



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

Consensus Report
(to be filled by the lead assessor)



IMPLEMENTATION PHASE¹ – interim assessment

Name Organisation under assessment: Universidad Autonoma de Madrid (UAM).....

This assessment is composed in **CONSENSUS** by the assessors on: 22 February 2019

DETAILED ASSESSMENT

1. QUALITY ASSESSMENT

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

	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's published 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	
Has the organisation developed an OTM-R policy² ?		X

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**?

Gap analysis provided by organization was prepared in 2016 and there is no info for the progress achieved since then. There are actions mentioned in the Action Plan of 2016 but there is not update what is the current status of the actions (completed, delayed or aborted) There is a new Action plan prepared in 2018 but it’s difficult to assess how appropriate it is with no knowledge of what took place since 2016. The strategy is very vague, details for how they will face significant number of weak points are missing. The weak points and their

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.*

strategy are grouped in a general action including all these cases. For example for all Career Development issues they suggest the “UAM Career Development Plan”, without clarifying what specific activities they will take for the “value of mobility”, for “access to career advise”, etc. meaning that all specific activities will be part of it. The institution does not use any indicator for specific activities.

HR Strategy and Action Plan have been published but not easy to find on the web side, especially the English translation that you need to browse via the Spanish one.

The strong point is that almost half of the 40 principles (19) are implemented, another 7 need minor actions and actions for 14 principles should be applied.

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	TICK the right option
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.		
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.	Details about what the concrete actions are going to include in the UAM Career Development Plan, for every principle, linked with the appropriate indicators.	X
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.		

*At this point of 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)*