HRS4R Assessment

• Master Class for new comers
  14th June 2019, Liege
The purpose of ...

**assessment** is to **INCREASE** quality.

**evaluation** is to **JUDGE** quality.
Your assessors ...

- Know about HRS4R from the inside
- Know about the assessment process
- Know about the ERA objectives
- Are committed to the « EU contract » (role, confidentiality, COI, agenda)
- Have used the IT-Tool
- Are assigned to an application by the EU – 1 Lead
Your assessors...

- Put themselves in the « flower pot »
- Give advice for growing in quality
- Differentiate between what must be done and what could be done
- Use short and clear sentences
- Decide on applications
- Remain available for assessing revisions
HRS4R - The essentials

Gap Analysis
Action Plan
Publication

Process
Involvement
Implementation
Coherence
Evidence
Ambition
• Involvement of all levels of researchers is MANDATORY
• Each principle has to be analysed within the current gaps and initiatives undertaken + suggestions for improvement
  • Focus on important principles: gender, ethics, OTM-R, OS
• Description of the process has to be clear and documented
• Gap Analysis is kept confidential
All schemes should include the involvement of researchers:

- Working groups
- Focus groups
- Large meetings
- Surveys

Stakeholders should be included throughout the whole process: listing gaps, the actual initiatives, ideas for improvement

Researchers should commit to and validate the gap analysis
It is not mandatory.
What is important is to do it correctly:
• Adapt questions to your context
• Address questions to all researchers
• Report on data and results
• Describe response rates such as researchers level, classes, gender, ...
• Interpretation has to make sense
THE PRINCIPLE: « Your are the gardener »

CONTENT

• Organisational information (read it first)
• Narrative regarding the 4 groups of principles
• Actions to be implemented within 2 years / 5 years
  • Action title – Timing – Responsible Unit – Indicator(s) / Target(s).
• Involvement of researchers in the implementation process
• Weak description of the organisation (i.e. autonomy of faculties or not, campuses, multi-site, ...)
• Actions are not coherent with the gaps
• Priorities are not explained
• All gaps are/are not covered within 2-5 years.
Main weaknesses in AP:

• Agenda is not realistic (duration, start-end, easyness)
• Progress assessment is not clear (targets, indicators)
• Communication and dissemination are not considered
• Implementation does not involve researchers
• Researchers did not commit to the Action Plan
is MANDATORY

When?  **Before** submission
Where? **Has to be visible**
What? **HR & AP + important docs**

**Not acceptable if...**

... It’s published on invisible page
... It’s not in English
... the HR & AP do not present the process & items from Template 4
... the GA process (strengths and weaknesses) is not described
... there are discrepancies with the submission
• Describe strengths and weaknesses
• Differentiate between what is major or what is minor
• Be clear on what is mandatory, optional but of added value, just a comment or just a typing error
• Give recommendations for improvement
• Recommend a decision
Possible decisions

• Accepted
• Accepted pending (minor)
• Declined

(2 months)

(12 months)
• Invite experts to discuss if needed
• The IF is anonymous and kept confidential
This is the (only) feedback document sent to the institution.

The lead assessor is responsible for aggregating IFs into the CF.

Clarification and discussion from assessors is often necessary.

If a consensus cannot be reached, the lead assessor decides and/or interacts with the EU coordinator.
More grows in the garden than the gardener knows he has sown...

Spanish Proverb