



'Sharing experience to better implement  
the Human Resources Strategy for Researchers'

**Consensus Report**  
(to be filled by the lead assessor)



**INTERIM EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT of STRENGTHENED HRS4R**

Name Organisation under assessment: University of Copenhagen UCPH

Organisation's contact details: Ulla Lund-Martorell

Submission date initial GAP-analysis, HR Strategy and Action Plan: 2014/2015

**GENERAL ASSESSMENT**

	RESULTS	COMMENTS
	<b>HRS4R EMBEDDED (accepted):</b> The application meets the criteria and the HR Award is granted. The application may receive some comments asking for future focus on a particular aspect/criterion, if appropriate.	
X	<b>*CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (minor modifications):</b> The application broadly meets the criteria but the assessors have some concerns/questions about specific areas/criteria. Minor modifications need to be implemented during the next period.	<i>Please, follow the recommendations below.</i>
	<b>*STRONG CORRECTIVE ACTIONS (major modifications):</b> The application does NOT meet the criteria to retain the HR Award in the future. Major modifications need to be implemented during the next period.	<i>Please, follow the recommendations below.</i>

*\* No re-submission permitted at this stage. The next submission deadline will be 36months after receiving this result*

**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 published an updated 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 policy?	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**?

<p>(+) UCPH provided an informative outline of their proceedings and documents, which show their willingness and capability to make progress</p> <p>(+) there are clear and explanatory documents provided for the implementation and follow up of the action plan, there are a large number of actions that seem completed.</p> <p>(+) They have described the progress until now with much detail.</p> <p>(+) UCPH involves different levels of management (incl. top management), HR and representatives from unions/associations</p> <p>(-) UCPH does not show (besides the General Collaboration Committee) how PhD-students, postdocs and other employees are involved in the development of procedures, guidelines and best practices</p> <p>(- ) Although the UCPH has written a detailed description of the status/activity of the several actions, they do not reach conclusion such as completed, extended, in progress et cetera.</p>
---

If relevant, please provide suggestions for alterations or revisions to the (updated) HR strategy:

<p>-&gt; UCPH should show (besides the impressive list of actions they have been executing) how satisfied they are with the current status (e.g. red-amber-green)</p> <p>-&gt; UCPH should add a conclusion for every goal/action or could design additional actions to reach the goal in a different way. It is not clear if they keep acting on the goals of current action plan.</p> <p>-&gt; UCPH should publish a revised HR strategy once the commitment and goal of the new rector is clear.</p>
---

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Which describes the organisation's progress most accurately?	Additional comments
<p>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>	
<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>Declare status of goals already reached in the interim assessment, gap that has to be filled for the 5-year-assessment.</p> <p>[See: hrs4r-template-3-internal-review.doc at <a href="https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/content/strengthened-hrs4r-process">https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/content/strengthened-hrs4r-process</a>]</p> <p>The publishing of the revised HR strategy is needed.</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>	

\* Do not sign it, please.