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The purpose of ...

Assessment is to increase quality.

Evaluation is to judge quality.
THE PRINCIPLE:

« Your are the gardener »
THE PRINCIPLE: « You are the gardener »

You as assessor ...

- Know about HRS4R from the inside
- Know about the assessment process
- Know about the ERA objectives
- Commit with the « contract »
  (role, confidentiality, COI, agenda)
You as assessor ...

- Put yourself in the flower pot
- Give advices for growing in quality
- Discriminate between what must be done and what would be done
- Use short and clear sentences
The ERA objectives

« The ultimate political goal is to contribute too the development of an attractive, open and sustainable European labour market for researchers, where the framework conditions allow for recruiting and retaining high quality researchers in environments conducive of effective performance and productivity »

« ... Europe must dramatically improve its attractiveness to researchers and strengthen the participation of women researchers by helping to create the necessary conditions for more sustainable and appealing careers fot them in R&D »

« Member states should endeavour to offer researchers sustainable career developement systems at all career stage, regardless of their contractual situation and of the chosen R&D career path, and they should endeavour to ensure that researchers are treated as professional and as an integral part of the institution in which they work »
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Operationalisation

ARTICLE 32 AMGA

• Obligation to take measures to implement the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers
• Consequences of non-compliance
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**Operationalisation**

**ARTICLE 32 AMGA**

- Obligation to take measures to implement the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers
- Consequences of non-compliance
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HRS4R - The essentials

Gap Analysis  Action Plan  Publication

Process  Involvement  Implementation  Coherence  Evidence  Ambition
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HR Excellence in Research UAB
The HR Excellence accreditation identifies institutions with favourable working conditions for their researchers.

HR Excellence in Research
HR Excellent in Research
The Charter & Code for researchers and candidates
HR4UAB initiatives related to the Charter & Code
OTMR (Open, Transparent and Merit-based Recruitment)
OTMR working group UAB
UAB check list
Euraxess Jobs

HR4UAB
In 2015, the EURAXESS-Human Resources Stratage for Researchers (EURAXESS-HE) was launched to support institutions in the process of implementation of the Charter and Code principles in their practices and policies.

The UAB is committed to improve its Human Resources policies in line with the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers.

In January 2012, the UAB adopted the Q90. In October 2012, the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona joined the 4th cohort of the Q90.

During 2012 and 2013, the Internal Analysis of the UAB was conducted by an Interdisciplinary team, including members of the Governing Board, the Management Board, and researchers from all fields of knowledge.

A total of this team was the "UAB: A Strategy for Action Plan". In December 2014, the UAB was acknowledged with the "HR Excellence in Research" logo, which reflects our commitment to continuously improve our human resources strategies in line with the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment ofResearchers, and our commitment to guarantee a supportive research environment implementing these principles into practice.

During the implementation of the Action Plan (2015-2019) as reflected in the "Report on the Interim Assessment (2 years)" new challenges and actions have been identified. As the UAB is currently facing some major organizational changes, these
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MANDATORY

When? Before submission
Where? Has to be visible
What? HR & AP + related docs

What if not conform?
Possible decisions

• Accepted
• Accepted pending (minor)
• Declined

MINOR (2 months)

MAJOR (12 months)
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**MANDATORY**

**When?** Before submission  
**Where?** Has to be visible  
**What?** HR & AP + related docs

**What if ...**

... Not published  
... pdf on invisible page  
... Not in English  
... HR & AP are not « Template 2 »  
... Related docs are in local language  
... GA Process not described  
... No explanation on HRS4R  
... Divergence with submission  
... Award still used
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- 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
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**INVOLVEMENT**

- 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
Surveys

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?
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 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).
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CONTENT

- 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
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, evenness)
• 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
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Individual Form

is a working document with your personal analysis

Report

- 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
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Individual Form

And also :
• Do not read what is not written
• Be as precise as possible
• Use simple sentences
• Respect the agenda
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**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
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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
More grows in the garden than the gardener knows he has sown...

Spanish Proverb