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What I will cover today

1. How to evaluate the coherence between the gap analysis and the action plan.

2. What are the normal/max. efforts expected from the assessors in making the links between gaps and actions or finding evidence?
The Gap Analysis

• A gap analysis is defined as “the comparison of actual performance with potential or desired performance”

• In the context of HRS4R it is the gap that exists between the institutions policy and practice and/or National Legislation and the 40 principles of the charter and code

• The gap analysis should clearly indicate the existing gaps in relation to the 40 principles

• The gaps should be described and there should be clear indicators as to how these gaps will be filled
Gap Analysis

Where the institution is now

Actions Needed to Get Where they're going

Where it Needs to Be

Survey Says!

Action Plan
You will see something like this on the e-tool...

**TEMPLATE 1 – GAP ANALYSIS**

Name Organisation under review: ........................................................................................................

Organisation’s contact details: ........................................................................................................

**SUBMISSION DATE:** ....................................................................................................................

**DATE ENDORSEMENT CHARTER AND CODE:** .................................................................

Please provide the date when your organisation officially endorsed the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers.

**PROCESS (MAX. 300 WORDS)**

The HR54R process must engage all management departments directly or indirectly responsible for researchers’ HR issues. These will typically include the Vice-Rector for Research, the Head of Personnel, and other administrative staff members. In addition, the HR54R strategy must consult its stakeholders and involve a representative community of researchers ranging from R1 to R4, as well as appoint a Committee overseeing the process and a Working Group responsible for implementing the process.

Please provide evidence of how the above groups were involved in the GAP-analysis: e.g. names, meeting dates, or consultation format. In addition, indicate how the Committee and Working Group are composed.

**GAP ANALYSIS**

The Charter and Code provides the basis for the Gap analysis. In order to aid cohesion, the 40 articles have been renumbered under the following headings. Please provide the outcome of your
Gap Analysis

What are you looking for?

1. Look for evidence of engagement with all management departments directly or indirectly responsible for researchers’ HR-issues.

2. Does this include the Vice-Rector for Research, the Head of Personnel, and other administrative staff members.

3. Is there evidence of consultation with stakeholders and involve a representative community of researchers ranging from R1 to R4.
4. Is there a Committee and/or Working Group overseeing the gap analysis and implementing the process

5. Is there any evidence of how the above groups were involved in the GAP-analysis: e.g. names, meeting dates, or consultation format.

6. What is the composition of the Committee and/or Working Group.
### European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers: GAP analysis overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status: to what extent does this organisation meet the following principles?</th>
<th>+ = fully implemented</th>
<th>+/- = almost but not fully implemented</th>
<th>-/+ = partially implemented</th>
<th>- = insufficiently implemented</th>
<th>Initiatives already undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In case of -, -/+ or +/-, please indicate the actual &quot;gap&quot; between the principle and the current practice in your organisation. If relevant, please list any national/regional legislation or organisational regulation currently impeding implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethical and Professional Aspects

| 1. Research freedom |
| 2. Ethical principles |
| 3. Professional responsibility |
| 4. Professional attitude |
Your role....

Coherence

Find the Links between the gaps identified in the Gap Analysis and the HRS4R Action Plan
### Example of what a gap looks like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. Supervision and managerial duties</td>
<td>Senior researchers should devote particular attention to their multi-faceted role as supervisors, mentors, career advisors, leaders, project coordinators, managers or science communicators. They should perform these tasks to the highest professional standards. With regard to their role as supervisors or mentors of researchers, senior researchers should build up a constructive and positive relationship with the early-stage researchers, in order to set the conditions for efficient transfer of knowledge and for the further successful development of the researchers' careers.</td>
<td>For academic staff, supervision both of research students and early-stage researchers is a key criterion in schemes for promotion and establishment. A programme of professional development for research supervisors has been established (currently involving five half-day workshops addressing different stages of the research student life-cycle, from recruitment to examination and beyond), and participation by staff has been strong.</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38. Continuing Professional Development</td>
<td>Researchers at all career stages should seek to continually improve themselves by regularly updating and expanding their skills and competencies. This may be achieved by a variety of means including, but not restricted to, formal training, workshops, conferences and e-learning.</td>
<td>A framework for professional development for researchers, based around principles of Training Needs Analysis and Professional Development. This framework recognises both formal (e.g., workshops and short courses) and informal (i.e., experiential) learning and skill development. It has been identified that an on-line system is required to support the process.</td>
<td>The University will hold a Researcher Conference, to support career development for researchers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gap meets Action Plan

The University will hold a Researcher Conference, to support career development for researchers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Action</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsible Unit</th>
<th>Indicator/Target</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>preparation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The University will hold a Researcher Conference, to support career development for researchers | 2013, 2015, 2016, 2017 | Human Resources | 3 conferences hosted so far and one in preparation:  
  - Researcher Careers April 2013  
  - Endurance in Research April 2015  
  - Chance favours the prepared mind April 2016  
  - The Mobile Researcher May 26th 2017  
  See link to conference programme and speakers here | Complete Implementation on-going |
| Green = Complete - Implementation On going  Yellow = New Action Complete  Blue = Not Complete prior to Deadline  Red = New Action in Preparation |
Open Transparent Merit based Recruitment

- Template 1 – Annex: Open, Transparent and Merit-based Recruitment Check-list

More on this later......
To plan your search for coherence ask yourself the following?

Does the Institution:

1. Map current HR practices against the 40 principles of Charter and Code;
2. Identify where gaps exist; describe the gap and subsequent actions that will fill the gap.
3. Make sure the process of undertaking the internal gap analysis is as inclusive as possible and includes researchers at all levels (R1 to R4)
4. If applicable include aspects of local or national legislation should be disclosed
To plan your search for coherence ask yourself the following?

Has the Institution:

• Formed a committee or working group to oversee the gap analysis

• Is it sponsored by President/Vice President etc

• Included Title Action, Timing, Responsible Unit, Indicator/Target, Current Status

• Used the templates and published the action plan on the Institutions website?
How to find evidence of coherence and quality

What to look for

• Has the action plan been divided into the 4 topics?
  • Ethical & Professional,
  • Recruitment - OTMR
  • Working Conditions and
  • Training & Development

• Are the interactions logically connected?
• Have actions been randomly distributed?
• What is the quality of the actions?
How to find evidence of coherence and quality

What to look for

• Are the actions sensible and measurable?
• Is there an overall sense or understandability?
• Is there a coherence between the actions and capacity of the institution
• Is there **unity** between the gaps identified and the actions
• Short term v’s long term actions
• Is it hard to follow, has the report jumped around from idea to idea without **consistency** or connectivity
How to find evidence of coherence and quality

What to look for

• Are the main ideas difficult to follow.
• Are there **quantitative targets** in the action plan?
• Is there a mechanism for **effective on-going implementation** and review of the plan
• Is it being **monitored** and by whom
• Stakeholder engagement
• Evidence of **coordination** across the organisation
Efforts expected when assessing

1. Are the gaps adequately identified
2. Is there a clear link between the gaps and the action plan?
3. Is the plan for 2 years?
4. What is the quality of the actions?
5. Is it possible to make progress with these actions?
6. Are there clear indicators and targets?
7. Has there been a clear consultation process?
8. OTM-R discussed later.....
Efforts expected when assessing

1. Take a methodical approach
2. Has the institution used the correct forms?
3. Read the reports – what is your understanding?
4. Try to get an overall impression of the institution - how many researchers/staff/PhD students
5. What is the budget of the institution?
6. Is the process well structured
7. Is it easy to follow – coherent?
What do I do?

1. Google the institution
2. Read the reports many many times....
3. How big is the institution
4. Is the information on the net
5. Have they used the forms
6. Is there a connectivity between the gaps, what the have written and the action plan
7. Is it realistic
8. Are the actions quantitive
9. Do I get the impression that this is a box checking exercise?
Go Raibh Maith Agaibh

Thank you in various languages.