

EURAXESS

Initial Assessment - EC Consensus Report

Case number

2021SE601702

Name Organisation under assessment

SLU (Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences)

Organisation's contact details

International Office P.O. 7070SE-750 07, Uppsala, Sweden

Submission date of initial GAP-Analysis, HR Strategy and Action Plan

18/05/2022

Submission date to the European Commission

13/07/2022

Eligibility assessment

Please rate the state of achievement ("yes", "no" or "partly"). If any statements have prompted a "no" or "partly" in the evaluation, please provide recommendations:

	YES / NO / PARTLY	Recommendations
Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published on the organisation's website?	Yes	
Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published in English?	Yes	
Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published in a visible place?	Yes	

	YES / NO / PARTLY	Recommendations
Have the following elements of the templates for the Gap Analysis and the HR Strategy and Action Plan been completed with sufficient details and quality?		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gap Analysis ▪ HR Strategy and Action plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organisational information ▪ Strengths and weaknesses of the current practice ▪ Actions ▪ Implementation 	Yes	

Quality assessment

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

Rate the state of achievement ("yes", "no" or "partly"). If any statements have prompted a "no" or "partly" in the evaluation, please provide recommendations:

	YES / NO / PARTLY	Recommendations
Is the organisational information provided sufficient to understand the context in which the HR Strategy is designed?	Yes	
Is the Action Plan coherent with the Gap Analysis?	Yes	
Have a steering committee and working group been established to guarantee the implementation of the HRS4R-process?	Yes	
Has the research community been sufficiently involved in the process, with a representation of all levels of a research career?	Yes	
Are the relevant management departments sufficiently involved in the process so as to guarantee a solid implementation?	Yes	
Have adequate targets and indicators been provided in order to demonstrate when/how an action will be/has been completed?	Yes	
Is the organisation establishing an OTM-R policy?	Yes	
Are the goals and ambitions sufficiently ambitious considering the context of the organization?	Yes	

General Assessment

Accepted

Pending **minor** modifications

Pending **major** revisions



Explanation

- **Accepted: This application meets the criteria and the HR award is granted.**
The assessors might have commented on your file asking for future focus on a particular aspect/criterion, so please refer to the comments given above.
- Pending **minor** modifications: This application **broadly meets the criteria**, but the assessors have some concerns/questions about specific areas/criteria. Please reflect about the feedback given above and update your file before **re-submitting within 2 months**.
- Pending **major revisions**: This application does not meet the criteria; please make the appropriate changes taking into account the comments of the assessors before **re-submitting within 12 months**.

General Recommendations

If any of the above statements have prompted a "no" in the evaluation, please provide suggestions of modifications in the form below.

If the general assessment is:

- "pending minor modifications" the recommendations are split into:
 - Immediate mandatory modifications (to be implemented in order to obtain the award, resubmission within 2 months)
 - Other modifications (to be carried out during the implementation phase).
- "pending major revisions" the recommendations are split into:
 - Mandatory modifications (in order to obtain the award, resubmission within 12 months)
 - Other modifications.

Recommendations *

The resubmission is of quality. The organisation addressed seriously the assessors' recommendations and argues on what was required as clarification.

The question of SMART indicators versus objectives/targets is still pending : the measurement of progress is mandatory and must be pertinent. The measurement of impact (progression, evolution, change of practices/culture, improvement of qualifications) etc. should also be defined on time. SLU should be able to explain how they defined and evolved on this aspect in their interim report. Practice in implementation will probably highlight this point.

We can recommend SLU to regularly revise their AP according to the identified gaps. They should also use their HRS4R webpage for providing evidence of their progress and results to their community and the world. (Attractiveness, reference for EU projects evaluators).

We wish SLU the best for a successful implementation of the HRS4R as well as for an increasing commitment of their research staff and board to the principles of the charter and code.

Other modifications

It is suggested that the aspects considered "fully implemented" are re-evaluated, as it would seem as if the analysis has been done solely from the legal point of view and not so much from the implementation and results point of view. A re-evaluation considering current quantitative and qualitative indicators regarding these aspects could highlight the presence of room for improvement in the alignment with the C&C.

Proper consultation process among academics and PhD students, should be a basis for the implementation of HRS4R at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences. It is suggested to enter this activity in the new Action Plan.

If the organisation deserves to be commended on their ambition, their actions, evidence of good practice and/or their implementation process, please provide a commentary supporting this. (max. 2000 words)

--