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HRS4R - The essentials

INITIAL PHASE
- Endorsement of the C&C
- Application for the HR Award:
  - Gap Analysis
  - OTM-R
  - Initial Action Plan Design

IMPLEMENTATION PHASE
- Implementation of the Action Plan
- Implementation of the Revised Action Plan

AWARD RENEWAL PHASE
- Implementation of the Improved Action Plan
- Implementation of the Further Improved Action Plan

12 months

24 months

36 months

36 months
Publication
is MANDATORY

When? **Before submission**
Where? Has to be **visible**
What? **HRS & AP + important docs**

Not acceptable if...

... Not published on a visible page
... Not in English
... HRS & AP do not present the process and mandatory items
... GA process (strengths and weaknesses) is not described
... Divergence with application files
• Involvement of all levels of researchers is MANDATORY
• The description of the process has to be clear and documented
• Each principle has to be analysed regarding the actual gap and initiatives undertaken + suggestions for improvement
  • Focus on some principles: gender, ethics, OTM-R, OS
  • Narrative of Template 2 will give a summary by groups)
• Gap Analysis is kept confidential
Different schemes exist:
- Steering committee
- Focus groups
- Stakeholders should be included during the whole process: listing the gaps, the actual initiatives, ideas for improvement
- Researchers are supposed to validate the gap analysis
What is important is to do it adequately:
• Sollicitate all researchers
• Pertinent questions are of importance
• Response rate has to be described regarding classes, gender, pertinent groups, ...
• Results are to be discussed
• Interpretation has to make sense
Survey recipients were asked for opinion on the 40 rules set out in Charter and the Code under 4 thematic headings. The respondents were asked to provide replies based on a five point scale, where 1 stood for “definitely no”, 2 for “rather no”, 3 for “I don’t know”, 4 for “rather yes”, 5 for “definitely yes”. Additionally, respondents had the opportunity to provide their comments and suggestions on the required actions regarding the Charter & Code principles.

What was the question?
Question: Are we conform with Principle# X?

Among the doctoral students, most, meaning 49 of 80 (sum of “no” and “probably no” responses) stated that additional efforts to complete this task are not necessary at all. 17 stated that changes are needed (sum of “yes” and “probably yes” responses). 14 not have an opinion.

Most respondents do not believe action is necessary in this matter. The respondents indicated a lack of legislation in the subject matter. There is however, no agreement (amongst respondents who saw need for change) as to the form of contact with the scientific advisor, which could be turned into the aforementioned legislation.

❖ Proposed actions      None
Question No 10: Are the researchers from protected against discrimination based on gender, age, ethnic, national or social origin, religion or belief, sexual orientation, language, disability, political opinion, social or economic condition?

The majority of the respondents selected *rather yes* (37.20%) and *definitely yes* (30.56%) answers. The *I do not know* option was indicated by 20.24% and *rather not* by 8.83% of those who were surveyed. The least popular response was *definitely not* (3.17%) (Fig. 20).

![Distribution of respondents' answers to the tenth question](image-url)
• Initial phase: Is the organisation establishing an OTM-R policy?
• Implementation phase: Has the organisation developed an OTM-R policy?
• Renewal phase: Is the OTM-R policy in place and publicly available?
• Organisational information
• Narrative regarding the 4 groups of principles
• Actions to be implemented within 2 years / 5 years
  • Action title – Timing – Responsible Unit – Indicator(s) / Target(s).
• Implementation process involving researchers
### Action Plan

**Action 12**

To expand the advisory services in terms of career to at least, R2 staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP Principle(s)</th>
<th>Timing (at least by year’s quarter/semester)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(+/-) 30. Access to career advice</td>
<td>M12-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Indicator(s) / Target(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VR for Research and Knowledge Transfer</td>
<td>*Nº of R2 supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TARGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worldwide researchers at all stages of their careers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weaknesses in applications are often related to:

- The description of the organisation (autonomy of faculties or not, multisite, ...)
- The fact that the process is cycling. Not all the gaps are to be filled within 2 years! Priorities given are not explained. A 5y-perspective is also important
- The actions are not fully coherent with the gaps (+ institutional problems if any)
Weaknesses in applications are often related to:

- The agenda is not realistic (duration, start-end, eavyness)
- Progress evaluation is not clear (targets, indicators)
- Communication and dissemination is not considered
- Implementation doesn’t involve researchers
- Researchers did not commit with the Action Plan
Individual Form

is a working document with your personal analysis

• Give strengths and weaknesses
• Discriminate between what is major or what is minor
• Provide recommendation for improvement
• Be clear on what is mandatory, optional but of added value, just a comment or just a typing error
• Try to estimate how many time it will take to correct
Individual form

Eligibility assessment

Please rate the state of achievement ("yes", "no" or "partly"). If any statements have prompted a "no" or "partly" in the evaluation, please provide recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes / No / Partly</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published on the organisation’s website?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published in English?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published in a visible place?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the following elements of the templates for the Gap Analysis and the HR Strategy and Action Plan been completed with sufficient details and quality?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gap Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HR Strategy and Action plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organisational information</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strengths and weaknesses of the current practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quality assessment

The quality assessment evaluates the level of ambition and the quality of progress intended by the organisation. Rate the state of achievement ("yes", "no", or "partly"). If any statements have prompted a "no" or "partly" in the evaluation, please provide recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes / No / Partly</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the organisational information provided sufficient to understand the context in which the HR Strategy is designed?</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Many of the documents and links are not in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the Action Plan coherent with the Gap Analysis?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a steering committee and working group been established to guarantee the implementation of the HR Strategy-process?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the research community been sufficiently involved in the process, with a representation of all levels of a research career?</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>It's not clear if there is enough representation of researchers at the working group. In the text it's said that there is through the two trade union researchers representatives. It seems that not all R1, R2, R3 and R4 are represented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the relevant management departments sufficiently involved in the process so as to guarantee a solid implementation?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have adequate targets and indicators been provided in order to demonstrate when/how an action will be/has been completed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the organisation establishing an CTM-R policy?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>They had a certain policy up to date and right now they are going to start the CTM-R policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the goals and ambitions sufficiently ambitious considering the context of the organization?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Assessment

- Accepted
- Pending minor modifications
- Pending major revisions

Explanation

- Accepted: This application meets the criteria and the HR award is granted. The assessors might have commented on your file asking for future focus on a particular aspect/criterion, so please refer to the comments given above.

- Pending minor modifications: This application broadly meets the criteria, but the assessors have some concerns/questions about specific areas/criteria. Please reflect about the feedback given above and update your file before re-submitting within 2 months.

- Pending major revisions: This application does not meet the criteria; please make the appropriate changes taking into account the comments of the assessors before re-submitting within 12 months.
Recommendations *

The low ratio of international researchers, about 4%, should address the recruitment and OTM-R issues are only referred to civil servants and some (Contratos de obra y servicio). Please consider the possibility to develop Action 6 about data security could be the basis for consider a research c.

If the organisation deserves to be commented on their ambition, their actions, evidence of good practice and/or their implementation process, please provide a commentary supporting this. (max. 2000 words)

Translation into English of documents is very welcome, as well as the Welcome package for newcomers and R2 career development support.
THE PRINCIPLE: « You are the gardener »

Individual Form

• Write what is uncertain to you, what is questionable, seems « strange »
• If you cannot make recommendation, say it to the lead assessor

Report

Is it?

I’m not sure...
This is the feedback document sent to the EU then the institution
- The lead assessor is responsible for aggregating the IFs into the CF
- Clarification and discussion is often necessary
- A good skype can sometimes help
- If a consensus cannot be reached, the lead interacts with the EU
And then?

- You will stay in the team for further assessment(s)
- Keep track of your assessment
- Take lessons from your experience
- Stay connected with the website (news)
- Participate to webinars for assessors/organisations
- Disseminate about your experience