

An official EU website

How do you know?

**Important message to institutions:**

**Site Visits:** All HRS4R in-house audits planned for 2021 will be conducted remotely with the consent of the host institution. Should your institution be at renewal stage, once you submit your self-assessment online via the e-tool, the EC will be in contact with you to set a date for the remote visit together with a panel of independent experts. Should the institution prefer a classic on-site visit, the audit will be postponed. Meanwhile, institutions involved in the process can continue using the HR Excellence in research award.

## Initial Assessment - EC Consensus Report

**Case number:** 2019FR450392**Name Organisation under assessment:** University of Tours**Submission date of initial GAP-Analysis, HR Strategy and Action Plan:** 23/08/2021**Submission date:** 27/09/2021

## 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	

An official EU website
**YES / NO / PARTLY****Recommendations**

How do you know?

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?

- Gap Analysis
- HR Strategy and Action plan
  - 🔗 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

<input type="checkbox"/> An official EU website	YES / NO / PARTLY	Recommendations	How do you know?
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?	Partly	The OTM-R policy could be developed further and there is time to do this.	
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.**

An official EU website

How do you know?

## 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 \*

An excellent submission - keep up the good work.

The OTM-R policy could be developed further and there is time to do this.

Continue to involve the research community at all levels R1 - R4

Continue to monitor progress and develop new actions where appropriate.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>An official EU website</b>	How do you know?
<p>The information and documents provided about the implementation process of HRS4R at University Tours are visible, easy to find and comprehensive. Almost every suggestion from the assessors is implemented. This proves the significant involvement and engagement. The organization provided necessary and sufficient details about the process, context, activity and persons involved. The information in English for newcomers is well designed and prepared.</p> <p>The governing bodies and stakeholders show a good level of engagement with the strategy and the implementation process. The project's methodology is explained, and representatives of institutional stakeholders have been involved in the work procedure.</p> <p>The self-awareness and understanding of the process are visible.</p> <p>The institution has performed a thorough gap analysis and action plan, shows promising progress in the implementation process and is conscious about the identified strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>The University also demonstrates a long-term commitment and gives evidence of its ambition to meet the higher quality standards set by the European Commission for the years to come.</p> <p>As a lead assessor, I believe that the University has put an excellent submission forward.</p>		