



‘Sharing experience to better implement
the Human Resources Strategy for Researchers’

Consensus Report
(to be filled by the lead assessor)



RENEWAL PHASE¹ – assessment with a SITE VISIT

Name of the Organisation under assessment: University of Rijeka

This assessment is composed **in CONSENSUS** by the assessors on: 2019, February the 24th

DETAILED ASSESSMENT

1. QUALITY ASSESSMENT

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

1A. DESK-BASED ASSESSMENT

	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 published an updated 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	
Is the OTM-R policy² in place and publicly available?		X

Look ahead at the questions to be addressed during the site visit, listed in part 1B:

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.

Does the internal assessment of the institution give **rise to any issues you wish to explore** in more detail during the site visit?

Which elements of the HR Strategy and Action Plan would **you like to focus on** during the site visits?

WORKING GROUP:

Current Working-Group composition and responsibilities.

Explanation of the HRS4R monitoring process. How is the HRS4R process monitored?

GAP ANALYSIS AND ACTION PLAN:

Will new surveys and gap analysis will be performed? Have you performed more surveys during the period?
Was it only once done?

Does the 2014-2020 University strategy plan contain specific actions to meet and adopt the HRS4R strategy in a consistent way?

Do you plan to adapt the HRS4R to the current scenario of the 40 principles framework?

What is the University current action plan for the pending actions?

How will the main addressed handicaps be solved: lack of corporate motivacion, competences, national policies, financial tools, national support?

OTM-R:

What is the plan to implement OTM-R in your institution?

WEBSITE:

Will the website section for HRS4R be improved?

1B. SITE-VISIT BASED Assessment (to be completed jointly by the assessors after the site visit)

Please provide a brief answer to the following questions:

1. Does the site visit confirm the impression made by the written self-evaluation report?

Yes, partially. The site visit has ease a correct understanding of the real situation of the HRS4R policy's development and implementation in the UNIRI. The presentation offered by the Rector together with the meetings we have held with the Researchers (3 representatives for R1, R2, R3 and 3 R4, the participants well gender-balanced and included national and international researchers) have provided the assessment team with more elaborated and complete information than the one on the documents reviewed while the desk-based assessment. As a consequence of the site visit, the overall impression is now more accurate, more complete and closer to reality than before.

<p>2. What have been the benefits of implementing an HR Strategy in the organisation under review? How do you judge its overall impact and achievements?</p>
<p>The main benefits have been identified as follows (evidence of progress and good practice has been identified regarding all these points):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Category I. <i>Ethical And Professional Aspects</i>: the principles of (1) “<i>Research Freedom</i>”, (2) “<i>Ethical Principles</i>”, (8) “<i>Dissemination, Exploitation of Results</i>” and (10) “<i>Non-Discrimination</i>” have benefited from the implementation of the HR strategy. ▪ Category III. <i>Working Conditions</i>: (23) “<i>Research Environment</i>” = infrastructure; (27) “<i>Gender Balance</i>”; (31) “<i>IPR</i>” ▪ Category IV. <i>Training</i>: (36) “<i>Relation with supervisors</i>”. <p>The impact and achievements are reasonable and it would be great to extend the achievements to the other categories (for example, recruitment).</p>
<p>3. How do you judge the organisation’s level of ambition with regard to its HR strategy for researchers, taking into account the initial state of play?</p>
<p>The first initial level of ambition is impressive; UNIRI was the first institution in Croatia receiving the HR award and one of the first ten in Europe. From 2010 to 2014 UNIRI put lots of efforts, energy and resources into the project. Unfortunately from the actions in implementation the HRS4R were frozen due to the lack of information on how to continue the process and the deadlines. At that time there were no specific guidelines the institution could follow at this level of advance.</p> <p>The assessment team’s impression is that this initial high level of ambition will be back after this site visit session and feedback.</p>
<p>4. How do you judge the organisation’s efforts to ensure the implementation of the Charter and Code principles regarding the Ethical and Professional Aspects of Researchers?</p>
<p>The efforts are visible to us; the institution believes in the HR strategy. In fact, our conversations with the researchers showed that ethical and professional aspects are well tackled and managed in the institution. All stakeholders are familiar with C&C principles.</p>
<p>5. How do you judge the organisation’s efforts to ensure the implementation of the Charter and Code principles regarding the Recruitment of Researchers? Is an OTM-R policy in place?</p>
<p>Commitment to recruit under OTM-R policy could be perceived; all the stakeholders are aware of the importance of merit based recruitment and mobility, they believe having foreign researchers is enriching. However, national legislation prevents them to implement the OTM-R policy completely (for example, scientific publication in Croatian language is considered an advantage for candidate researchers in a recruitment process).</p> <p>Currently, there is no OTM-R policy in place and the check-list was not completed in a thorough way.</p>
<p>6. How do you judge the organisation’s efforts to ensure the implementation of the Charter and Code principles regarding the Researchers’ Working conditions and Social Security?</p>
<p>The science park and the infrastructure researchers have access to is remarkable.</p> <p>Researchers have guaranteed all rights from employment, including social rights. In general, working conditions and social security are not in the university’s hands but depend on national legislation. UNIRI’s representatives try their best to do lobbying the government and influence policy makers at a national level.</p>
<p>7. How do you judge the organisation’s efforts to ensure the implementation of the Charter and Code principles regarding Researchers’ Development and Training?</p>
<p>Evidence on good practices was detected in the conversations with R1 and R2 researchers, for example, in what refers to the relation with supervisors. Some systematic/corporate guidelines based on good practices would be very useful to extend them all over the UNIRI.</p>

Please list one or more **elements of good practice** that you would recommend to other organisations – either in terms of action or in terms of coordination/process.

1. The UNIRI top Management (Rector) commitment and involvement with the HRS4R strategy. The current Rector led the initial phase 2010-2014 of the HRS4R strategy implementation and is now back and ready to retake the process.
2. On 2010 an online survey on HRS4R was delivered to the whole of the faculties, focus groups were organised and external audit by Deloitte were carried out. The process was very complete and comprehensive.
3. An IPR rulebook was developed and adapted for all UNIRI faculties. This needs to be highlighted as it is very complex to adopt corporate rulebooks in this case because it is a decentralized university.
4. They are taking part in 2 interesting H2020 projects very related and complementary to HRS4R: SPEAR = Supporting and implementing Plans for gender Equality in Academia and Research; HRMinHEI = Modernisation of Higher Education Institutions through enhancement of Human Resources Management functions.
5. The University has a foundation which offers competitive founding for Installation or Starting Grants for young researchers.

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**?

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

STRENGTHS:

- The high level of commitment and involvement of the university's higher hierarchy: the fact that the Rector is the leader of the HRS4R strategy in UNIRI needs to be highlighted.
- The proactive approach UNIRI adopted all throughout the process: they were the first Croatian institution receiving the award.
- UNIRI tries hard to have an influence on how HR should be managed in all UNIRI faculties and also they try to have an effect on other regional/national institutions.
- UNIRI is involved in several human resources related very interesting initiatives and European projects. This kind of projects are complementary and supportive to HRS4R.
- UNIRI's mission and vision are in line with HRS4R (transparency, academic integrity, circulation of researchers, public engagement).
- The goals and objectives defined in the UNIRI's Strategy 2014-2020 meet the C&C principles.
- Very interesting website - <http://iuri.uniri.hr/> with info for foreign researchers.

WEAKNESSES:

- UNIRI stopped working on the HRS4R strategy from 2014-on. No new gap analysis nor action plans were developed. The working group quitted activities on 2014.
- National legislation prevents the institution from working on merit-based recruitment.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A renewed working group/steering committee should be appointed in order to relaunch the HRS4R strategy in UNIRI. The working group could include R1-R4 researchers and international researchers. Some of the researchers who took part in the interviews conducted in the site visit could be interesting members of this group.
- A new survey/focus group should be put in place in order to work on an updated gap analysis and action plan.
- Action plan should include a correct schedule with short/medium/long term actions appointing some well selected priorities (more relevant gaps) well connected with the principles of the charter and code.
- The OTM-R check-list should be updated and UNIRI needs to start working on the horizon of a merit based internal corporate recruitment.

- Good practices carried out in some of the faculties should be identified and used as models to be spread within the rest of faculties.
- The initial (2010) motivation for the HRS4R should be recovered in order to continue working with a high level of ambition.
- It would be interesting to work on an updated webpage – HR Excellence in Research – more visible and with more information about the updated process in English.

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

Which describes the organisation's progress most accurately?	Additional comments	TICK the right option
<p>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. <i>The next assessment will take place in 36 months.</i></p>		
<p>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. <i>The institution is requested to submit within 1-2 months a revised file taking into account the recommendations of the assessors.</i></p>	<p>The assessment team believes that if UNIRI follows the recommendations on this consensus report, HRS4R will be embedded in a more complete way.</p> <p>An updated gap analysis and action plan should be put in place in order to progress. The assessment team believe that UNIRI already has much information they have obtained as a result of the HR projects they are taking part in so they could use all this info to build the updated versions of these documents.</p>	X
<p>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. <i>The institution is requested to submit within 12 months a revised file taking into account the recommendations of the assessors.</i> <i>Until then, the HR award will be put as 'pending'.</i></p>		