to matter.

I don't see it advertised anywhere, so I don't see how it can help.

3.2 ... and will help to retain teaching staff in the profession?

A Little	Not at All	DK
3	2	1

Comments

It will be very much like the incentive scheme to attract teachers, but when they have had enough, they will have had enough!

Incentives are not an issue in this context. It won't retain staff because it's not enough money. People will only stay if they want to teach in HE.

It ties into the Certificate of Advanced Studies in Teaching and Learning (CASLAT) which is equivalent to a Masters course. All new members of staff are required to take it. Golden hellos and CASLAT are tied in at this Institution. It seems just like a salary increase.

The incentive runs out after three years. It may not hold them.

This is a minor point. It won't make much difference.

It helped me a lot. If you are so totally financially stressed out in a job in the first year, you will get the pressure taken off a bit.

3.3 To what extent do you think that a scheme like golden hellos may ease recruitment difficulties in the HE sector overall?

To a Great Extent	To Some Extent	A Little	DK
2	1	2	1

Comments

It is important as Institutions are trying to compete internationally now. There are people from all over the world lecturing here and having a salary increase makes it more attractive especially because of the cost of housing.

For London it may have an impact, because I do know people who may not apply for London because of the salaries.

It will help where people have to make a decision because life in London is very expensive.

It may not be enough. One of the reasons that HEIs have recruitment problems is that academics are badly paid and they can't attract people with PhDs. This business school is trying in its own way but other places are also trying to be competitive.

There will be some effect but people who want to be lecturers will be no matter what. I think that salary and location will be the difficulty financially.

3.4 Other Comments

The scheme is a good idea. Academic salaries are quite low when compared to other salary levels. It won't really help for recruitment, it's not enough, but it is just counteracting the injustice of salaries. It depends on the policy of awarding and in which field. Most of the money is in the first year so over the first 3 years the salary is constant. Stamp duty on my house is more than the golden hello. Most of the costs of moving are at the beginning so it's a good idea but it is really a case of the basic salaries being looked at.

I appreciate getting the extra money. It's helpful. We were trying to compare the quality of living and one of the biggest difficulties is the cost of housing. It also would have been helpful when they advertised the jobs if they had mentioned the higher salary and golden hellos but they are still not promoting it.

For me it is a very good thing. Academia is not very well paid.

It's not good tapering off after 3 years. I am hoping that I will be ready to apply for promotion. It's a very constructive scheme especially for people who are coming in new. It should be made more attractive, you should be looking at it. It shouldn't go on the road to decline.

It is a short term measure which will not necessarily ensure that you will keep staff. I changed [my job] because I wanted to be a more specialised teacher. I am enjoying it very much and I am glad that I changed.

There could be an inequality with colleagues. Academics have a rigid scale ... I enjoy the interaction with students. The golden hello scheme is a good idea. Extra money for teachers and lecturers is what is needed. However, I would prefer it to go direct into salary to help with mortgage negotiations. New people tend to compare salaries.