

TEMPLATE C: RENEWAL EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT based on SITE VISIT

Name Organisation under assessment:
Organisation's contact details:
Submission date initial GAP-analysis, HR Strategy and Action Plan:
Date Site Visit:

Name Assessor 1 (lead):
Name Assessor 2:
Name Assessor 3:

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

This assessment is composed in consensus by the assessors on (date).....

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 (TO BE COMPLETED BY EACH ASSESSOR PRIOR TO THE SITE VISIT)

	YES	NO
Has the organisational information been sufficiently updated to understand the context in which the HR Strategy is implemented?		
Does the narrative provided list goals and objectives which clearly indicate the organisation's priorities in HR-management for researchers?		
Has the organisation published an updated HR Strategy and Action Plan been updated with the actions' current status, additions and/or alterations?		
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?		
Is the OTM-R policy in place and publicly available ¹ ?		

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

¹ Organisations that have entered the HRS4R process 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 penalized but strong recommendations must be made to address these principles appropriately.

Does the internal assessment submitted by the organisation 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 visit?

--

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?
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?
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?
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?
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?
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?
7. How do you judge the organisation’s efforts to ensure the implementation of the Charter and Code principles regarding Researchers’ Development and Training?

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.

--

Please list one or more examples of difficulties the organisation has had to deal with during the set-up or implementation of the HR Strategy and Action Plan.

2. STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the information submitted and the site visit, 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:

RECOMMENDATIONS

Which describes the organisation’s progress most accurately?	Additional comments
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.	

<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.</p>	
<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.</p>	