

EURAXESS

Implementation Phase Interim Assessment - EC Consensus Report

Case number

2018ES360970

Name Organisation under assessment

Universidad de Jaén

Organisation's contact details

Campus Las Lagunillas, Edif. Rectorado (OFIPI, B1-025), Jaén, 23071, Spain

Submission date of the Interim Assessment Internal Review

19/07/2022

Submission date to the European Commission

06/10/2022

Quality assessment

The quality assessment evaluates the level of ambition and the quality of progress 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?	Yes	Even though a lot of work has been done to review the organisations progress what is lacking is the "strategic narrative" of where the HR strategy sits within the overall organisation.
Does the narrative provided list goals and objectives which clearly indicate the organisation's priorities in HR-management for researchers?	Yes	The organisation has highlighted the strengths and weaknesses very well with actions built from the weaknesses identified.
Has the organisation published an updated HR Strategy and Action Plan been updated with the actions' current status, additions and/or modifications?	Yes	Yes. It is easy to find and with English translation
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?	Partly	I could not see evidence of focus groups or surveys - or any particular introduction of HRS4R for all researchers. There is information and a presentation on the website but this reviewer senses that HRS4R may not be widely known within the organisation.
Has the organisation developed an OTM-R policy?	No	This reviewer could not find the OTM-R Policy

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

Progress within the organisation has been made under the 4 pillars of HRS4R and of particular note is that the organisation provides career guidance and training such as employment training and soft skills training for their R1 to R4 researchers. The organisation also has international mobility schemes to encourage researcher mobility. Their vacancy page is easy to find and the organisation advertises its roles on EURAXESS. The terms and conditions are good (as per Spanish law which recognises researchers as professionals). Freedom of Research is included in the UJA Statutes and the organisation has accountability and IP protection mechanisms in place as well as equality and evaluation procedures.

Weaknesses

No OTMR policy that this reviewer could find. There is a good HRS4R narrative here but the organisation could have demonstrated it in a better way for example highlighting the excellent training or the mobility programmes available. Now is the time for the organisation to build on the good foundations provided by the existent Spanish legal landscape and the internal regulations of the organisation and introduce further positive policies and practice for research staff.

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

Suggestions

1. OTMR policy must be written and available on the web
2. Evidence of consultation with all stakeholders should be available in the form of a survey or focus group report highlighting weaknesses and strengths which show the evolution of the positive effects of HRS4R within the organisation.

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.

HRS4R embedded



HRS4R embedded, corrective actions needed



HRS4R embedded, strong corrective actions needed



Additional comments *

For the next phase of the process:

1. Provide evidence through links of new policies etc introduced as a result of HRS4R
2. Consider embedding HRS4R within the organisation's strategy further
3. Declare the organisations ambition with regards to HRS4R - clearly stating that ambition.

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.**