



INITIAL PHASE¹ - assessment

Name Organisation under assessment: Université de Bretagne Occidentale (FR-UBO-Brest)

This assessment is composed in **CONSENSUS** by the assessors on:20th December 2018.....

DETAILED ASSESSMENT

1. ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT

	YES	NO (or no evidence)
Has the organisation formally endorsed the Charter and Code ² ?	Yes	
Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published on the organisation's website?	Yes	
Have the following elements of the templates for the Gap Analysis and the HR Strategy and Action Plan been completed? A. Gap Analysis B. HR Strategy and Action plan: B1. Organisational information B2. Narrative B3. Actions B4. Implementation	Yes	
Have the Strategy and Action Plan been formally endorsed by the organisation's highest authority ² ?	Yes	

2. QUALITY ASSESSMENT

The quality assessment evaluates the **level of ambition** and the **quality of progress** intended by the organisation.

	YES	NO
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	

¹ Last update 2.2.2018

² Check out: <https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/charter/declaration-endorsement>

Has the research community been sufficiently involved in the process, with a representation of all levels of a research career?	Yes	In so far as possible
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 ?	Yes	
Are the goals and ambitions sufficiently ambitious considering the context of the organization?	Yes	

RECOMMENDATIONS

If any of the above statements have **prompted a 'no' in the evaluation**, please provide **suggestions for (minor) alterations or (major) revisions**, in order to end up qualifying for the HRS4R award.

If the organisation deserves to be commented on their ambition, their actions, evidence of good practice and/or their implementation process, please **provide a comment** supporting this.

This is a very ambitious action plan which sets realistic and measurable objectives. They have a thorough understanding of the key issues at their University and have put in place structures to address these issues. The inclusion of a gantt chart in the Annex is a welcomed addition.

UBO leaves an impression of being very devoted to the HRS4R process and are serious in creating more benefits in managing its most valuable resources.

Great effort has been made to actively promote and display the HRS4Rs Logo, Strategy and Action Plan on the website. The Assessors welcome the efforts to translate the HR documents in English for non-French speaking recruited staff, by creating an English friendly platform on UBO's website.

The explanation around the issues of recruiting and evaluating R2 researchers in the French University systems is fully explained and understood.

The Assessors congratulate UBO for an excellent communication strategy and empowerment tactics used to spread the HRS4R awareness throughout the Institution! They made a huge effort to have robust monitoring of the project.

The assessors wish UBO every success in implementing the HRS4R action plan.

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

✓	<p>ACCEPTED</p> <p>This application meets the criteria and the HR award is granted.</p> <p>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.</p>
	<p>ACCEPTED pending 'minor' alteration</p> <p>This application broadly meets the criteria, but the assessors have some concerns/questions about specific areas/criteria. Please reflect about the feed-back given above and update your file before re-submitting within 1-2 months.</p>
	<p>DECLINED pending 'major' revisions</p> <p>This application does not meet the criteria, please make the appropriate changes taking into account the comments of the assessors before re-submitting after 12 months³.</p>

³ unless stipulated otherwise by the assessors