



INSTITUTION REPORT

Recognition & Rewards Culture Barometer

First measurement report
Eindhoven University of Technology

68463 – 16 May 2024

Contents

Chapter 1 3

Introduction 3

1.1	Reason for the report and key question	3
1.2	This institution report	3
1.3	Structure of this report	4

Chapter 2 5

Familiarity with the Recognition & Rewards programme..... 5

2.1	Ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme	5
2.2	Familiarity with the Recognition & Rewards programme	5
2.3	Communication about the Recognition & Rewards programme.....	8
2.4	Extent of perceived recognition and rewards	8

Chapter 3 10

Experiences with the Recognition & Rewards programme 10

3.1	Visible changes within the organisation.....	10
3.2	Diversifying and vitalising career paths.....	11
3.3	Development.....	13
3.4	Achieving a balance between the individual and the collective	15
3.5	Open science.....	17
3.6	Leadership	19

Chapter 4 21

Concerns and opportunities..... 21

4.1	Concerns	21
4.2	Opportunities	22

Chapter 5 24

Response within this institution 24

5.1	Response structure	24
-----	--------------------------	----

Introduction

In this section, we briefly describe the reason for the Culture Barometer and this institution report.

1.1 Reason for the report and key question

Dutch universities, university medical centres, research institutes and research funders launched the Recognition & Rewards programme in 2020. Through the Recognition & Rewards programme, these parties are working towards a new balance in the way in which academic work is recognised and rewarded, ensuring that everyone's talent counts. Together, they aim to recognise and reward the work of academics (in the broadest sense of the word) by paying more attention to the diverse contributions of each person in the different domains (research, teaching, impact, leadership and patient care) in which academics work, as well as to collaboration within teams. Many academics feel that there is an overly one-sided emphasis on quantitative and individual research performance, as a result of which activities in other areas regularly receive insufficient attention.

To achieve the stated goals of Recognition & Rewards, the parties involved jointly launched a change programme. It is important to gain insight into the extent to which the goals that were set are actually being achieved, where adjustments may need to be made, what the causes are of the achievement or non-achievement of goals and what staff members' experiences and perceptions are. For this reason, the "Recognition & Rewards Plan 2022–2026" introduced a culture barometer. The dual purpose of this culture barometer was stated as:

1. Assessing the extent to which academics recognise, experience and share the ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme and the associated workplace behaviour (within their own institution);
2. Providing insight into the extent to which the envisaged culture change over the duration of the programme is progressing.

The culture barometer will be conducted twice, in a similar way: the first culture barometer in early 2024 and a follow-up measurement in 2026. The first culture barometer was conducted by Berenschot. The follow-up measurement will also be conducted by Berenschot, based on the same survey. All institutions within the Recognition & Rewards programme were involved in the preparation and implementation of the Culture Barometer. A guidance committee advised Berenschot and the Recognition & Rewards programme team and discussed the draft report.

1.2 This institution report

Berenschot has delivered a sector report, which sets out the results of the Culture Barometer. The sector report presents the results from all institutions combined, broken down by several categories, such as job category and subject area. The results of individual institutions cannot be derived from that report. The sector report will be published in June 2024.

Next to the sector report, we have prepared this institution report for Eindhoven University of Technology, presenting the results on each question compared with the sector results. In this

institution report, we do not break down the results by category, or interpret the differences compared with the sector report.

This report provides an insight into the current state of the Recognition & Rewards programme, based on respondents' opinions. We do not make any value judgements on these opinions, and we therefore also refrain from making statements about the relative significance of a certain high or low value.

Response

The questionnaire was distributed to 2762 potential respondents at this institution. The target group for the study was defined as 'people working as academics at the institutions involved'. The response rate was 14,7%. The total response rate across all institutions was **12.1%**. Further information on representativeness, the non-response rate and interpretation of the findings is presented in the sector report. To ensure that results cannot be traced back to individuals, we have not reported on groups with fewer than 10 respondents. This may mean that not all the results you read in the sector report are reflected in this report.

1.3 Structure of this report

In the next few chapters, we describe the findings by subject for this institution, compared with the results from the sector report (which covers all institutions). In Chapter 2, we describe the extent to which respondents are familiar with the Recognition & Rewards programme and its stated ambitions. We also look at the extent of institutions' communications about the programme and whether respondents talk about it with colleagues. In Chapter 3, we look at respondents' experiences with the Recognition & Rewards programme in the workplace. First, we look at whether respondents have noticed changes in the organisation as a result of the Recognition & Rewards programme, then we examine the extent to which they experience aspects of Recognition & Rewards in their daily work in the areas of career paths, development, the balance between the individual and the collective, open science and leadership. In Chapter 4, we outline staff members' concerns and opportunities. Finally, we describe the response rate (Chapter 5).

Team Berenschot

(Roeleke Vunderink, Saraï Sapulete, Martha Jordaan)

Familiarity with the Recognition & Rewards programme

In this chapter, we discuss the outcomes in relation to the ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme, familiarity with the programme and visible changes in the organisation due to the programme.

2.1 Ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme

The change envisaged by the Recognition & Rewards programme is described as follows: *"Our aim is to have a healthy and inspirational environment for our academic members of staff. An environment in which all talents are valued: teaching, research, impact, patient care and good leadership."*

The Recognition & Rewards programme has five ambitions, namely:

1. Diversify and vitalise career paths. We enable more diversity in career paths and profiles for academics (in the broadest sense).
2. Achieve a balance between the individual and the collective. We are assessing the input of academics in terms of their individual as well as team performance.
3. Focus on quality (and less emphasis on quantity). In our assessments of academic performance, we increasingly focus on quality, content and creativity.
4. Stimulate all aspects of open science. We are encouraging academics to work according to the principles of open science.
5. Stimulate leadership (in academia). We stimulate good leadership at every level.

2.2 Familiarity with the Recognition & Rewards programme

The questionnaire asked respondents how familiar they were with the Recognition & Rewards programme. At the national level, almost 40% were already largely to completely familiar with the Recognition & Rewards programme before completing the questionnaire. 28% were not at all or not very familiar with the programme and 23% were somewhat familiar with it. Table 1 shows the results for this institution.

Table 1. Familiarity with the Recognition & Rewards programme before this questionnaire (N=382).

	TU Eindhoven	All institutions
Not at all	27,7%	25%
Hardly	12,6%	13%
Somewhat	24,3%	23%
Largely	28,0%	29%
Completely	7,3%	10%

2.2.1 Familiarity with the ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme

Nationally, the awareness score for each of the programme's ambitions was around 3 (somewhat familiar); there were no major differences. The best-known ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme are focusing on quality (with less emphasis on quantity) and stimulating all aspects of open science. Table 2 shows how familiar respondents from this institution are with the programme's ambitions.

Table 2. Familiarity with the ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme (N=395;

1. Not at all familiar – 5: Completely familiar).

	TU Eindhoven	SD*	All institutions	SD
Diversifying and vitalising career paths	3,0	1,3	2,6	1,3
Achieving balance between individuals and the collective	2,6	1,2	2,9	1,4
Focusing on quality (and less emphasis on quantity)	2,9	1,3	3,1	1,3
Stimulating all aspects of open science	2,9	1,3	3,1	1,3
Stimulating leadership (in academia)	2,7	1,2	2,8	1,3

* Standard deviation

2.2.2 Support for the ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme

When asked about the extent to which staff support the specific ambitions, at the national level we can see that they support all ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme. Within these ambitions, the ones they value most are the diversification and vitalisation of career paths and the focus on quality. Few staff disagree or completely disagree with the ambitions. This percentage ranges from 2% for the ambition of focusing on quality to 4% for the ambitions around open science and leadership. Table 4 shows how these results compare with the results for this institution.

Table 3. Ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme.

Ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme	
1	Diversifying and vitalising career paths
2	Achieving balance between individuals and the collective
3	Focusing on quality (and less emphasis on quantity)
4	Stimulating all aspects of open science
5	Stimulating leadership (in academia)

Table 4. To what extent do you support the ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme? (N=386-391). a: this institution, b: all institutions.

	1		2		3		4		5	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Completely disagree	1,8%	1%	1,8%	1%	1,0%	1%	1,8%	1%	2,4%	1%
Disagree	0,3%	2%	2,3%	2%	1,5%	1%	1,8%	2%	2,6%	2%
Neutral	9,0%	6%	11,9%	10%	4,6%	5%	14,8%	14%	18,5%	14%
Agree	32,2%	31%	38,1%	38%	25,6%	27%	35,2%	36%	39,4%	37%
Completely agree	56,7%	59%	45,9%	49%	67,3%	65%	46,4%	46%	37,0%	45%

2.3 Communication about the Recognition & Rewards programme

The results from all institutions combined show that the Recognition & Rewards programme is not a regularly topic of conversation between colleagues. At the national level, respondents most often indicated that their organisation 'sometimes' communicates about the Recognition & Rewards programme. The tables below show how respondents perceive communication within and from this institution.

Table 5. Communication with colleagues about the Recognition & Rewards programme (N=389).

	TU Eindhoven	All institutions
Never	37,5%	38%
Rarely	24,7%	21%
Occasionally	23,4%	26%
Often	11,6%	11%
Very often	2,8%	3%

Table 6. Communication from the institution about the Recognition & Rewards programme (N=354).

	TU Eindhoven	All institutions
Never	17,2%	23%
Rarely	28,5%	27%
Occasionally	39,8%	34%
Often	12,4%	13%
Very often	2,0%	3%

2.4 Extent of perceived recognition and rewards

We asked respondents about the extent to which, in general, they feel recognised and rewarded for the work they do (see Tables 7 and 8). In general, academics feel reasonably recognised and rewarded for the work they do. At the national level, we can see that while the majority of respondents feel recognised and rewarded, this is not true for around a quarter of respondents (for 24%, the statement regarding recognition was not applicable or not at all applicable, and for 29%, the statement regarding rewards was not applicable or not at all applicable). The results for this institution can be found in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7. Extent to which respondents feel recognised for the work they do (N=394).

	TU Eindhoven	All institutions
Not at all applicable	9,9%	8%
Not applicable	13,5%	16%
Neutral	29,9%	27%
Applicable	37,8%	40%
Extremely applicable	8,9%	9%

Table 8. Extent to which respondents feel rewarded for the work they do (N=395).

	TU Eindhoven	All institutions
Not at all applicable	13,4%	11%
Not applicable	15,9%	18%
Neutral	32,7%	26%
Applicable	28,4%	36%
Extremely applicable	9,6%	9%

Experiences with the Recognition & Rewards programme

This chapter uses the five ambitions to discuss staff experiences. We start by describing the extent to which staff have noticed changes in the organisation due to the Recognition & Rewards programme.

3.1 Visible changes within the organisation

We asked respondents about the extent to which they notice changes related to the Recognition & Rewards programme. We divided these changes into three categories, namely:

- System (such as organisational structure, the composition of committees);
- Policies (such as career policies, evaluation policies, annual interviews, recruitment and selection, and strategy);
- Culture (such as the way we collaborate, room for personal development, interaction with colleagues and supervisors/managers).

At the national level, the majority of respondents indicated that they had not noticed any changes in the above areas as a result of the Recognition & Rewards programme (see Tables 9–11). This applied most to systemic changes, followed by changes in culture. Most of the changes observed related to policies and were mainly positive changes. For example, 43% of respondents reported seeing a positive or somewhat positive change in policy as a result of the Recognition & Rewards programme. This was also true for 36% of respondents in terms of changes in culture and 30% in terms of systemic changes. The proportion of respondents who have experienced negative or somewhat negative changes is relatively low, ranging from 11% (systemic changes) to 14% (policy changes). The table below shows whether and to what extent respondents from this institution have experienced changes as a result of the Recognition & Rewards programme.

Table 9. Change due to the Recognition & Rewards programme experienced in relation to systems (N=278).

	TU Eindhoven	All institutions
Negative change	6,1%	5%
Somewhat negative change	5,8%	6%
No change	53,6%	59%
Somewhat positive change	27,0%	25%
Positive change	7,6%	5%

Table 10. Change due to the Recognition & Rewards programme experienced in relation to policies (N=293).

	TU Eindhoven	All institutions
Negative change	7,2%	6%
Somewhat negative change	6,8%	8%
No change	42,0%	43%
Somewhat positive change	32,8%	34%
Positive change	11,3%	9%

Table 11. Change due to the Recognition & Rewards programme experienced in relation to culture (N=305).

	TU Eindhoven	All institutions
Negative change	3,9%	5%
Somewhat negative change	8,2%	7%
No change	51,1%	53%
Somewhat positive change	27,5%	29%
Positive change	9,2%	7%

3.2 Diversifying and vitalising career paths

Explanation of ambition

The position paper lists diversifying and vitalising career paths as one of the ambitions. The goal is to *“enable greater diversity in possible career paths and profiles by recognising and rewarding more diversity in competences and talents. In line with this, we are switching to a system in which academics can make a mark in one or more domains (diversification). In this system, the area profile of academics may change in the course of their career (vitalisation), and competences acquired outside of the academy are acknowledged as having added value. The domains identified are research, teaching, impact, patient care and leadership. The interconnectedness of education and research, typical of the Dutch university system, does require that academics have enough competences in at least these two domains. Within a team, department or faculty, the different profiles and backgrounds are integrated into a coherent whole.”*

Outcomes

In making agreements about work tasks, staff perceive that consideration is given to where their ambitions lie. Looking at all institutions, more than 60% agree or completely agree. There was also a high level of agreement with the statement that staff can develop in the type of work that suits them best (57% agree or completely agree). Almost half also experienced a good balance between

consideration of their individual talents and consideration for the needs of the institution. Almost half (48% agreed or completely agreed) said they find it feasible to combine the different domains in their jobs. A third said they disagreed or completely disagreed with this. A large proportion of respondents (almost three-quarters agreed or completely agreed) feel that they have to excel at all the various domains of their work. Only a small proportion agreed that the different domains are equally valued by their institution (14% agreed or completely agreed). The majority of respondents (68%) disagreed or completely disagreed. Tables 12 and 13 show how these national results compare with the results for this institution.

Table 12. Statements on diversifying and vitalising careers.

Statement	
1	My ambitions are taken into account when reaching agreements about my work.
2	When reaching agreements about my work, my impression is that there is a good balance between attention paid to my talents and attention to the needs of the institution.
3	I feel I can continue to develop in the kind of work that suits me best.
4	I find that combining the different domains (teaching, research, impact, patient care, leadership) is achievable in my job.
5	My experience is that I have to excel in all the various domains of my work.
6	I get the impression that the various domains in my institution are appreciated to the same extent.

Table 13. Extent of agreement with statements around diversifying and vitalising career paths (N=368-385).

a: this institution, b: all institutions

	1		2		3		4		5		6	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Completely disagree	4,7%	5%	5,4%	6%	5,2%	5%	7,7%	8%	1,6%	1%	18,5%	25%
Disagree	6,5%	13%	14,9%	19%	11,4%	15%	17,2%	25%	8,7%	10%	38,9%	43%
Neutral	25,7%	20%	25,2%	26%	19,5%	23%	22,2%	21%	24,7%	16%	23,9%	19%
Agree	49,2%	50%	43,9%	41%	46,2%	44%	42,0%	36%	45,4%	47%	16,8%	12%
Completely agree	13,9%	12%	10,6%	8%	17,7%	13%	11,1%	10%	19,7%	26%	1,9%	1%

3.3 Development

Explanation of ambition

The position paper *Room for everyone's talent* describes a greater emphasis on development: "The assessment of academics will see a reduced emphasis on quantitative results (such as number of publications) and a greater emphasis on quality, content, scientific integrity, creativity, contribution to science, academia and/or society, and acknowledgement of the academic's specific profile and domain(s) in which the academic is active. We expect that this will lead to the diversification and vitalisation of career paths as well as reducing the perceived workload."

Outcomes in the area of rewarding work

Half of respondents across all institutions (49%) indicated that quality is more important than quantity in discussing their work (see Table 15). 39% agreed that other forms of output are also rewarded, but a third disagreed. More than half of the respondents (55%) said that the societal relevance of their work is valued. A higher proportion of respondents do not perceive a focus on development over assessment, compared with respondents who do perceive such a focus (30%

agree, 36% disagree). The majority of respondents (63%) are confident that their supervisor/manager appreciates the value of their talents and ambitions. Tables 14 and 15 show how these national results compare with the results for this institution.

Table 14. Statements about development.

Statement	
1	When talking about my work, the quality of my work is more important than the quantity.
2	In my work, other more innovative and creative kinds of output are recognised and rewarded, alongside publications for instance.
3	The societal relevance of my work is appreciated.
4	In my institution, the focus is on development (instead of assessment).
5	I am confident that my supervisor/manager appreciates the value of my talents and ambitions.

Table 15. Extent to which respondents agree with statements around Development (N=351-385).

a: this institution, b: all institutions

	1		2		3		4		5	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Completely disagree	3,6%	4%	7,2%	8%	3,1%	5%	8,3%	10%	5,2%	7%
Disagree	16,7%	18%	23,4%	25%	9,5%	13%	20,8%	26%	8,8%	12%
Neutral	23,2%	28%	29,5%	28%	30,7%	27%	31,3%	34%	16,6%	18%
Agree	42,2%	39%	32,0%	33%	45,5%	44%	31,9%	26%	44,4%	44%
Completely agree	14,3%	10%	8,0%	6%	11,2%	11%	7,7%	4%	24,9%	19%

Outcomes in relation to aspects that are important for the next career step

We asked respondents to indicate how important activities in different areas are in their institution in relation to taking the next step in their career, in the current situation and in the desired situation, on a scale from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree).

Table 16. In which domains is it currently important in your institution to do work to be able to take the next step in your career path? And how important do you think work in the following domains should be in order to take the next step in your career path at your institution?

	TU Eindhoven				All institutions			
	Current	SD*	Desired	SD	Current	SD	Desired	SD
Teaching	3,5	1,1	4,2	0,7	3,5	1,1	4,1	0,7
Research	4,6	0,8	4,4	0,6	4,6	0,7	4,4	0,6
Leadership	4,0	1,0	4,0	0,8	3,7	1,0	4,0	0,8
Impact	3,9	0,9	4,0	0,8	3,7	1,0	3,9	0,8
Patient care	2,1	1,2	2,7	1,4	2,8	1,4	3,3	1,4
Team spirit	2,9	1,1	4,0	0,7	3,0	1,1	4,1	0,8
Open science	2,8	1,1	3,7	0,9	2,9	1,0	3,7	0,9
Open education	2,6	1,1	3,5	1,0	2,5	1,0	3,4	1,0

* Standard deviation

3.4 Achieving a balance between the individual and the collective

Explanation of ambition

This section is about achieving a good balance between the individual and the collective. In this regard, the position paper states the following: *"We ensure that academics are assessed not just for their individual performance but also for their contribution, based on their own expertise and competences, to the team, department, consortium, institution or organisation of which they are a part. In order to foster cooperation within research groups as well, we are creating more opportunities to acknowledge teams or consortia of academics for their joint work. This is in recognition of the fact that it takes diversity and the interplay of talents and skills to make for a good team. It will also be conducive to a safer, more inclusive work culture that accommodates the complexity and interdisciplinary nature of current academic and social problems. Ultimately, we are looking for a greater balance between encouraging cooperation within and across domains and disciplines on the one hand, and a stronger disciplinary basis on the other hand. This does not mean that there is no room left for monodisciplinary studies and careers. On the contrary: a strong disciplinary basis is a condition for meaningful translation across the boundaries of disciplines. The key word is diversification: there is room and a need for a greater variety of talents within the academy."*

Outcomes

We asked respondents how they perceived the work in their team. Respondents were asked to consider the team most relevant to them; accordingly, this may differ from one respondent to another. The results from all institutions combined show that in more than half of cases, staff perceive that everyone's contribution to success is recognised in the team (see Table 18). Respondents were less likely to agree that joint performance is more important than individual performance. This was the experience of 27% of respondents who agreed or completely agreed; 43% of respondents disagreed or completely disagreed.

Team objectives and everyone's contribution to them are about equally likely to be discussed (37% disagreed or completely disagreed and 36% agreed or completely agreed). Respondents largely agreed that their work contributes to the goals of the team and the institution. Almost everyone agreed that they find it stimulating to be able to work with colleagues who have skills that are different from their own. In more than half of teams, it is normal to give one another feedback. In just over a fifth of teams, this is not the case. Some of the respondents selected 'not applicable'; these individuals may not work in teams. Respondents also said they found it difficult to determine which team was meant here, as they worked in several teams.

Tables 17–18 present these national results alongside the results from this institution.

Table 17. Statements about achieving a balance between the individual and the collective.

Statement	
1	Everyone's contribution to success is recognised in our team.
2	In my team, joint performance is more important than individual performance.
3	Team goals, and everyone's contribution to this, are subjects for discussion in my team.
4	I contribute with my work to the goals of my team and the institution.
5	I find it stimulating to be able to work with colleagues who have skills that are different to mine.
6	In my team, it's standard practice to give one another feedback.

Table 18. Extent of agreement with statements about achieving a balance between the individual and the collective (N=373-384). a: this institution, b: all institutions

	1		2		3		4		5		6	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Completely disagree	6,2%	6%	10,4%	11%	10,4%	11%	1,6%	4%	0,8%	1%	5%	5%
Disagree	13,9%	19%	27,4%	33%	25,3%	27%	2,4%	2%	1,3%	1%	13,2%	17%
Neutral	17,7%	22%	32,7%	28%	25,3%	24%	15,5%	14%	7,0%	6%	25,9%	25%
Agree	48,8%	44%	23,7%	22%	34,0%	32%	57,9%	59%	44,0%	44%	41,4%	39%
Completely agree	13,4%	9%	5,9%	6%	5,1%	5%	22,7%	21%	46,9%	48%	14,5%	13%

3.5 Open science

Explanation of ambition

With regard to open science, the position paper 'Room for everyone's talent' states the following: *"More room for open science is an issue that needs to be addressed specifically. This new approach to science and academia gives others, in addition to the academics themselves, the opportunity to cooperate on, contribute to and make use of the academic process. This means, for example, that academics share the results of their research more broadly with society, that they make research results more accessible and that they can involve society in the research (such as through citizen science). Open science is bound up inextricably with the modernisation of the system of recognition and rewards. It requires time and attention from academics that cannot be automatically translated as traditional academic output such as publications, but which can have a significant impact on society, science and academia (such as sharing research data)."*

Outcomes

Below, we present the extent to which staff are encouraged to do their work according to the principles of open science and open education, for both this institution and all institutions combined (see Tables 19 and 20). When we consider all institutions, we see that open education (in the form of the sharing of learning materials) is encouraged even less often than open science (such as sharing research findings). The number of respondents who indicated that they were not encouraged or not at all encouraged to share learning materials was roughly equal to the number

of respondents who were encouraged or completely encouraged to share learning materials (36% and 27%). Almost three-quarters of respondents said they were encouraged to share research results through open access publication. 56% of respondents had been encouraged to make data available for reuse. Almost half of respondents had been encouraged to involve stakeholders and/or the general public in teaching and research and 42% had been encouraged to share research through science communication. The results for your own institution are shown below.

Table 19. Statements about open science.

Statement	
1	I am encouraged to share the learning materials developed for education.
2	I am encouraged to share my research findings by publishing them through open access platforms.
3	I am encouraged to make my data available to be used again.
4	I am encouraged to involve stakeholders and/or the general public in my teaching and research.
5	I am encouraged to share my teaching and research with the general public through science communications.

Table 20. Extent to which open science and open education are encouraged (N=354-372).

a: this institution, b: all institutions

	1		2		3		4		5	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Completely disagree	8,9%	9%	2,7%	3%	3,7%	4%	3,6%	6%	5,1%	6%
Disagree	20,0%	27%	5,9%	9%	10,5%	14%	15,2%	19%	20,7%	21%
Neutral	23,9%	27%	15,1%	16%	28,8%	26%	28,1%	28%	25,8%	30%
Agree	34,7%	29%	43,4%	42%	40,7%	39%	37,5%	36%	36,6%	33%
Completely agree	12,5%	8%	32,9%	30%	16,4%	17%	15,7%	12%	11,8%	9%

3.6 Leadership

Explanation of ambition

Leadership is key to achieving a change in culture. The position paper *Room for everyone's talent* describes it as follows: "Attention will be paid to good leadership on all levels, from young academics to established ones. This applies not only to academic leaders, such as study programme coordinators, heads of department and deans, but also to (starting) academics who supervise academic teams."

Outcomes

In Tables 21 and 22, we present the extent to which there is a focus on leadership within different institutions, for both this institution and all institutions combined. At the national level, almost 40% feel there is sufficient focus on leadership development, while a third disagree or completely disagree. Respondents often disagree that managers are given enough time to perform their duties as supervisors/managers; 55% disagree or completely disagree while 20% agree or completely agree. Some respondents did not have a view on this statement, so this question was completed by fewer respondents than for the other statements. More than half of respondents feel that demonstrating personal leadership is encouraged, taking on other tasks is appreciated, and supervisors/managers pay attention to team cooperation and development of staff members. 59% agreed or completely agreed with the latter statement. Table 22 shows how these results compare with the results for this institution.

Table 21. Statements about leadership.

Statement	
1	Sufficient attention is paid to leadership development in my institution.
2	Supervisors/managers are given enough time to perform their duties as supervisors/managers.
3	Demonstrating personal leadership is encouraged in our institution. (Here we have in mind giving and taking responsibility, demonstrating initiative, self-reflection.)
4	My supervisor/manager pays attention to the development of staff members.
5	Taking on other tasks that the institution values is appreciated, such as being on committees, participating in employee representation or organising social activities.
6	My supervisor/manager pays attention to the collaboration in the team.

Table 22. Extent to which respondents agree with statements about leadership (N=349-374).

a: this institution, b: all institutions

	1		2		3		4		5		6	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Completely disagree	7,9%	8%	14,9%	16%	5,6%	6%	5,4%	8%	5,8%	7,0%	6%	7%
Disagree	24,6%	24%	33,5%	39%	17,6%	16%	10,5%	12%	12,4%	15%	10%	15%
Neutral	27,5%	29%	24,6%	26%	25,1%	27%	20,1%	21%	24%	25%	24,4%	26%
Agree	34,3%	33%	21,5%	17%	44,9%	43%	44,2%	44%	45,2%	44%	43,9%	40%
Completely agree	5,7%	6%	5,4%	3%	6,7%	8%	19,8%	15%	12,7%	9%	15,7%	11%

Concerns and opportunities

In this chapter, we discuss the concerns and opportunities staff see as a result of the Recognition & Rewards programme and the differences in experiences in terms of disciplines, job categories, gender, age, nationality and type of contract.

4.1 Concerns

We asked respondents about their concerns around the goals of the Recognition & Rewards programme and the impact on their own careers (see Tables 23 and 24). 30% of respondents are worried that their ability to transfer to another academic institution *within* the Netherlands is hampered by their chosen profile or focus areas. The picture is very similar for transferring to an academic institution *outside* the Netherlands. Half of respondents have no concerns about this. 44% of respondents are worried that their chosen profile is less rewarded and recognised than other compositions. An almost equal proportion of respondents (around 40%) said they agreed with worries that the standards of teaching and/or research are declining. The same applies to the next statement: around 40% are worried that the Recognition & Rewards programme requires them to be a jack of all trades; meanwhile, around 40% indicated that they are not worried about this. More than half of respondents expressed concern that the ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme will not be achieved in practice. A smaller proportion than for the other statements (17%) disagreed or completely disagreed. These national results are compared with the results for this institution in Table 24.

Table 23. Statements about concerns, "I am worried that ..."

Statement	
1	...transferring to another academic institution in the Netherlands will be hampered by my profile/chosen area of focus.
2	...transferring to another academic institution outside the Netherlands will be hampered by my profile/chosen area of focus.
3	...there is less recognition and reward for the composition of my profile (based on the domains of research, teaching, impact, leadership and patient care) than for other profile compositions.
4	...the standards of education and/or research are declining.
5	...the Recognition & Rewards programme requires me to be a jack of all trades.
6	...that the ambitions of the Recognition & Rewards programme will not be achieved in practice.

Table 24. Staff concerns resulting from the Recognition & Rewards Programme (N=308-358).

a: this institution, b: all institutions

	1		2		3		4		5		6	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Completely disagree	15,8%	13%	17,1%	13%	8,3%	8%	8,7%	9%	7,1%	8%	3,8%	3%
Disagree	37,6%	37%	36,3%	36%	26,5%	27%	27,1%	32%	35,4%	30%	17,4%	14%
Neutral	19,4%	20%	16,8%	19%	29,5%	21%	21,2%	21%	25,6%	24%	28,2%	27%
Agree	20,0%	22%	20,1%	21%	27,1%	30%	28,5%	25%	20,1%	25%	30,7%	35%
Completely agree	7,3%	8%	9,6%	10%	8,6%	14%	14,5%	13%	11,7%	14%	19,9%	21%

4.2 Opportunities

We also asked about the possible opportunities that respondents see as a result of the Recognition & Rewards programme (Tables 28 and 29). At the national level, almost half of respondents expect to experience more or much more job satisfaction than before as a result of the Recognition & Rewards programme. 43% expect no change in job satisfaction. 44% of respondents expect to experience less or much less frustration and annoyance in their work than before. Meanwhile, 15% expect to experience more or much more frustration and irritation than before because of the Recognition & Rewards programme. More than half of respondents (55%) expect to be able to make fundamental decisions that align with their preferences, talents and life phase more or much more than before. A large proportion of respondents (62%) expect broader aspects of quality in their work to be appreciated more or much more than before. More than half expect their workload to remain at the same level; roughly equal numbers (around 22% each) expect their work-related pressure to be higher than before or lower than before, as a result of the Recognition & Rewards programme. Table 29 presents the results for all respondents alongside the results from respondents in this institution.

Table 25. Statements about opportunities expected by staff as a result of the Recognition & Rewards programme.

Statement	
1	To have ... job satisfaction
2	To be ... frustrated and irritated in my work.
3	That I can make fundamental choices that suit my preferences, talents and life phase,
4	That the broader aspects of quality in my work are appreciated,
5	To experience ... work-related pressure.

Table 26. Opportunities expected by staff as a result of the Recognition & Rewards programme (N=327-341).
a: this institution, b: all institutions

	1		2		3		4		5	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Much less than before	4,1%	2%	5,5%	5%	2,4%	3%	2,1%	2%	3,3%	3%
Less than before	4,7%	6%	41,6%	39%	2,9%	5%	4,4%	4%	20,6%	18%
The same as before	40,8%	43%	41,9%	41%	35,6%	37%	36,1%	32%	53,3%	56%
More than before	43,7%	44%	8%	12%	49,1%	47%	47,0%	52%	17,6%	18%
Much more than before	6,7%	5%	3,1%	3%	10,0%	8%	10,4%	10%	5,2%	5%

Response within this institution

5.1 Response structure

Below, we present the structure of the response within this institution, according to various background characteristics.

Table 27. Distribution of responses by gender (N=392).

	Percentage for this institution	All institutions
Male	62,8%	47%
Female	31,4%	47%
Non-binary or none of the above	0,3%	1%
Prefer not to say	5,6%	5%

Table 28. Distribution of responses by job category (N=396).

	Percentage for this institution	All institutions
Professors	17,7%	15%
Medical Specialist Professors	0,0%	2%
Associate professors	16,4%	17%
Assistant professors	24,7%	27%
Researchers (including postdoctoral researcher)	8,8%	11%
Teachers (including academic teachers)	4,8%	7%
PhD candidates	26,5%	17%
Medical specialists not in any of the above academic positions	0,0%	3%
Other, namely ...	1,0%	1%

Table 29. Distribution of responses by whether the respondent is a doctor, asked only of university medical centre respondents (N=n.v.t.).

	Percentage for this institution	All institutions
Yes	n/a	40%
No	n/a	60%

Table 30. Distribution of responses by age group (N=383).

	Percentage for this institution	All institutions
24 years or younger	2,3%	1%
25–29 years	21,7%	14%
30–34 years	14,1%	14%
35–39 years	14,4%	15%
40–44 years	11,2%	16%
45–49 years	8,9%	12%
50–54 years	10,4%	10%
55–59 years	7,6%	8%
60–64 years	6,3%	8%
65 years or older	3,1%	3%

Table 31. Distribution of responses by subject area (N=392)

	Percentage for this institution	All institutions
Agriculture and Applied Life Sciences	0,5%	2%
Natural and Life Sciences	16,3%	19%
Technology	65,1%	13%
Healthcare	2,8%	25%
Economics	1,0%	6%
Law	0,0%	4%

	Percentage for this institution	All institutions
Behavioural and Social Sciences	7,9%	18%
Language and Culture	0,5%	9%
Education (as an academic field)	4,8%	3%
Other, namely ...	1%	1%

Table 32. Distribution of responses by supervisory/management role yes or no (N=383)

	Percentage for this institution	All institutions
Yes	59,3%	50%
No	40,7%	50%

Table 33. Distribution of responses by type of employment contract (N=395)

	Percentage for this institution	All institutions
Permanent employment contract	60,5%	72%
Temporary employment contract	39,5%	28%

Table 34. Distribution of responses by nationality (N=393).

	Percentage for this institution	All institutions
Dutch	50,9%	72%
Nationality within European Union	28,5%	19%
Nationality of a country outside the EU	20,6%	10%