

Important message to institutions:**Onsite visits are resumed starting 1 September 2022**

The broad lifting of the COVID-19 related travel limitations, allow us to cautiously resume the onsite visits. All site visits scheduled to take place after 1 September, will be organized under the normal onsite configuration.

Please note that after 1 September the virtual formula for "remote" site visits, will not be in place anymore.

Implementation Phase Interim Assessment - EC Consensus Report

Case number: 2018ES328092

Name Organisation under assessment: university of Girona

Submission date of the Interim Assessment Internal Review: 23/06/2022

Submission date: 07/07/2022

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	The Action Plan, the OTM-R policy and the OTM-R checklist are published on the organization's website. It will be very useful to publish information for the Gap Analysis
Does the narrative provided list goals and objectives which clearly indicate the organisation's priorities in HR-management for researchers?	Yes	

	YES / NO / PARTLY	Recommendations
Has the organisation published an updated HR Strategy and Action Plan been updated with the actions' current status, additions and/or modifications?	Yes	The new actions are ending Q2 2025 which is the limit of the 3 years for the next evaluation. By Q2 2025 the organization will prepare the report and the site visit will be organized. This process needs time for planning that's why my suggestion is to plan a bit further than the exact time for evaluation.
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?	Yes	

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

It is evident that the HR strategy and Action Plan are sufficiently embedded within the organisation. The information provided in the internal review was clear enough to understand the progress done by also the aims for the future. It is very positive to see that some of the actions are focused directly on researchers.

Weaknesses

It would be nice to have the HRS4R webpage in a more visible place in the organization's website structure. Moreover, uploading some information for the Gap Analysis will be really useful.

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

The new actions are ending Q2 2025 which is the limit of the 3 years for the next evaluation. By Q2 2025 the organization will prepare the report and the site visit will be organized. This process needs time for planning that's why my suggestion is to plan a bit further than the exact time for evaluation.

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 *

Also in the Initial phase evaluation, it was mentioned that the HRS4R page is not in a very visible place. It is in three levels depth UdG > Research > Responsible Research and Innovation > HRS4R.

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.**