## **EURAXESS**

# Implementation Phase Interim Assessment - EC Consensus Report

Case number

2020SE572661

Name Organisation under assessment

Uppsala University

Organisation's contact details

751 05 Uppsala, Uppsala, Sweden

Submission date of the Interim Assessment Internal Review

16/03/2021

Submission date to the European Commission

15/06/2021

## Quality assessment

The quality assessment evaluates the level of ambition and the <u>quality of progress</u> intended by the organisation. If any statements have prompted a "no" or "partly" in the evaluation, please provide recommendations:

	YES / NO / PARTLY	Recommendations
Has the organisational information been sufficiently updated to understand the context in which the HR Strategy is implemented?	Partly	Missing information on internals and
Does the narrative provided list goals and objectives which clearly indicate the organisation's priorities in HR-management for researchers?	Yes	
Has the organisation published an updated HR Strategy and Action Plan been updated with the actions' current status, additions and/or modifications?	Yes	Minimalist (see below)
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?	Yes	
Has the organisation developed an OTM-R policy?	Partly	The OTM-R cheklist is filled as "complleted". However no information is provided on the website regarding UU OTM-R policy or synamic ensuring its development/implementation/improvement

### Strengths and weaknesses

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?** (maximum 1000 words)

#### Strengths

UU is far in implementing the principles of the charter and code

#### Weaknesses

- 1. The actual AP is made of 2 actions in progress (not extended terms reserved to extension of their scope): one on some gender activities to be implemented and one on an expected approval of an existing document). This seems missing ambition in the current context of post-covid. It is not evident to confirm if it is really misambitious or not, because we have no refreshment on researchers needs and consultation.
- 2. About OTM-R: it is mandatory to have an OTM-R policy available at the end of Cycle 1 (in 3 years). You have to develop have a dedicated section on OTM-R policy and practices on your website. Please reflect on how you will draft it and make is visible. (Your OTM-R checklist is not published. The give link to the appointment regulation is dead.
- 3. Your HRS4R webpages are very poor in content. This is the window of your HR Strategy for internals and internationals. You published a very raw version of the AP, with no comments on real progress that could be useful for researchers. More over, it is located on the "join us" section, under "charter and code" and thus internals are not targeted. You should add links to achievements and good practices, links to significant documents. Remember that the external EU-projects evaluators are checking what about your answer to Article 32 ... Your website doesn't give an excellent image of what you are doing.
- 4. Beware that you have some deadlinks in your interim report.

If relevant, please provide suggestions for modifications or revisions to the (updated) HR strategy: (maximum 2000 words)

#### See above :

- Update and design your webpages for having presenting useful information to the world, sharing your best practices and illustrating your achievements
- Be clear an transparent on OTM-R actions (at least one in the check list is not completed and muste be addressed
- Plan to consult all your researchers in order to update the gap analysis. Be ambitious and creative on new potential action for increasing their working environment
- Describe your long term perspectives in HR management and working conditions improvement. What will you do in 3 years when your 2 actions will be completed?

#### 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.

At this point of the 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).

#### Recommendations

Which of the below situations describes the organisation's progress most accurately? Tick the right situation and add comments/general recommendations accordingly.

#### **Explanation**

- HRS4R embedded: The organisation is progressing with appropriate and quality actions as described in its Action Plan. There is evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded.
- HRS4R embedded, corrective actions needed: 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.

■ HRS4R embedded, strong corrective actions needed: 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.