IMPLEMENTATION PHASE[1] – interim assessment

Name Organisation under assessment: …………… University of Udine ……………….

This assessment is composed **in CONSENSUS** by the assessors on: ……………………14.1.2019………………..

DETAILED ASSESSMENT

1. QUALITY ASSESSMENT

The quality assessment evaluates the **level of ambition** and the **quality of progress** intended **and** obtained by the organisation.

	YES	NO
Has the **organisational information** been sufficiently updated to understand the context in which the HR Strategy is implemented?	X	
Does the **narrative** provided list goals and objectives which clearly indicate the organisation's priorities in HR-management for researchers?	X	
Has the organisation's published **HR Strategy and Action Plan been updated** with the actions' current status, additions and/or alterations?		X
Is the implementation of the **HR Strategy and Action Plan sufficiently embedded** within the organisation's management structure (e.g. steering committee, operational responsibilities) so as to guarantee a solid implementation?	X	
Has the organisation developed an **OTM-R policy**[2]?		X

2. STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the information submitted and taking into account the **organisation's national research context**, how would you as an assessor judge the **HR Strategy's strengths and weaknesses**?

Strengths - The organization is promoting and adopting measures to improve its HR strategy and are tackling the gaps detected during the analysis.

---

[1] Last update 2.2.2018

[2] *During the **transition period** special conditions apply:*
Institutions having started the HRS4R implementation prior to the publication of the OTM-R toolkit and recommendations by the European Commission (2015) may not have prioritised actions implementing the OTM-R principles yet. In this case, they should not be penalised but strong recommendations should be made to address these principles appropriately.

- Since the first evaluation of the HRS4R action plan, organization cherishes the principles of openness by making information on the website also available in English with information for international students.

- The action plan is of appropriate ambition and well balanced.

- Organization is committed to recognition of the value and importance of young researchers (PhDs), research ethics and mobility.

- Gap analysis has been improved since the initial submission.

- The action plan implementation is aligned and coordinated in a wider context, in specific the outcomes of the national assessment of research quality results. The conclusions of this assessment, namely the desired activities to improve are in fact tightly related to the HRS4R action plan, in areas of recruitment quality and supporting training activities.

- Many activities are related to ethical research which is quite good. Also, organization addresses other responsible researcher & innovation issues, such as open science initiative. It would be good to know if the organizational repository is connected to European-wide initiatives, such as OpenAIRE. If not, did you consider the integration and interoperability initiatives?

Weaknesses

- Lots of late actions, even some very important ones.

- There are no evidences that the organization developed OTM-R policy. The narrative reports on an OTM-R but the actions dedicated to OTM-R are not completed yet (website pages on positions and selection procedure) and the policy is not analysed fully as is foreseen with the OTM-R table evaluation

- New schedule is not defined, no timing of actions for 2018-2021 period. More specific schedules (quarters) are needed.

- The status of actions remains unclear. Label "In preparation" does not mean a lot if it is not accompanied by the short description of completed work, quantitative progress indication and similar.

- HRS4R webpage does not provide enough information to understand this pan-European initiative.

- From the process point of view, the relationship between the actions arising from the initial action plan and those related to the national assessment of research results in 2017 is not clear.

- In the initial plan a quality control panel was established which could be a good manner to follow up the progress. In the narrative it is however not clear how they can control and act and there is no evidence about their involvement.

- The assessor could not find job postings in English on the organization website. Although the positions are advertised on EURAXESS portal, the detailed information is only available in Italian (disclaimer: for the jobs assessor tried to check)

- In the narrative of the implementation it is said that a new working group will be established. It is not clear if this is a renewal of an existing workgroup and not clear what the role will be in the long term. It is strange that the action plan still must be reviewed because normally the goal of the midterm assessment itself is to do so.

- It is not totally clear how the internal review process is organised and how the researchers are involved.

- The action related to "Creation of guidelines for mentors and for supervisors in accordance with C&C principles" seems quite important in the context of the given priorities to training, especially since it can be

considered as predecessor for many other related activities. Yet, this action is late (planned for 2017). It should receive maximum priority and it needs to be implemented as soon as possible. In fact, none of the actions related to training were completed.

- Given that the improvement of recruitment process is one of the few most important priorities of the organization, it is strange to find that open positions are not yet centrally published, even on the organizational website. That action was supposed to be implemented on End of 2016, but it is still "in preparation". Similar remarks stand for action "Provision of a short description of the different stages of the selection process", which was due on 2017.

If relevant, please **provide suggestions for alterations or revisions** to the (updated) HR strategy:

- Introduce new deadlines for the uncompleted late actions for period 2018-2021, refer also to old deadlines.

- For each of the late actions, explain the reasons for the delay.

- Provide more detailed assessment of the individual action statuses, especially those which are delayed.

- Develop organizational OTM-R policy and publish it online. OTM-R table should be completed to analyse fully if the recruitment is compliant with the OTM-R principles

- Clarify why another review of the action plan by the working group (to be established) is needed (see remark above, in Weaknesses section).

- Provide short description of process in which the efforts of meeting the challenges noted in national assessment of research results and implementing HR action plan are coordinated.

- Provide more details on the internal review process, especially those related to involvement of researchers.

- Revamp HRS4R webpage by adding more information and details to existing initiatives.

- In the action plan, include at list highlights of some of the outcomes of the completed actions, not only indicators. For example, the organization reports on 30 meetings related to sharing, discussing and embracing guidelines for organizational and departmental strategic plans, but no outcomes at all (what are the critical findings, are those guidelines endorsed by the organizational management, etc.).

- Explain in detail how the quality of the process and its outcomes is being assessed.

- Explain shortly what is "Specific Guaranteeing Committee for equal opportunities".

- In the scope of action "Creation of a specific webpage devoted to the outgoing mobility of researchers", the organization purchased Pivot platform. Can you explain why EURAXESS portal was not the primary choice (especially since it is free)?

- In the organizational information section of the template, numbers of researchers must be integers.

- Submission date must be date of the internal review report submission, not initial application.

SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING NEW ACTIONS:

- The problem was identified that no clear definition of the duties and responsibilities of the supervisors exist. It could be an idea to introduce a charter for supervisor and PhD-student based on best practices. This has been successfully introduced in several universities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Which describes the organisation's progress most accurately?	Additional comments	TICK the right option
1. The organisation is progressing with appropriate and quality actions as described in its Action Plan. **There is evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded.**		
2. The organisation is, for the most part, progressing with appropriate and quality actions as described in its Action Plan, but could benefit from alterations as advised through the Assessment process. **There is some evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded.**	See the recommendations above.	X
3. The organisation is not deemed to be implementing appropriate and quality actions and this raises some concern for the future efforts to implement actions closely aligned to the Charter and Code. **There is a lack of evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded.**		

At this point of INTERIM assessment, the __institution does not jeopardise maintaining the HR award__. Nevertheless, the institution is advised to take into account the comments and recommendations of the assessors to meet all assessment criteria at the next assessment (in 36 months)