



'Sharing experience to better implement the Human Resources Strategy for Researchers'

**Consensus Report**  
(to be filled by the lead assessor)



**IMPLEMENTATION PHASE<sup>1</sup> – interim assessment**

Name Organisation under assessment: IRBLLEIDA, Spain .....

This assessment is composed in **CONSENSUS** by the assessors on: 13 January 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 <b>organisational information</b> been sufficiently updated to understand the context in which the HR Strategy is implemented?	X	
Does the <b>narrative</b> provided list goals and objectives which clearly indicate the organisation's priorities in HR-management for researchers?	X	
Has the organisation's published <b>HR Strategy and Action Plan been updated</b> with the actions' current status, additions and/or alterations?		X
Is the implementation of the <b>HR Strategy and Action Plan sufficiently embedded</b> 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 <b>OTM-R policy<sup>2</sup></b> ?		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 HR Strategy has been integrated in the overall IRBLLEIDA 2017-2020 Strategic Plan (available at [http://www.irbllleida.org/media/upload/arxiu/ABOUT\\_US/IRBLleida\\_2017-2020\\_Strategic\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.irbllleida.org/media/upload/arxiu/ABOUT_US/IRBLleida_2017-2020_Strategic_Plan.pdf), but not in the provided link....

All levels of researchers seem to have been involved in the process

Action plan has been updated for the next period.

<sup>1</sup> Last update 2.2.2018

<sup>2</sup> 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.*

## Weaknesses

Neither the interim report nor the OTM-R are to be found on the institutional website.

The narrative section lacks details on the state of play of the four thematic areas of the Charter and Code: it simply mentions that “the HR strategy has been embedded in the general 2017-2020 Strategic plan”.

The implementation of an adequately ambitious 2014-2016 Action Plan is deemed insufficient: the interim report indicates that 6 out of those 8 actions, which involved developing an internal policy or plan, are “in preparation”. Delivery targets simply appear to be pushed back in the next update but no explanations are provided as to why the results are so limited after 2 years of implementing the action plan.

In the original gap analysis, IRBLLLEIDA established criteria to exploit the results of a survey conducted;  
- the criteria  $\leq 4$  for implementation and  $\geq 3$  for importance were defined to identify items as “Challenges” to be addressed. Even though over 20 C&C principles match these criteria, only 9 items translate into 8 actions in the original action plan.

- The items with  $\leq 4$  for implementation and  $< 3$  for importance were to be addressed in the updated action plan.

=> Unfortunately those items to be addressed in the updated action plan remain absent, and there is no explanation as to why they are not addressed. Only one additional action “immigration guidelines” (9<sup>th</sup> and new action) is added to the updated action plan without any explanation on the motivations for its inclusion.

Indicators had been defined in the original proposal, but no values are provided in the interim report.

Indicators such as “Dissemination” should be completed with more specific measuring tools (such as number of Workshops, mailing, downloads of the published document, and so on...).

The description of the implementation phase is too vague, which doesn’t help assess the monitoring tools or system put into place. No detail is given about the frequency of the meetings held by the Working group nor about the monitoring system or any other measures aiming at guaranteeing that proposed actions are actually implemented (e.g. who will monitor what, when, how).

Some of the responses to the OTM-R Checklist are not consistent with what is stated in the revised action plan: in the revised action plan, the status of OTM-R policy is “*In preparation*” while the answer to “*Have we published a version of our OTM-R policy online (in the national language and in English)?*” is “*yes completely*”. The OTM-R check list and future policy should also include indicators.

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

IRBLLLEIDA states that they wish to strive for excellence in research via an OTM-R plan, to ensure gender equality, etc... In order for IRBLLLEIDA to demonstrate this will to align its practices with the principles of the C&C, we recommend to:

- revise and strengthen the monitoring system to ensure that actions are carried out as planned: provide extensive details on the monitoring systems, the stakeholders’ position and area of expertise, and clear monitoring procedures (e.g. who will monitor what, when, how).

- Define adequate indicators and target values and use qualitative and quantitative data as indicators of progress

- Strengthen the leadership’s commitment to implement of the Charter and Code principles, beyond the achievement of some specific objectives by tackling more of the “Challenges” as defined by IRBLLLEIDA in its initial plan

- Correct inconsistencies and visibly publish both the interim report and OTM-R checklist on the institutional website.

## 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. <b>There is evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded.</b>		
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. <b>There is some evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded.</b>		
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. <b>There is a lack of evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded.</b>	The lack of detailed qualitative and quantitative data in the report prevents assessors to properly assess the progress made over the implementation phase and the presented results fail to demonstrate a solid monitoring nor a strong commitment to carry out the announced actions.	X

*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)*