

Initial Assessment - EC Consensus Report

Case number: 2019SE372597

Name Organisation under assessment: Halmstad University

Submission date of initial GAP-Analysis, HR Strategy and Action Plan: 28/11/2019

This report was drafted by the Lead-Assessor in consensus with the members of the assessment team

Submission date: 14/07/2020

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:

	YES / NO / PARTLY	Recommendations
Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published on the organisation's website?	Yes	The website is conform to the EU requirments. HH has however to consider that the webpage is important for their attractiveness and impact. So that they should improve their internal and external communication regarding HRS4R using these pages.
Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published in English?	Yes	
Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published in a visible place?	Yes	

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?

- Gap Analysis
- HR Strategy and Action plan

- 🕒 Organisational information
- 🕒 Strengths and weaknesses of the current practice
- 🕒 Actions
- 🕒 Implementation

Partly

Information is not clear enough on what was kept from discussion with the researchers and how the actual Action Plan answers their needs. There is no action planned to avoid weaknesses detected in ethical and professional aspects (GDPR, IPR, open data...)

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:

	YES / NO / PARTLY	Recommendations
Is the organisational information provided sufficient to understand the context in which the HR Strategy is designed?	Yes	Very strong embeddment in the institutional strategic plan
Is the Action Plan coherent with the Gap Analysis?	Yes	Also cohrent with other Action plan (GMA, for instance)
Have a steering committee and working group been established to guarantee the implementation of the HRS4R-process?	Yes	No membership of researchers however

Has the research community been sufficiently involved in the process, with a representation of all levels of a research career?	Yes	HH benefited from their internal expertise in HR management and their existing consultation structure for drafting the gap analysis. Evidence is given of discussion and invitation to all researchers to engage, but this is not enough to show that researchers' concerns (in the framework of the HRS4R) process was taken into account
Are the relevant management departments sufficiently involved in the process so as to guarantee a solid implementation?	Yes	
Have adequate targets and indicators been provided in order to demonstrate when/how an action will be/has been completed?	Yes	Indicators should be revised for ensuring that they will track progress (and not only completion)
Is the organisation establishing an OTM-R policy?	Partly	No evidence on that point in the HRS4R framework
Are the goals and ambitions sufficiently ambitious considering the context of the organization?	Yes	The goals seem to be ambitious enough considering the context

General Assessment

Accepted



Pending minor modifications



Declined 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

- **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**.

- **Declined** 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**.

General Recommendations

If any of the above statements have prompted a "no" in the evaluation, please provide suggestions of modifications in the form below.

If the general assessment is:

- "pending minor modifications" the recommendations are split into:
 - 🕒 Immediate mandatory modifications (to be implemented in order to obtain the award, resubmission within 2 months)
 - 🕒 Other modifications (to be carried out during the implementation phase).

- "declined pending major revisions" the recommendations are split into:
 - 🕒 Mandatory modifications (in order to obtain the award, resubmission within 12 months)
 - 🕒 Other modifications.

Recommendations *

The application is conform to the EU requirements. However it suffers from its very strong embeddment in the institutional strategy, so that it is not evident that the HRS4R process is enough visible internally and externally and that it focuses on the C&C objectives (ie the improvement of researchers' working conditions ad a project based on their needs, not driven by the institutional strategic plan).

Immediate mandatory modification: the AP should include a clear action on OTMR policy establishment. Indicators should be revised.

Other modifications : Recommendations on indicators, visibility (website) and need to consider the researchers' voice - rather than the internal strategy - are to be considered during the implementation phase

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)

Important message to institutions:

Site Visits: All HRS4R in-house audits planned for 2020 Q4 will be conducted remotely with the consent of the host institution. Should your institution be at renewal stage, once you submit your self-assessment online via the e-tool, the EC will be in contact with you to set a date for the remote visit together with a panel of independent experts. Should the institution prefer a classic on-site visist, the audit will be postponed to early spring 2021. Meanwhile, institutions involved in the process can continue using the HR Excellence in research award.