



'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: **Erasmus University of Rotterdam**

Organisation's contact details: [brenda.docter@eur.nl](mailto:brenda.docter@eur.nl)

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

Self-assessment: February 2017

**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.	
<b>X</b>	<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 recommendation 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 recommendation below.</i>

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

### Strengths:

- The Executive Board is fully involved in the implementation process. Wide and well-structured involvement of the key roles of the institution in the interim assessment.
- There is an 'action point manager', from the steering committee, responsible for the implementation and monitoring of specific action point/s.
- The responsibility for implementing the policy is born at a decentralised level including the participation of the academic staff.
- The HR Strategy for 2014-2018 included the following priorities: career mobility and sustainable employability; talent management; improving quality through the Performance & Development cycle (P&D); internationalisation; diversity. All of them have some actions related.
- The action points are linked to the current strategic projects. The action points indicated in the 2014 Action Plan have been incorporated into HR's annual plans, which provide a practical interpretation of the HR strategy and it is proven that HRS4R is embedded in institutional strategy.
- The roles and responsibilities of the 'action point managers' are clear assigned. The HR is the leader of the implementation and the Steering committee monitors and discusses the progress four times a year. Relevant departments are involved. All these prove that the HRS4R is not an isolated HR-department procedure.
- It is proven a continuing commitment.
- Good record of the follow up of most of the actions of the Action Plan. E.g. action point 1.
- In Appendix 1, it is well explained how actions have been implemented, providing concrete examples of initiatives, as well as actions to overcome the difficulties encountered. E.g. action point 4.

**Weaknesses:**

- There are only two new action points in the revised Action Plan:

- Action point 12 consists of "*Distributing the HR logo throughout the entire university*". The Logo was awarded in December 2014 and it should have been disseminated and entrusted to all the stakeholders from the beginning. It is crucial that personnel are sufficient informed about the HRS4R and the Logo to assure a safe implementation.

- Action point 11: The OTM-R Checklist shows that the OTM-R policy is still in a preliminary stage, since 8 of the 23 questions of the checklist are not in place. In this sense, OTM-R check list has been completed but no actions have been planned. It is not explained who has completed the Checklist.

- In the revised Action Plan, there is a lack of indicators and targets for each action, so that these can be assessed in the future. Also in Appendix 3, timing and indicators are not clear fixed.

- There is no explanation why most of the actions have been delayed. Almost all actions: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, etc.

- Renewal assessment by external evaluators will be in 3 years. It is not sufficient clear how the University is going to prepare for the assessment.

- The timing for the implementation of actions refers mainly for 2017 and only one action (OTM-R policy) for 2019.

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

- There is a specific link to "HR Excellence in Research" but on the contrary, it is not to find in the University English main webpage. The HRS4R should be easily accessible and should be mentioned in the main webpage of the University or at least appear within the HR general information, thus giving the 'HR Excellence in Research Logo' more visibility.

- EUR must be preparing a coherent OTM-R policy and corresponding actions including its publication and dissemination.

- Targets, indicators and corresponding timings must be included for monitoring purposes (to judge whether the action is successfully implemented). These should be included in the revised Action Plan.

- The new actions of the New Action Plan are not sufficient ambitious considering the context of the EUR: namely the OTM-R policy, the recruitment and attracting talent from diversity perspective (Appendix3) and to raise awareness of the HR Logo. Therefore, new actions for the following years should be added in the New Action Plan.

- Dissemination, publicity and training and involvement of the board is advisable.

## 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.	
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.	<b>X</b> Please, see comments above.
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.	

\* Do not sign it, please.