

UPV's HRS4R application

CASE NUMBER: 2019ES368935 - UNIVERSITAT POLITÈCNICA DE VALÈNCIA

Organisation's contact details: Carlos Ripoll - Director for Institutional Projects - cripoll@upv.es - Camino de Vera sn - 46022 - Valencia - Spain

Date endorsement Charter and Code: 14th of January 2019

Submission date: 20th of December 2019

Submission date (Revised version): 21st of September 2020

Table of contents

PROCESS	1
Introduction	2
People involved	2
Consultation groups	3
Governing Council	3
Social Council	4
University Senate	4
University Management Council	5
Steering Committee	5
Working Group 1: Ethical and Professional Aspects	7
Working Group 2: Recruitment	9
Working Group 3: Working conditions and social security	10
Working Group 4: Training and Career Development	12
Working Group 5: Legal Framework	13
UPV Research Community	13
Trade Unions	14
Committee overseeing the process	15
Working Group responsible for the implementation	15
GAP ANALYSIS	16
Introduction	17
Ethical and Professional Aspects	17
Research freedom (1): +/-	17
Ethical principles (2): +/-	19
Professional responsibility (3): +/-	20
Professional attitude (4): -/+	21
Contractual and legal obligations (5): +/-	22
Accountability (6): +/-	23
Good practice in research (7): -/+	25
Dissemination, exploitation of results (8): +/-	26
Public engagement (9): -/+	28
Non discrimination (10): +/-	29
Evaluation / appraisal systems (11): +/-	30
Recruitment and Selection	31

Recruitment (12): -/+	32
Recruitment - Code (13): +/-	33
Selection - Code (14): +/-	35
Transparency - Code (15): +/-	37
Judging merit - Code (16): -/+	39
Variations in the chronological order of CVs - Code (17): -/+	42
Recognition of mobility experience - Code (18): -/+	44
Recognition of qualifications - Code (19): +/-	46
Seniority - Code (20): ++	48
Postdoctoral appointments - Code (21): +/-	49
Working Conditions and Social Security	51
Recognition of the profession (22): -/+	51
Research environment (23): +/-	52
Working conditions (24): +/-	52
Stability and permanence of employment (25): -/+	54
Funding and salaries (26): -/+	54
Gender balance (27): -/+	56
Career development (28): +/-	56
Value of mobility (29): -/+	57
Access to career advice (30): - -	59
Intellectual Property Rights (31): +/-	61
Co-authorship (32): +/-	62
Teaching (33): -/+	63
Complains / appeals (34): + -	64
Participation in decision-making bodies (35): + +	66
Training and Development	67
Relation with supervisors (36): +/-	67
Supervision and managerial duties (37): +/-	68
Continuing Professional Development (38): +/-	69
Access to research training and continuous development (39): -/+	70
Supervision (40): +/-	70
Open Transparent Merit based Recruitment	71
OTM-R matrix	72
Action Plan	74
Organisational information	75
Key figures	75

Organisational profile	75
Strengths and weaknesses of the current practice	76
Ethical and Professional aspects	76
Recruitment and Selection	77
Working Conditions	78
Training and Development	79
Actions	80
A1: Program for better dissemination, exploitation and science outreach	80
A2: Observatory and learning program on legal and financial aspects for R&D activities	84
A3: Assessment and enhancement of existing R&D practices in project management, IT security and health and safety procedures	86
A4: To setup the Researcher's Career Development Unit	88
A5: UPV researcher development framework	91
A6: Enhance recruitment practices for R2 short term research contracts	93
A7: A one-stop shops for EU researchers merits recognition at UPV	95
A8: Research incentives and salaries	97
A9: Teaching and Research	99
A10: Definition of an action to implement and monitor the OTM-R policy at UPV	101
Open Recruitment Policy	104
Implementation	105
General Overview	105
Checklist	105
Additional remarks	109

PROCESS

Introduction

The HRS4R 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 HRS4R 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.

People involved

Please provide the name, the position and the management line/ department of the persons who are directly or indirectly engaged in the HRS4R process in your organisation.

Name	Position	Management line / Department
Francisco José Mora	Rector	University
Rosa Puchades	Vice-rector	Social Responsibility and Cooperation
José E. Capilla	Vice-Rector	Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer
Eduardo Vendrell	Vice-Rector	Studies, Quality and Accreditation
José Manual Barat	Vice-Rector	Academic Planning and Faculty
María Consuelo Jiménez	Vice-Rector	Planning and Foresight
José Luis Cueto	Vice-Rector	Students, Culture and Sports
José Millet	Vice-Rector	Employment and Entrepreneurship
Virginia Vega	Vice-Rector	Digital Resources and Documentation
Marilda Azulay	Vice-Rector	Campuses and Sustainability
Juan M. Martínez	Vice-Rector	Rector's Office
Josep A. Claver	Secretary General	Legal Office
Salvador F. Navarro	Bursar	University Management
Agustín Blasco	Full Professor / Director	Department of Animal Science
Ana Albalat	PhD Candidate	Department of Linguistics

Name	Position	Management line / Department
Ivana Gasulla	Researcher	Institute for Telecommunications and Multimedia Applications
Fernando Conesa	Director	Technology Transfer Office
Eduardo Tomás	Director	Research Management Office
M ^a José Iza	Director	Human Resources Office
Carlos Ripoll	Director	Institutional Projects and Student Experience
Sergio Marí / Alberto Conejero	Director	Legal Office
Carlos Fernández	Researcher	Trade Unions

Consultation groups

Your organisation 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 the implementation of the HRS4R process. Provide information on how the above groups were involved in the GAP-analysis.

Governing Council

The Governing Council is the highest governing body of the university. Among its main functions is “to establish the strategy of the university and the necessary implementation processes to put strategy in practice. Its main areas of competences include regulations in teaching, research, human resources, economic resources and budget preparation. Its members are: the Rector, the Secretary General, the Bursar, three representatives from the Social Council (see below) and 50 members from the whole university community according to this criterion: 15 members appointed by the Rector, including the Vice-Rectors, 20 representatives from the University Senate chosen by peers, 6 Deans, 6 Department Directors, 3 Research Institute Directors.

The decision to implement the HRS4R strategy was taken early before the HRS4R process started, on 2014, with the approval of the university strategic plan by the Governing Council. Since that the university committed itself to pursue the principles stated on European Code and Charter for Researchers (2005/251/EC). On the 28th of October 2016, the Governing Council approved a proposal by the Vice-Rector for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer to set up the HRS4R Steering Committee, that would be in charge of overseeing the design of the HRS4R planning phase. On the 13th of April 2018, the Governing Council approved an update on the composition of the HRS4R Committee due to changes in the university management.

On the 19th of December 2019 the Vice-Rector for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer presented the Gap Analysis and Action Plan, that was subsequently approved by the Governing Council. Afterwards it was sent for approval to the Social Council (See below).

Social Council

The Social Council is defined as a “participatory body of the society in the university”, acting as a link between the university and different social agents like companies, the Regional Government, the Valencian municipality, trade unions or professional bodies. In addition it includes 6 representatives from the university community, including the Rector, the Secretary General, the Bursar and 3 members elected by the Governing Council. Among its main functions is supervising economic activities and monitoring institutional performance. Additionally, it also aims to foster public-private partnerships as funding instruments for the University in the fields of teaching, research and technology transfer.

On the 19th of December 2019 the Vice Rector for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer presented the final version of the Gap Analysis and Action Plan and it was approved by the Social Council.

University Senate

The University Senate is the highest representative body of the university community. It is composed by the Rector, who chairs the sessions, the Secretary General, who acts as a secretary during Senate meetings, the Bursar and 300 members from the university community. Among those 300 members, there are 4 Vice-Rectors, the Deans of the 17 Schools and Faculties and the Student Union Representative. The rest of the Senate includes a range of academics, students and administrative staff derived from the results of an electoral process participated by the whole university community.

Among its main functions is “to debate on the Annual Report from the Rector regarding the situation of the University”. As part of the Annual Report, the Vice-Rector for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer, was called to present the HRS4R process during the session held on the 26th of October 2017.

University Management Council

The University Management Council is a body aimed to coordinate the executive branch of the institution. It is chaired by the Rector, who supervises a team conformed by 10 Vice-rectors, the Bursar and the Secretary General.

Under the premises established by the Strategic Plan, on the 11th of September 2016, the Vice-Rector for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer presented a concrete proposal to initiate the HRS4R process and a draft of the composition of the Steering Committee.

For the whole duration of the HRS4R process definition, the Vice-Rector for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer presented to the University Management Council quarterly reviews to monitor and give feedback on the progress of the HRS4R process.

On the 11th of November 2019, the Vice-Rector for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer presented the last version of the Gap Analysis and the Action Plan to the University Management Council and informed about his intention to submit it to the Governing Council for approval.

Steering Committee

The purpose of the Steering Committee is to supervise the HRS4R process. It is chaired by the Vice-Rector for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer, who acts as a link between the Steering Committee and the other decision-making bodies involved in the process (i.e. the University Management Council, the University Senate, the Social Council and the Governing Council). In addition, the Vice-Rector for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer was in charge of appointing Steering Committee members. The criterion followed to set up the Steering Committee is described on the next section. The list of members was sent for approval to the Governing Council, which ratified its composition on the 28th of October 2016. Later on, due to changes on the university governing structure, it was approved an update on the list of members on the 13th of March 2018.

The Steering Committee met 6 times during the whole duration of the definition of the HRS4R process (28th of September 2016, 2nd of November 2016, 25th of January 2018, 28th of June 2018 and 27th of November 2019).

During the first meeting the Director for Institutional Projects was officially endorsed to conduct the whole process and to report to the Steering Committee on the different achievements of the design of the HRS4R process. On subsequent meetings the Director for Institutional Projects conveyed, among other things, a proposal for the HRS4R process, the results from the different working group sessions, a proposal for the online survey, a proposal of the gap analysis, a proposal of the action plan, a proposal for the dissemination event and a tentative website. All proposals were acknowledged by the Steering Committee.



In order to conduct the Gap Analysis, it was agreed to combine a qualitative analysis, using the focus group methodology, with a quantitative analysis by means of an online survey addressed to the whole university community. The qualitative analysis would collect the raw material that would help on the identification of areas to focus, whilst the quantitative analysis would serve as a mean to quantify how important was each of the detected areas.

Due to the complexity of the university, it was suggested to develop the qualitative analysis by deploying 4 thematic working groups based on the Charter and Code Principles areas: Working group on Ethical and Professional issues (WG1), Working Group on Recruitment (WG2), Working Group on Working Conditions and Social Security (WG3) and Working Group on Training and Career development (WG4). Each working group included representatives from R1-R4 and also members from the different areas involved in research (i.e. technology transfer management, human resources management, research management, trade unions and the legal department). For each working group a report was produced by the Director of Institutional Projects. Each report served as the grassroots to build up the gap analysis, the action plan and the online survey.

In addition to those 4 working groups, an ad-hoc fifth working group (WG5) was created to carry on with the analysis of the current legal framework. This group was composed by the Director of the Legal Office and the Director of Human resources. The Director of Institutional Projects acted as facilitator.

The Steering Committee had a crucial role on validating a preliminary proposal of the Gap Analysis and the Action Plan. This preliminary proposal was the base to set up an online survey that would act as a quantitative method to validate the areas and actions detected during the qualitative phase by means of focus groups and internal meetings. It was used a specific methodology to validate the preliminary version of both the Gap Analysis and the Action Plan that would help on reaching an agreement among Steering Committee members: participants in the Steering Committee were presented with a list of 100 statements extracted from working group contributions and organised in the same terms as the Charter and Code principles. For each statement each member was asked to express the level of acknowledgement he/she. It was used a scale ranging from 1 (Totally in disagreement) to 5 (Totally in agreement). Eventually, scores from all member were presented on a table format highlighting those statements with higher divergence on the scores acknowledged. Each member was asked to justify his/her score. Finally a list of gaps and actions was produced. This list was used to set up a survey that was prompted to the whole research community of the university (2.495 researchers). The number of respondents to the survey was 1.374, almost 60% of the entire population. This represents a very good metric of the level of involvement of the whole university in this process.

Working Group 1: Ethical and Professional Aspects

The purpose of the Ethical and Professional working group is to perform a qualitative analysis on each of the 11 aspects defined by the Charter and Code in this field. The group was chaired by Mr. Eduardo Tomás, Director of the Research Management Office. The session was facilitated by Dr. Carlos Ripoll, Director of Institutional Projects who, in addition, was in charge of compiling all the issues raised by participants during the session, and in producing the final report of the group.

Participants to this working group were selected by the Steering Committee. The selection criterion (see later) sought to have at least one representative of each researcher career stage (R1 to R4). As a result, the following people was called to participate: Manuel Monleón (R4), Manuel Alcazar (R4), Pilar Bravo (R3), M^a Victoria González (R3), Ana Albalat (R2), Gerardo Martínez (R1) and Marcos Carreres (R1). In addition to this, it was included a representative from the Research Management Office, Dr. Concepción Ginestar, a representative from the Technology Transfer Office, Dr. M^a Carmen Rodrigo and a representative from Trade Unions, Dr. Carlos Fernández.

A 3 hours session was held on the 30th of March 2017 to work on ethical and professional issues. Participants received in advance the list of the 11 aspects of this area, the description for each one stated by the Charter and Code, the methodology and what was expected from the session.

The session started with an introduction to the topic, that was made by the chairperson and the Director of Institutional Projects. Afterwards, an average of 2 aspects were assigned to



each participant. Then, participants had 10 minutes of individual work, to think in terms of strengths and weakness about how the university was performing on each of the aspects that they had been assigned. Eventually, during a final discussion, each participant had the opportunity to present their reflections on each aspect and have feedback from other participants. The Director of Institutional Projects moderated the final discussion to guarantee that all participants could provide their feedback. During the discussion, a mind map was constructed to help on focusing the discussion.

All feedback obtained during the session, including strengths, weaknesses and comments, was compiled by the Director of Institutional Projects on a report entitled “Qualitative analysis of ethical and professional field”. The report was sent to the chairperson for validation on the 23rd of January 2018. The final version was structured in 4 sections: participants, methodology, executive summary and a full analysis of each of the 11 aspects covered during the session. The report has 8.802 words and 19 pages.

The document was sent to the Steering Committee on the 25th of January 2018 as part of the Gap Analysis report. The final version of this report is available at the HRS4R website of the university.

Working Group 2: Recruitment

The purpose of the Recruitment working group is to perform a qualitative analysis on each of the 10 aspects defined by the Charter and Code in this field. The group was chaired by Mrs. M^a José Iza, Director of the Human Resources Office. The session was facilitated by Dr. Carlos Ripoll, Director of Institutional Projects who, in addition, was in charge of compiling all the issues raised by participants during the session and in producing the final report.



Participants to this working group were selected by the Steering Committee. The selection criterion (see later) sought to have at least one representative of each researcher career stage (R1 to R4). As a result, the following people were called to participate: Fernando Brusola (R4), Rosa Peiró (R3), Daniel Catalá (R2), Cristian Gil (R1), Joaquín de la Morena (R1) and Valentina Cristini (R1). In addition to this, it was included a representative from the Research Management Office, Juan Fuster, a representative from the Human Resources Office, Antonio Gimeno and a representative from Trade Unions, Dr. Carlos Fernández.

A 3 hours session was held on the 18th of July 2017 to work on Recruitment issues. Participants received in advance the list of the 10 aspects of this area, the description for each one stated by the Charter and Code, the methodology and what was expected from the session.

The session started with an introduction to the topic, that was made by the chairperson and the Director of Institutional Projects. Afterwards, an average of 2 aspects were assigned to each participant. Then, participants had 10 minutes of individual work, to think in terms of strengths and weakness about how the university was performing on each of the aspects that they had been assigned. Eventually, during a final discussion, each participant had the opportunity to present their reflections on each aspect and have feedback from other participants. The Director of Institutional Projects moderated the final discussion to guarantee that all participants could provide their feedback. During the discussion, a mind map was constructed to help on focusing the discussion.

All feedback obtained during the session, including strengths, weaknesses and comments, was compiled by the Director of Institutional Projects on a report entitled “Qualitative analysis of recruitment field”. The report was sent to the chairperson for validation on the 4th of October 2017. The final version was structured in 4 sections: participants, methodology, executive summary and a full analysis of each of the 10 aspects covered during the session. The report has 12.193 words and 27 pages.

The document was sent to the Steering Committee on the 4th of October 2017 as part of the gap analysis report. The final version of this report is available at the HRS4R website of the university.

Working Group 3: Working conditions and social security

The purpose of the Working Conditions and Social Security working group is to perform a qualitative analysis on each of the 14 aspects defined by the Charter and Code in this field. The group was chaired by Mrs. M^a José Iza, Director of the Human Resources Office. The session was facilitated by Dr. Carlos Ripoll, Director of Institutional Projects who, in addition, was in charge of compiling all the issues raised by participants during the session and in producing the final report of the group.

Participants to this working group were selected by the Steering Committee. The selection criterion (see later) sought to have at least one representative of each researcher career stage (R1 to R4). As a result, the following people were called to participate: Salomé Cuesta (R4), Vicente Moreno (R3), M^a Esther Gómez (R2), Stella Heras (R2), Adrián Hernández (R1) and Roberto Montes (R1). In addition to this, it was included two representatives from the Research Management Office, Dr. Emilio Rayón and Dr. Saturnino del Castillo and a representative from Trade Unions, Dr. Carlos Fernández.

A 3 hours session was held the 22nd of March 2017 to undergo with the topic of Working Conditions and Social Security. Participants received in advance the list of the 14 aspects of this area, the description for each one stated by the Charter and Code, the methodology and what was expected from the session.



The session started with an introduction to the topic, that was made by the chairperson and the Director of Institutional Projects. Afterwards, an average of 2 aspects were assigned to each participant. Then, participants had 10 minutes of individual work, to think in terms of strengths and weakness about how the university was performing on each of the aspects that they had been assigned. Eventually, during a final discussion, each participant had the opportunity to present their reflections on each aspect and have feedback from other participants. The Director of Institutional Projects moderated the final discussion to guarantee that all participants could provide their feedback. During the discussion, a mind map was constructed to help on focusing the discussion.

All feedback obtained during the session, including strengths, weaknesses and comments, was compiled by the facilitator on a report entitled “Qualitative analysis of working conditions and social security field”. The report was sent to the chairperson for validation on the 20th of December 2017. The final version was structured in 4 sections: participants, methodology, executive summary and a full analysis of each of the 14 aspects covered during the session. The report has 6.995 words and 16 pages.

The document was sent to the Steering Committee on the 20th of December 2017. The final version of this report is available at the HRS4R website of the university.

Working Group 4: Training and Career Development

The purpose of the Training and Career Development working group is to perform a qualitative analysis on each of the 5 aspects defined by the Charter and Code in that field. The group was chaired by Prof. José Manual Barat, Vice-Rector for Academic Planning and Faculty. The session was facilitated by Dr. Carlos Ripoll, Director of Institutional Projects who, in addition, was in charge of compiling all the issues raised by participants during the session and in producing the final report.



Participants to this working group were selected by the Steering Committee. The selection criterion (see later) sought to have at least one representative of each researcher career stage (R1 to R4). As a result, the following people were called to participate: Javier Ribal (R4), Mercedes Verdeguer (R3), David Gómez (R2), M^a Amparo Borrell (R2), Gerardo Martínez (R1) and Laura Montalbán (R1). In addition to this, it was included a representative from the Career Development Office, Eva González, a representative from the Doctoral Training, Juan Carcel and a representative from Trade Unions, Dr. Carlos Fernández.

A 3 hours session was held the 7th of April 2017 to work on this topic. Participants received in advance the list of the 5 aspects of this area, the description for each one stated by the Charter and Coded, the methodology and what was expected from the session.

The session started with an introduction to the topic, that was made by the chairperson and the Director of Institutional Projects. Afterwards, an average of 2 aspects were assigned to each participant. Then, participants had 10 minutes of individual work, to think in terms of strengths and weakness about how the university was performing on each of the aspects that they had been assigned. Eventually, during a final discussion, each participant had the opportunity to present their reflections on each aspect and have feedback from other participants. The Director of Institutional Projects moderated the final discussion to guarantee that all participants could provide their feedback. During the discussion, a mind map was constructed to help on focusing the discussion.

All feedback obtained during the session, including strengths, weaknesses and comments, were compiled by the facilitator on a report entitled “Qualitative analysis of training and career development field”. The report was sent to the chairperson for validation on the 12th of December 2017. The final version was structured in 4 sections: participants, methodology, executive summary and a full analysis of each of the 5 aspects covered during the session. The report has 3.878 words and 10 pages.

The document was sent to the Steering Committee as part of the gap analysis report on the 12th of December 2017. The final version of this report is available at the HRS4R website of the university.

Working Group 5: Legal Framework

The goal of this working group was to identify legal constrains that could affect the development of the HRS4R process. Its members, the Director of the Legal Office and the Director of Human Resources, were in charge of analysing existing European, national and regional legislation together with all internal regulations related with scientific research. The Director of Institutional Projects was in charge of facilitating the whole process and producing a report based on their feedback and some other additional information that could be obtained from research funding bodies.

The result of this working group was a compilation of 75 regulations, both external and internal to the university. They were presented on a double entrance table format, with regulations in rows and aspects of the Charter and Code in columns. It was then possible to determine the weight of each regulation on each aspect.

In addition to that, it was presented a report containing 3.520 words and 15 pages and covering the key findings of this analysis.

UPV Research Community

The aim of this group is to validate quantitatively the work done during previous phases to construct the gap analysis and the action plan. The population for this survey was the whole

research community (2.495 researchers). They were asked to complete an online questionnaire.

The questionnaire was designed with the information obtained from the different working groups after the final validation of the Steering Committee (see above).

Results show how highly committed is the research community with the HRS4R process: the number of respondents to the survey was 1.374, almost 60% of the entire population, a figure significantly higher than any other HRS4R online survey publicly available in Spain.

Eventually, once the online survey was analysed, we obtained a list of improvement areas prioritised and a list of improvement actions that would be the ground to build the action plan.

Results were presented during a dissemination event on the 22nd of October 2018 called “Designing the Human Resources Strategy at UPV”. The goal of this event was to present to the research community the results and to exchange face to face feedback with attendees. For that purpose the whole sessions was designed following round tables and interviews format. Speakers were the Vice-Rector for Research and Technology Transfer, the Director for Institutional Projects, the Responsible of International Science of the Spanish Foundation for Science and Technology (FECYT), the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs and Faculty, the Director of the Research Management Office, representatives from R1-R4 and a representative from Trade Unions. The session was recorded and is available at the HRS4R website

Trade Unions

The aim of this group is to validate quantitatively the work done during previous phases to construct the gap analysis and the action plan. The population for this survey was the whole research community (2.495 researchers). They were asked to complete an online questionnaire.

The questionnaire was designed with the information obtained from the different working groups after the final validation of the Steering Committee (see above).

Results show how highly committed is the research community with the HRS4R process: the number of respondents to the survey was 1.374, almost 60% of the entire population, a figure significantly higher than any other HRS4R online survey publicly available in Spain.

Eventually, once the online survey was analysed, we obtained a list of improvement areas prioritised and a list of improvement actions that would be the ground to build the action plan.

Results were presented during a dissemination event on the 22nd of October 2018 called “Designing the Human Resources Strategy at UPV”. The goal of this event was to present to the research community the results and to exchange face to face feedback with attendees.

For that purpose the whole sessions was designed following round tables and interviews format. Speakers were the Vice-Rector for Research and Technology Transfer, the Director for Institutional Projects, the Responsible of International Science of the Spanish Foundation for Science and Technology (FECYT), the Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs and Faculty, the Director of the Research Management Office, representatives from R1-R4 and a representative from Trade Unions. The session was recorded and is available at the HRS4R website

Committee overseeing the process

The Vice-Rector for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer (VRITT) was in charge of appointing members for the Steering Committee. The criterion to select its members was to include representatives from each research stage (R1 to R4) and key people involved, on a broad sense, on facilitating research.

Fourteen people were called to become part of the committee. The VRITT acted as chairperson. Vice-Rector for Academic Planning and Faculty, the Director of Research and Innovation Programs, the Director of Human Resources, the Director of the Office of the Secretary General, the Coordinator of R&D, the Director of the Research Management Office, the Director of the Technology Transfer Office. Additionally, trade unions were called to propose a candidate to be part of the Steering Committee were included. The group the Director of Institutional Projects was added to conduct the process. Finally, a total of 4 researchers (R1 to R4) were appointed. Their role would be to act as representatives from their research mates, appointing also members for the working groups.

The list of members was submitted to the Governing Council, which ratified its composition on the 28th of October 2016. On the 13th of March 2018 an update on the list was approved.

Working Group responsible for the implementation

For the implementation of HRS4R process it has been considered the following parameters: number of researchers (more than 2.400), number of administrative staff (more than 1.600) and number of students (more than 25.000). Research activity is made in departments and in research institutes. In addition, it has also been taken into consideration how the Charter and Code is organised: there are 4 areas and 40 different principles (aspects).

In order to implement the HRS4R process it is foreseen to have the same 4 thematic working groups that were set up for the definition of the HRS4R process: Working group on Ethical and Professional issues (WG1), Working Group on Recruitment (WG2), Working Group on Working Conditions and Social Security (WG3) and Working Group on Training and Career development (WG4). Each working group includes representatives from R1-R4, technology transfer management, human resources management, research management, trade unions and the legal department.

GAP ANALYSIS

Introduction

The Charter and Code provides the basis for the Gap analysis. In order to aid cohesion, the 40 articles have been renumbered under headings called “aspects” grouped in 4 categories. In this document we provide the outcome of our organisation’s GAP analysis below. If we do not fully meet the criteria, we provide a list whether national or organisational legislation may be limiting the Charter’s implementation, initiatives that have already been taken to improve the situation or new proposals that could remedy the current situation.

Each aspect has been analysed following the methodology described in the document “Process”. As a result, there is a level of accomplishment for each aspect, according to the following scale:

- +: fully implemented
- +/-: almost but not fully implemented
- -/+: partially implemented
- - -: insufficiently implemented

Additionally, in each aspect we describe the current situation (gap) and those initiatives undertaken or suggestions for improvement. The document “Action Plan” will select certain actions that are supposed to reduce the gap we encountered.

The document complies with the following structure:

- Name of the aspect
- Descriptive text of each aspect: it will help the reader to understand better the gap
- Implementation: this will show to what extent the UPV meets that aspect, using the following scale:
- Actual gap (300 words maximum): In case of --, -/+, or +/-, we indicate the actual “gap” between the principle and the current practice in the organisation. When relevant, we list any national/regional legislation or organisational regulation currently impeding implementation
- Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement (200 words maximum): We present a first draft of potential suggestions for improvement, but it should not be misunderstood as the action plan (see template 3)

Ethical and Professional Aspects

Research freedom (1): +/-

Researchers should focus their research for the good of mankind and for expanding the frontiers of scientific knowledge, while enjoying the freedom of thought and expression, and the freedom to identify methods by which problems are solved, according to recognised ethical principles and practices. Researchers should recognise the limitations to this freedom that could arise as a result of particular research circumstances (including supervision / guidance /management) or operational constraints, e.g. for budgetary or infrastructural

reasons or, especially in the industrial sector, for reasons of intellectual property protection. Such limitations should not, however, contravene recognised ethical principles and practices, to which researchers have to adhere.

Gap:

No one would dispute the fact that researchers have “the freedom to identify methods by which problems are solved, according to recognised ethical principles and practices”, but it seems researchers have a diverse understanding of what “research freedom” means. It is worth to mention that research topics are dictated by external funding bodies, with no consideration to each researcher perspective. Themes are defined in different calls for proposals and researchers have no other option than alining their activities to those topics. This can harm emerging areas that are not on the main stream of funding bodies. This situation is exacerbated in those researchers on earlier stages (R1-R2), who are very dependent on external funding to support their activity and, moreover, their own contracts. Hence, it could be said that research autonomy could be constrained by the actual contractual framework of each individual. In addition to that, supervision is sometimes misunderstood by PhD candidates as a constraint to their research freedom. Additionally, we consider that there is no clear understanding of the implications and limitations of “research freedom”.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Spanish Constitution 1978	General framework for R&D and innovation activities
Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007)	
Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	Code of good practices in research and scientific integrity
Organic Law 4/2007, of 12th April, modifying Organic law 6/2001, 21st December, on Universities.	Bylaws

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Explore connections between funding bodies, the UPV Doctorate School and the university governing board.
- Doctorate School training activities should consider to include the funding schemes as part of its program
- Analyse existing working conditions for researchers funded by external bodies to determine the possibility to allocate a certain part of dedicating part of their working time to other topics, not necessarily connected to the funded activity
- Better explain the role of the supervisor in relation to the PhD candidate

Ethical principles (2): +/-

Researchers should adhere to the recognised ethical practices and fundamental ethical principles appropriate to their discipline(s) as well as to ethical standards as documented in the different national, sectoral or institutional Codes of Ethics.

Gap:

It is widely admitted that researchers are aware of the ethical principles both in terms of existing ethical codes and good practices. This aspect is strongly regulated by different national and regional legislation that the university and every researcher must comply with. In addition, the university established 2 bodies directly connected with ethical issues: the Ethical Commission and the Commission for Biomedical Research.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
<p>Directive 2001/18/CE of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12th March of 2001 on the deliberate release into the environment of genetically modified organisms and repealing Council Directive 90/220/EEC</p> <p>Directive 2009/41/CE of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6th May 2009 on the contained use of genetically modified micro-organisms</p> <p>Directive 2010/63/UE of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22nd September of 2010 on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes</p> <p>Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007)</p> <p>Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)</p> <p>Royal Decree 1716/2011, of November 18</p> <p>Order/Decree 9/2012 of data protection and security of information by the Valencian Ministry of Health</p> <p>Royal Decree 2132/2004, of 29 October in stem cells</p> <p>Royal Decree 223/2004 of 6 February in clinical essays</p> <p>Spanish law on personal data protection (15/1999)</p> <p>Royal Decree of animal protection in experimentation (1201/2005)</p> <p>Royal Decree 53/2013, of 1st February, establishing applied basic rules for animals protection used in experimentations and other scientific purposes including teaching.</p>	<p>Conflicts of interest code of conduct</p> <p>Ombudsman regulation</p> <p>Code for good practices in research</p> <p>Ethics Commission</p> <p>Bylaws</p>

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Disseminate the Ethics Committee activities and its role among the research community

Professional responsibility (3): +/-

Researchers should make every effort to ensure that their research is relevant to society and does not duplicate research previously carried out elsewhere. They must avoid plagiarism of any kind and abide by the principle of intellectual property and joint data ownership in the case of research carried out in collaboration with a supervisor(s) and/or other researchers. The need to validate new observations by showing that experiments are reproducible should not be interpreted as plagiarism, provided that the data to be confirmed are explicitly quoted. Researchers should ensure, if any aspect of their work is delegated, that the person to whom it is delegated has the competence to carry it out .

Gap:

Research relevance is guaranteed by the fact that publicly funded calls are supposed to support only relevant research. As discussed in aspect 1, researchers must align their activities to those themes defined in the call, so it could be said that having research activity supported by public external financing qualifies a research activity as relevant. During the different sessions, it was admitted that researchers were aware of their responsibility to conduct research oriented to societal needs. Nonetheless, there was some discussion on whether research activity is driven by societal challenges or, sometimes, driven by the need of each individual to progress on the career ladder.

The level of understanding of intellectual property issues, seems to be co-related with the researcher experience: some R1 researchers are not aware of how intellectual property affect them and have little understanding about research results ownership.

In terms of professional responsibility as such, it was argued that those researchers that are still being trained should have different duties than those better experienced. They must be clearly recognised as personnel in training. In the case of people doing PhD it is not very clear that both supervisor and the PhD candidate know who is responsible of what

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science , Technology and Innovation	Conflicts of interest code of conduct
Law of Research Patent and utility models (11/1986) 20 March	
Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- To raise the awareness of the relevance of the intellectual property issues by organising open seminars
- To disseminate data protection issues by organising open seminars addressed to the whole research community
- To introduce the topic of research ownership in R1 training activities

Professional attitude (4): -/+

Researchers should be familiar with the strategic goals governing their research environment and funding mechanisms, and should seek all necessary approvals before starting their research or accessing the resources provided. They should inform their employers, funders or supervisor when their research project is delayed, redefined or completed, or give notice if it is to be terminated earlier or suspended for whatever reason.

Gap:

Whilst the university has established strict monitoring tools to control everything around economic management at large, those controls does not provide the level of granularity required to monitor research project management. Therefore, researchers are responsible for the project life cycle, but the university only participates at the beginning, to formalise the contracts, and at the end, to justify the grant against the funding body. However, throughout the life cycle of the project, there are no clear control mechanisms to determine if commitments made in the grant agreement are being fully satisfied. Researchers, in general, even those with engineering backgrounds, suffer from the lack of basic theory about project management, and more specifically from research project management. It is important to remark that by “management” we do not mean “administrative management”, we refer to management techniques that involve planning, organisation, resource allocation and control.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	General framework for R&D and innovation activities at UPV
Royal Decree 63/2006 of January 27 approving the Statute for research personnel in training	Policy on scientific integrity and good practices in research
Spanish State Plan on Scientific and Technic Research and Innovation 2013-2016	Regulation on research structures
	Researchers' Rights and Responsibilities
	Code for good practices in research

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Evaluate the possibility to apply UNE standards for project management
- It is considered that it would be appropriate to prepare manuals and guidelines to promote good practices on project management

- The researcher should be aware of what it means to carry out a project within a very regulatory framework that could be considered restrictive. The denial of this regulatory framework usually entails numerous frustrations on the part of researchers who cannot do what they "consider most appropriate at all times" and end up blaming the problems on the university

Contractual and legal obligations (5): +/-

Researchers at all levels must be familiar with the national, sectoral or institutional regulations governing training and/or working conditions. This includes Intellectual Property Rights regulations, and the requirements and conditions of any sponsor or funders, independently of the nature of their contract. Researchers should adhere to such regulations by delivering the required results (e.g. thesis, publications, patents, reports, new products development, etc) as set out in the terms and conditions of the contract or equivalent document

Gap:

It was discussed that researchers on early stages (R1 and R2) do not have the same knowledge of contractual and legal obligations as other researchers on later stages. This is due to the fact that legal obligations are established by a wide variety of external funding bodies, with different regulations. In additions, calls are usually increasing heterogeneity. Conditions should have to be in accordance with national or local regulations, but the mesh of the 3, makes difficult to have a clear understanding of the situation.

Additionally, pre-doctoral researchers have teaching requirements as part of their contract, but it is not always possible to match their expertise with the actual teaching needs on each Department, making its implementation a tough matter. This situation undermines career development, preventing them from accumulating the teaching experience required for future promotions.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Organic Law of Universities (6/2001)	General framework for R&D and innovation activities at UPV
Spanish Law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science , Technology and Innovation.	Directive for pre-docs
Organic law 4/2007, 12th April, modifying Organic law 6/2001, 21st December, on Universities.	Conflicts of interest code of conduct
Law of Research Patent and utility models (11/1986)	Regulation on research structures
Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007)	Directive for teaching collaborations and research personnel
Royal Decree 1/1995 of 24 March, approving the revised text of the Law of the Workers' Statute	General framework for academic activities (NOA)
Royal Decree 63/2006, of 27th January, approving Statute for research staff in training	Doctorate School regulation
Royal Decree Legislative 2/2015, of 23 rd October, approving the restated text of Law on the Statute of rights of workers	Regulation for doctorate studies
EU law for EC funded projects	

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Greater transparency and greater connection between the funding agency and the Doctoral School would be welcomed.
- Open seminars about contractual and legal obligations and working conditions for R1 and R2 researchers
- Design a monitoring system for project management
- Matchmaking platform of teaching needs and R1 researchers teaching capabilities

Accountability (6): +/-

Researchers need to be aware that they are accountable towards their employers, funders or other related public or private bodies as well as, on more ethical grounds, towards society as a whole. In particular, researchers funded by public funds are also accountable for the efficient use of taxpayers' money. Consequently, they should adhere to the principles of sound, transparent and efficient financial management and cooperate with any authorised audits of their research, whether undertaken by their employers/funders or by ethics committees. Methods of collection and analysis, the outputs and, where applicable, details of the data should be open to internal and external scrutiny, whenever necessary and as requested by the appropriate authorities.

Gap:

The discussion around this aspect focused in good research project management as a mean to be countable. In aspect number 4, we mentioned how the university has introduced strict controls and regulations in the field of economics. Changes on regulatory frameworks and requirements from the different financial bodies, have made those changes a must in order to be eligible for research projects. Whilst that should be considered positive, researchers had a different perception about this fact, and expressed disgust regarding how the rise of control mechanisms has derived in a huge increase in bureaucracy and paperwork, affecting their capability to run a project successfully. Researchers consider that the university has failed to create a framework that balance the requirements from existing regulatory frameworks with the agility required to run successfully research projects at an international scale. We could say that there is a divorce between the researcher community, which considers that “the university is bureaucratic and not agile” and the management staff that those complain come from a subtle ignorance by researchers on their responsibilities within existing legal frameworks and regulations.

Regarding accountability the spot was on project operational controls and project results assessments, but not so much on audits. Researchers complain about the lack of an standardised procedure, with specific instructions, on how the research results are supposed to be assessed, and what can be a matter of an audit. The issue of fragmentation among calls arise again: monitoring mechanism vary widely among each funding body.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Law of Research Patent and utility models (11/1986) 20 March	General framework for R&D and innovation activities at UPV
Law 38/2003, of 17th November, on General Subsidies	Research Activity Index regulation
Law 19/2013, of 9th December on Transparency, Access to public information and good governance	
Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007)	
Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	
Royal Decree 887/2006 of 21 July, approving the regulations of the Law 38/2003 of November 17, General Grant Management	

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Establish a standard process to assess existing research projects in terms of their contractual obligations
- Analyse existing research project management processes in order to improve managerial efficiency and monitoring capabilities of the institution
- To provide web tools for researchers to monitor project progress

Good practice in research (7): -/+

Researchers should at all times adopt safe working practices, in line with national legislation, including taking the necessary precautions for health and safety and for recovery from information technology disasters, e.g. by preparing proper back-up strategies. They should also be familiar with the current national legal requirements regarding data protection and confidentiality protection requirements, and undertake the necessary steps to fulfil them at all times.

Gap:

Researchers acknowledge that there is a general framework for labor risk prevention and the existence of a general occupational hazard prevention services at the university. It is true to say that the university fulfils all requirements set by the existing legal framework, but researchers manifest that research activities are very heterogeneous, causing specific issues difficult to deal with from a general approach. Overall, they concluded, that existing working conditions are suitable for developing their research activity in a safe manner.

Regarding protection against information loss and data protection, participants mentioned different practices they use. Nonetheless it was crystal clear that research practices has no institutional policy to prevent information loss. Things like backup copies are left at the individual will, with no preventive policy established from the institution. There were even some participants that raised their concerns on some people using private computers or external services to perform backup copies. This becomes highly relevant when working with sensitive data or research that have specific confidentiality clauses. No mention has been made either of data encryption or the use of university computing resources to safeguard the results of a project.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Spanish Constitution 1978	General framework for R&D and innovation activities at UPV
Law 31/1995, of November 8, Prevention of occupational hazards	Policy on scientific integrity and good practices in research
Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007)	Regulation on research structures
Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	Researchers' Rights and Responsibilities
Law of Science (14/2011) Spanish Committee of Research Ethics. Ninth Additional Provision. Protection of personal data	Code for good practices in research
Spanish law on personal data protection (15/1999)	Conflicts of interest code of conduct
EU Global data Protection Regulation	Regulations of the Prevention of Occupational Hazards Committee
	Code for good practices in research

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- There has been several talks by security experts to rise the awareness on the importance of data protection in research
- A code of good practice on safeguarding information and data related to research should be developed and disseminated.
- A catalogue of IT services for research projects should be prepared and be part of the assessment process defined in aspect 6
- Include the topic of information loss and data protection on a guide for research project management
- Define a code of good practices on data protection and information loss

Dissemination, exploitation of results (8): +/-

All researchers should ensure, in compliance with their contractual arrangements, that the results of their research are disseminated and exploited, e.g. communicated, transferred into other research settings or, if appropriate, commercialised. Senior researchers, in particular, are expected to take a lead in ensuring that research is fruitful and that results are either exploited commercially or made accessible to the public (or both) whenever the opportunity arises

Gap:

The Universitat Politècnica de València has always been a front runner in terms of exploitation of results, as it is widely acknowledge by external bodies like the Spanish National Agency for Accreditation as well as higher education rankings. As a result of an assessment conducted by the National Agency for Accreditation, UPV has performed 8

points over the average of the Spanish Higher Education System, and an outstanding 53% of the total researchers participating in the study have obtained a recognition for their work in technology transfer on a 6 year tram basis. Additionally UPV has always performed as the most active university in terms of exploitation of research results among the Spanish higher education system. The last edition of the U-Ranking (IVIE-Fundación BBVA) demonstrates that UPV is positioned among the top-5 universities in Spain in different indicators related with technology transfer, like licenses, contracts and patents.

It can be said that researchers, and the institution as a whole, are aware about the relevance of exploiting research results. Nonetheless, during the gap analysis it has been detected that researchers complain about the lack of recognition of exploitation compared with research. An action on this field could push numbers even higher. Additionally, researchers have expressed their willingness to have a better understanding of the different mechanism of dissemination and exploitation of results.

In terms of dissemination, the university has been pioneering the open access initiatives in the Spanish Higher Education System. The last edition of the open access monitor shows that almost 70% of research results were flagged as open, and available for the research international community. The institutional repository, established more than 10 years ago as a result of the endorsement of the Budapest Open Access Initiative and the Berlin Declaration, host more than 220.000 collections of content like publications, PhD dissertations, multimedia material or congress proceedings. Additionally, an institutional policy was set up on 2011 to promote open access and dissemination of results.

It can be concluded that the main gap detected is related with the recognition of exploitation and dissemination activities.

Links of interest:

Results on the national assessment on research results to market: <http://www.aneca.es/Sala-de-prensa/Noticias/2020/Concluida-la-evaluacion-del-proyecto-piloto-de-sexenios-de-transferencia>

U-Ranking: <https://www.u-ranking.es/en/analisis.php>

“Riunet” institutional repository: <https://riunet.upv.es>

Open access institutional policy: https://riunet.upv.es/bitstream/handle/10251/11342/Politica-acceso-abierto_UPV.pdf?sequence=10&isAllowed=y

UPV Open Access Monitor: <https://poliscience.blogs.upv.es/monitor-upv-del-acceso-abierto/>

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
<p>Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007)</p> <p>Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)</p> <p>Royal Decree (55/2002) of 18 January - exploitation inventions in public research bodies</p> <p>Guidelines on the Implementation of Open Access to Scientific Publications and Research Data in Projects supported by the European Research Council under Horizon 2020</p>	<p>Research Activity Index regulation</p>

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- The university already has dedicated personnel to dissemination and technology transfer
- There is a blog and a newsletter aimed to reach society at large and rise awareness of the impact of research in society
- The recent introduction of the 6-years national recognition of technology transfer activities by the national government is considered positive
- Adjust the UPV research assessment system to increase the weight of dissemination and exploitation
- Open seminars on the relevance of dissemination and exploitation
- Training on the different mechanisms to exploit research results: patents, licenses and contracts

Public engagement (9): -/+

Researchers should ensure that their research activities are made known to society at large in such a way that they can be understood by non-specialists, thereby improving the public's understanding of science. Direct engagement with the public will help researchers to better understand public interest in priorities for science and technology and also the public's concerns

Gap:

See aspect 8

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007) Law of the Sustainable Economy (2/2011) March 4th Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	General framework for R&D and innovation activities at UPV: Policy on scientific integrity and good practices in research Regulation on research structures Researchers' Rights and Responsibilities Code for good practices in research Conflicts of interest code of conduct

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

See aspect 8

Non discrimination (10): +/-

Employers and/or funders of researchers will not discriminate against researchers in any way on the basis of gender, age, ethnic, national or social origin, religion or belief, sexual orientation, language, disability, political opinion, social or economic condition.

Gap:

There are strict regulations, both internal and external, aimed to diminish any potential discrimination in terms of gender, age, ethnic, national or social origin, religion or belief, sexual orientation, disability, political opinion or social or economic conditions. Nonetheless, it is true to say that there is still room for improvement. Participants raised issues concerning language and gender balance (i.e. if we analyse the different research positions, we find that most of "full professors" (R1) positions are men).

Languages is also acknowledge as a source of discrimination. Despite the fact of being in a bilingual community, where Spanish and Valencian should be used interchangeably, it is far to be true in daily life. In addition, recruitment calls are not published in different languages, like English, reducing the options to attract foreign researchers benefiting only to those fluent in Spanish.

UPV's policy regarding work-family balance, called "Plan Concilia", should be reviewed. Participants acknowledged that some researchers are unaware of the Plan Concilia, restraining them from some rights that they already have.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Spanish Constitution 1978	Directive for pre-docs
Organic Law for the effective equality between women and men (3/2007) of 22 March	Gender balance regulation
Law 31/1995, of November 8, Prevention of occupational hazards	Regulation on temporal academic staff selection
Resolution of 20 May 2011, the Secretary of State for Public Service. Gender Balance in Public bodies	Regulation on permanent academic staff selection
Royal Decree 5/2015 Basic law civil servants	Regulation on R2 recruitment
Law of the Sustainable Economy (2/2011) March 4th	Regulation for effective work-family balance
Royal Decree Legislative 2/2015, of 23rd October, approving the restated text of Law on the Statute of rights of workers.	

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- STEM: a special attention should be given to the policies of recruitment of female students in the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths)
- Translate into English and Valencian every recruitment call
- Open seminars regarding working life balance

Evaluation / appraisal systems (11): +/-

Employers and/or funders should introduce for all researchers, including senior researchers, evaluation/appraisal systems for assessing their professional performance on a regular basis and in a transparent manner by an independent (and, in the case of senior researchers, preferably international) committee.

Gap:

Participants acknowledged the existence of an in-house systematic mechanism to monitor research activity. This system is based on an indicator called “Research Activity Index”, and it has several implications in terms of salaries and teaching responsibilities. The discussion focused on potential amendments to the Research Activity Index (RAI) so that a better measure of research activity could be achieved.

In addition, the discussion focused on potential discriminations that could arise from the indicator itself, mainly for those researchers with no teaching responsibilities. The index ranks higher those researchers holding a national recognition on research (6-years terms), but this recognition is only available to those researchers with teaching capabilities. Hence, researchers with no teaching capabilities are usually ranked lower than the rest.

There is a committee in charge of the RAI, but all members are part of the institution. It was pointed out as a source of potential conflict of interests.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Royal Decree (1052/2002)	Research Activity Index regulation
Royal Decree 5/2015 Basic law civil servants	General framework for academic activities (NOA)
Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007)	
Royal Decree 63/2006 of January 27 approving the Statute for research personnel in training	
Royal Decree 887/2006 of 21 July, approving the regulations of the Law 38/2003 of November 17, General Grant Management. Article 60 1. Evaluation criteria	
Spanish Law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science , Technology and Innovation	
Royal Decree 1086/1989, of 28th August, on university teaching staff remunerations, modified by Royal Decrees 1949/1995, of 1st December, 74/2000 of 21st January and 1325/2002	
Order of 2nd December 1994 establishing the proceeding to assess the research activity in development of Royal Decree 1086/1989, of 28th /August, on university teaching staff remunerations, updated by Order of 16th November 2000 and modified by Order CIN/3040/2008, of 20th October	

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- To include the H index as part of the UPV Research Activity Index
- To reduce the gap between academic and non-academic researchers in terms of research appraisal
- To add external experts on the Research Activity Index Commission

Recruitment and Selection

Recruitment (12): -/+

Employers and/or funders should ensure that the entry and admission standards for researchers, particularly at the beginning at their careers, are clearly specified and should also facilitate access for disadvantaged groups or for researchers returning to a research career, including teachers (of any level) returning to a research career. Employers and/or funders of researchers should adhere to the principles set out in the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers when appointing or recruiting researchers.

Gap:

Participants made clear that, in terms of recruitment, there are two streams: those researchers with a teaching profile and those with no teaching profile. Whilst the first follow a very standardised process (externally defined by the Ministry but locally driven by the University) the latter fall on a sort of ambiguous status guided by external funding bodies where uncertainty rules the situation.

When recruiting researcher, usually R1 or R2, for externally funded projects, the institution is certainly the employer, but plays a low profile role compared to R4 researchers who act usually as their employers “de facto”, having a predominant role. Participants complain that job description is vaguely defined and working conditions are not clearly stated. More over, some argue that job description is too static and, in many cases, does not evolve accordingly to what the researcher does in practice: it should be noticed that the role of the researcher in the project may change during project life cycle, while his/her working conditions and job description may not.

During the discussion there was no mention to individuals moving from a teaching career to a research career neither a mention to the admission of disadvantage groups. Disadvantaged groups are clearly regulated by law, with a reserved a quota of job provision that the university must comply.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Spanish Constitution, 27th December 1978	Regulation for visiting professors
Organic Law 6/2011, of 21st December, of Universities.	Directive for pre-docs
Spanish Law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science , Technology and Innovation	Gender balance regulation
Royal Decree (1312/2007) - National accreditation for university teachers	Regulation on temporal academic staff selection
Royal Decree (1313/2007) - Public procurement for university teachers	Regulation on permanent academic staff selection
Order CIN/2657/2008 to regulate the administrative procedure for research activity assessment. Pre-Researchers	Regulation on R2 recruitment
Royal Decree 5/2015 Basic law civil servants Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	UPV Bylaws
Royal Decree Legislative 2/2015, of 23 rd October, approving the restated text of Law on the Statute of rights of workers	
Royal Decree 63/2006 of January 27 approving the Statue for research personnel in training	
Royal Decree Legislative 1/2013, of 29th November approving the restated text of General Law on rights of disabled people and their social inclusion	
LO 3/2007, of 22nd March, on effective equality between Women and Men.	

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- To define a new profile of generic researcher that could intervene in different research projects without needing to repetitively hired for each project.
- To publish standards for recruitment of researchers that will participate on externally funded projects

Recruitment - Code (13): +/-

Employers and/or funders should establish recruitment procedures which are open, efficient, transparent, supportive and internationally comparable, as well as tailored to the type of positions advertised. Advertisements should give a broad description of knowledge and

competencies required, and should not be so specialised as to discourage suitable applicants. Employers should include a description of the working conditions and entitlements, including career development prospects. Moreover, the time allowed between the advertisement of the vacancy or the call for applications and the deadline for reply should be realistic.

Gap:

It is mandatory to advertise, at least, every job vacancy in these websites:

- The Official Journal of the Valencian Regional Government, known as DOCV, and accessible via a public website
- The Official Journal of the Universitat Politècnica de València, known as BOUPV and accessible via a public website
- The website of the Human Resources Department

Additionally, Marie Curie positions are advertised on the Euraxess platform and some research institutes replicate the job advertisement on their own websites. The university complies with the existing legal framework, listed below, which guarantees that our recruitment policy is open, transparent, merit based and internationally comparable. Nonetheless since only a small fraction of the job posts are advertised in English, that creates a discrimination among potential international researchers coming from non Spanish speaking countries. This situation is probably one of the root causes of having such a low number of international researchers (5% at the moment of preparing this strategy). Hence, it cannot be said that a fully OTM-R policy is implemented, beyond the legal requirements.

Participants in the process pointed out that recruitment and selection processes should be reviewed according to the Charter and Code Principles, improving areas like the information provided after a candidate has been evaluated, the performance of the candidates during the interviewing process or the lack of good practices to advertise a position. More effort should be done on the advertisement practices, going beyond the official channels, by publishing job positions in other platforms like LinkedIn or Research Gate. “The publication of every research position on Euraxess should be mandatory”, participants acknowledged.

Links of interest:

The Official Journal of the Valencian Regional Government: www.dogv.gva.es/va/

The Official Journal of the Universitat Politècnica de València, <https://www.upv.es/entidades/SG/infoweb/sg/info/513084normalc.html>

The website of the Human Resources Department: www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/conypi/indexnormalc.html

Recruitment process: https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/menu_1015490c.html

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Spanish Constitution, 27th December 1978	Regulation for visiting professors
Organic Law 6/2011, of 21st December, of Universities.	Directive for pre-docs
Spanish Law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science , Technology and Innovation	Gender balance regulation
Royal Decree (1312/2007) - National accreditation for university teachers	Regulation on temporal academic staff selection
Royal Decree (1313/2007) - Public procurement for university teachers	Regulation on permanent academic staff selection
Order CIN/2657/2008 to regulate the administrative procedure for research activity assessment. Pre-Researchers	Regulation on R2 recruitment
Royal Decree 5/2015 Basic law civil servants Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	UPV Bylaws
Royal Decree Legislative 2/2015, of 23 rd October, approving the restated text of Law on the Statute of rights of workers	
Royal Decree 63/2006 of January 27 approving the Statue for research personnel in training	
Royal Decree Legislative 1/2013, of 29th November approving the restated text of General Law on rights of disabled people and their social inclusion	
LO 3/2007, of 22nd March, on effective equality between Women and Men.	

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Detailed Assessment report for every position
- Good practices for recruitment
- Translation of every single job advertisement to English
- Advertise every research position on Euraxess
- Crossposting of job positions on other platforms, like LinkedIn or Research Gate
- Define an explicit OTM-R policy
-

Selection - Code (14): +/-

Selection committees should bring together diverse expertise and competences and should have an adequate gender balance and, where appropriate and feasible, include members from different sectors (public and private) and disciplines, including from other countries and

with relevant experience to assess the candidate. Whenever possible, a wide range of selection practices should be used, such as external expert assessment and face-to-face interviews. Members of selection panels should be adequately trained should be realistic.

Gap:

It could be said that people participating in selection committees are well fit to that position, they are knowledgeable of its area of expertise and have the necessary requirements to make an objective selection of the best candidate. Nonetheless, participants complained about an unbalanced situation in terms of gender inclusion. It is true to say that it is not always possible to set up a gender balance committee mainly because women R1 researchers are fewer, so it is not always possible to fulfil the gender balance requirement.

Participation of people from the private sector in selection committees is currently forbidden by law. Nonetheless, international members could be possible, but there is not always the necessary budget allocated to support this kind of international selection committees.

The most disgusting issue raised by participants is that the selection criteria for R1-R2 researchers is totally outdated, with a model that comes from 20 years ago but that has not suffered any kind of update since then. In addition to that, the criteria ask for certain requisites that are not connected at all with the research activity. Moreover, the aspects it assess are quickly saturated so that is finally up to the researcher to select the best candidate by the use of the so-called "suitability coefficient". This coefficient is supposed to assess non-quantitative aspects but, at the end, is the one which determines who is selected and who is not.

Public advertising of research positions is done, but channels are not considered to be the best, specially if the aim is to attract international candidates.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Organic Law 6/2011, of 21st December, of Universities.	Directive for pre-docs
Royal Decree Legislative 5/2015, of 30th October approving the restated text of Law on the Statute of rights of workers	Research Activity Index regulation
Royal Decree (1312/2007) - National accreditation for university teachers	Regulation on temporal academic staff selection
Royal Decree (1313/2007) - Public procurement for university teachers	Regulation on permanent academic staff selection
Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	Regulation on R2 recruitment
	UPV Bylaws

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Allocate an specific budget to setup international selection committees
- Increase the participation of women in selection committees
- Participants consider that it would be useful to have some pre-selection system for researchers with temporary contracts
- To advertise international job positions
- To setup a recruitment procedure based on generic research lines that are not so tightened to specific research projects

Transparency - Code (15): +/-

Candidates should be informed, prior to the selection, about the recruitment process and the selection criteria, the number of available positions and the career development prospects. They should also be informed after the selection process about the strengths and weaknesses of their applications.

Gap:

In order to have an understanding of the recruitment policies at UPV, criterion 13 can be consulted. The existing of an open, transparent, merit based and internationally comparable process is out of the question, but a lack of international visibility is to be addressed as part of the HRS4R process. The links provided include multitude of examples that offer a clear understanding of the process, from the job advertisement to the final decision. Job descriptions and the scale used to assess every candidate is also available. The university has approved different regulations in order to demonstrate that transparency is enacted, like the regulation on temporal academic staff selection, approved by the Governing Council , the regulation on permanent academic staff selection the regulation of academic staff selection, or the regulation for R1 and R2 recruitment. Examples of the different kind of calls can be consulted on the following links:

Hiring process for researchers working for research projects: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/conypi/591169normalc.html>

Hiring process for permanent and temporal researchers with teaching responsibilities: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/pdi/579825normalc.html>

Nonetheless, participants acknowledge that the feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the applicants in the selection process is far from being sufficient. The selection process is conducted by the Human Resources Department at the request of the principal researcher. If the researcher is going to be hired as part of a research project, additional conditions may apply, but is the principal researcher the one who sparks the process. When a teaching background is required, the process is initiated at the Head of Academic Department's request. In both cases the Human Resources Department is in charge of the administrative process, and partly responsible for the communication with potential candidates. The principal researcher or the academic department is in charge of most of the process, like the CV evaluation or the interview. Though it is mandatory to follow a scale previously published and assessed, candidates only receive the final result, with no further elaboration on the discussions hold by the selection committee in those parts considered qualitative, like the

interview. Parts flagged as quantitative are adequately established, though quickly staffed, that is why the discussion about the “suitability coefficient” surfaces as a main weakness of the system in terms of transparency.

However the situation, the hiring of temporary research staff can be considered transparent, though participants made clear that “clarity on the use of the so-called ‘suitability coefficient’ would be welcomed”. Hence, the use of such an indicator is considered a weakness of the whole process in terms of transparency, and something that should be addressed during the HRS4R process.

The selection process of researchers with teaching responsibilities is also on the spot, mainly because the National Agency in charge of accrediting academic curricula suffers from a lack of transparency due to the reduced amount of information provided in how decisions are made. Academics submit their curricula but they never get any concrete feedback on the scoring received. That feedback is considered of the utmost importance for researchers, because it can provide a path to direct their career. Hence, any potential improvement on the evaluation of the academic curriculum is undermined by this, and the Agency should be encouraged to enhance the information provided to academic researchers.

Links of interest:

Regulation on temporal academic staff selection: <https://www.upv.es/entidades/SG/infoweb/sg/info/U0615103.pdf>

Regulation on permanent academic staff selection: https://riunet.upv.es/bitstream/handle/10251/119653/BOUPV_125_144.pdf?sequence=20&isAllowed=y

Internal regulation on academic staff selection: https://riunet.upv.es/bitstream/handle/10251/119653/BOUPV_125_144.pdf?sequence=20&isAllowed=y

Hiring process for researchers working for research projects: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/conypi/591169normalc.html>

Hiring process for permanent and temporal researchers with teaching responsibilities: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/pdi/579825normalc.html>

National Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation: <http://www.aneca.es/eng>

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Organic Law 6/2011, of 21st December, of Universities	UPV Bylaws
Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	Directive for pre-docs
Royal Decree 887/2006 of 21 July, approving the regulations of the Law 38/2003 of November 17, General Grant Management. Article 60 1. Evaluation criteria	Research Activity Index regulation
Royal Decree Legislative 5/2015, of 30th October approving the restated text of Law on the Statute of rights of workers	Regulation on temporal academic staff selection
	Regulation on permanent academic staff selection
	Regulation on R1 and R2 recruitment

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Better feedback mechanisms need to be established
- Introduced changes on the use of the “suitability coefficient”

Judging merit - Code (16): -/+

The selection process should take into consideration the whole range of experience of the candidates. While focusing on their overall potential as researchers, their creativity and level of independence should also be considered. This means that merit should be judged qualitatively as well as quantitatively, focusing on outstanding results within a diversified career path and not only on the number of publications. Consequently, the importance of bibliometric indices should be properly balanced within a wider range of evaluation criteria, such as teaching, supervision, teamwork, knowledge transfer, management of research and innovation and public awareness activities. For candidates from an industrial background, particular attention should be paid to any contributions to patents, development or inventions.

Gap:

On criteria 13 and 15 the selection process is defined. The examples provided and the description itself can be an excellent takeaway of how merits are judged. Moreover, the university has approved different regulations where judging merit is the key part, like the

regulation on temporal academic staff selection, approved by the Governing Council , the regulation on permanent academic staff selection, the regulation of academic staff selection, or the regulation for R1 and R2 recruitment. Examples of the different kind of calls can be consulted on the following links:

Hiring process for researchers working for research projects: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/conypi/591169normalc.html>

Hiring process for permanent and temporal researchers with teaching responsibilities: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/pdi/579825normalc.html>

UPV's selection policy takes into account a holistic perspective of candidates for judging merits. The candidate's evaluation includes a wide range of items, including those related with qualifications and research experience. For the sake of transparency, all merits have to be backed by evidences. Additionally, metrics have been developed in order to objectify the selection decision, though there are still some weaknesses to be addressed like those presented on criterion 15. All applications are compared against a scale that conforms a selection criteria of competences in line with the job descriptions published and the job post call. It is worth to mention that the selection committee includes people with relevant achievements on the research field to be judged. In addition, gender balance is considered as part of a key priority policy to reduce the gender gap existing in STEM focused institutions. When compared to the criterion, it can be said that the main gap is that judging merits mainly relies on bibliometrics indicators, provoking important disadvantages on certain domains, like design, arts or architecture, where publications are not the key element to disseminate results. Nonetheless, the assessment system has been adapted to the academic field in order to have a fair system that can be easily applied to those areas aforementioned. Participants acknowledged that by claiming that "one size does not fit all", because diversity is essential to address the different endeavours that society faces today. Regardless those adaptations, participants acknowledge that more flexibility is needed to embrace diversity.

It has already been mentioned the in-house system to assess research performance. Participants also commented that we could be over-assessing research, due to the fact that the in-house system is performed in addition to the national assessment system and the regional assessment system.

Nowadays, qualitative assessment is based on the so-called suitability coefficient. That indicator is designed to present on a quantitative way information that is purely qualitative, like creativity or level of independence. All participants recognise the necessity to recognise qualitative merits, but the existing practice is far from being considered adequate, due to the fact that is considered to be undermining transparency (See criterion 15). A standardised qualitative assessment criteria in addition to the existing quantitative assessment criteria is of the utmost relevant. Participants encourage the university to explore qualitative practices currently in place in other international research institutions.

Links of interest:

The regulation on temporal academic staff selection: <https://www.upv.es/entidades/SG/infoweb/sg/info/U0615103.pdf>

The regulation on permanent academic staff selection: https://riunet.upv.es/bitstream/handle/10251/119653/BOUPV_125_144.pdf?sequence=20&isAllowed=y

The regulation of academic staff selection: https://riunet.upv.es/bitstream/handle/10251/119653/BOUPV_125_144.pdf?sequence=20&isAllowed=y

Hiring process for researchers working for research projects: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/conypi/591169normalc.html>

Hiring process for permanent and temporal researchers with teaching responsibilities: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/pdi/579825normalc.html>

Example of a scale to hire a researcher: <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwjy1-aArNnrAhXcAmMBHf-VCUkQFjABegQIAhAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.upv.es%2Fentidades%2FSRH%2Fpdi%2FU0773445.doc&usg=AOvVaw1NNoS7QzKWY3sL9bNjSYuG>

Selection criteria for the hiring of temporary academic researchers: <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwjy1-aArNnrAhXcAmMBHf-VCUkQFjAEegQIBhAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.upv.es%2Fentidades%2FSRH%2Fpdi%2FU0555078.doc&usg=AOvVaw0VYnkzvNtbQeSAurHMDHyN>

Example of the feedback provided to candidates after a selection process: http://www.upv.es/entidades/DD/infoweb/dd/info/Acta_meritos_S5132.pdf

Example of a call to hire an associated academic researcher: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/DMMCTE/infoweb/dmmcte/info/AC-S5514-18.pdf>

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
<p>Spanish Constitution 1978 Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)</p> <p>Organic Law 6/2011, of 21st December, of Universities.</p> <p>Royal Decree 887/2006, of 21 July - Procedure for General Grants Law</p> <p>Royal Decree 887/2006 of 21 July, approving the regulations of the Law 38/2003 of November 17, General Grant Management. Article 60 1. Evaluation criteria</p> <p>Spanish Law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science , Technology and Innovation</p> <p>Royal Decree legislative 5/2015, of 30th October approving the restated text of Law on the Statute of rights of workers. Title IV, Chapter I. Articles 55 - 61.</p> <p>Royal Decree Legislative 1/2013, of 29th November approving the restated text of General Law on rights for disabled people and their social inclusion</p> <p>Organic Law 3/2007, 22nd March, for effective gender balance</p>	<p>Research Activity Index regulation</p> <p>UPV Bylaws</p>

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Explore the possibility to implement a qualitative assessment system beyond the existing suitability-coefficient
- Analyse the use of the “suitability coefficient” and its impact on hiring temporal research staff
- Design a standard process for judging merits that could be used for different domains of knowledge
- Perform a test on how qualitative measures could be introduced on the existing assessment system
- OTM-R strategy (see criteria 12 and 13)
-

Variations in the chronological order of CVs - Code (17): -/ +

Career breaks or variations in the chronological order of CVs should not be penalised, but regarded as an evolution of a career, and consequently, as a potentially valuable contribution to the professional development of researchers towards a multidimensional career track. Candidates should therefore be allowed to submit evidence-based CVs,

reflecting a representative array of achievements and qualifications appropriate to the post for which application is being made.

Gap:

As aforementioned, the selection and recruitment process is considered open, transparent, merit based and internationally comparable. Candidates are ranked against a selection criteria publicly available. The process consist, among other things, on written applications, interviews and the assessment of the research experience and the participation in projects or publications. Examples of this process can be consulted on the different regulations like the one on temporal academic staff selection, approved by the Governing Council , the regulation on permanent academic staff selection, the regulation of academic staff selection, or the regulation for R1 and R2 recruitment. Examples of the different kind of calls can be consulted on the following links:

Hiring process for researchers working for research projects: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/conypi/591169normalc.html>

Hiring process for permanent and temporal researchers with teaching responsibilities: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/pdi/579825normalc.html>

Nonetheless professional experience or mobility does not account in the researcher curriculum. Assessment systems are not considering those as merits to be taken into consideration. It could be said that neither the National Agency, nor the UPV, consider those as a merit.

Participants acknowledged that “taking the alternative to interrupt the academic career is not considered as viable for researchers” due to the design of the existing legislation. Interrupting a research career to pursue other professional goals is considered risky, and an impediment to progress on the career ladder. The only affordable choice is when a researcher participates on a spin-off, a company intended to exploit research results, where the link between the university and the company is clearly visible, and the researcher can dedicate her time to the company goals. A kind of sabbatical period, a maximum of 5 years length, can be obtained for researchers participating on these companies. This process is reserved for permanent research staff at UPV.

Links of interest:

Regulation on the temporal academic staff selection: <https://www.upv.es/entidades/SG/infoweb/sg/info/U0615103.pdf>

The regulation on permanent academic staff selection: https://riunet.upv.es/bitstream/handle/10251/119653/BOUPV_125_144.pdf?sequence=20&isAllowed=y

The regulation of academic staff selection: https://riunet.upv.es/bitstream/handle/10251/119653/BOUPV_125_144.pdf?sequence=20&isAllowed=y

Hiring process for researchers working for research projects: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/conypi/591169normalc.html>

Hiring process for permanent and temporal researchers with teaching responsibilities: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/pdi/579825normalc.html>

Existing spin-offs created at UPV's initiative: <https://innovacion.upv.es/es/investigadores/lista-spin-offs-upv/>

Internal process to constitute a spin-off: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/I2T/info/891435normalc.html>

Regulation to the creation of technology based companies, so-called "spin-offs": <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SGI/info/U0674587.pdf>

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	Regulation for visiting professors
Organic Law 6/2011, of 21st December, of Universities	UPV Bylaws
	Regulation for doctorate studies
	Regulation to the creation of technology based companies, so-called "spin-offs"

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Explore alternatives to assess professional experience in academic curricula
- Extend the current existing policy of sabbaticals for spin-offs to other companies

Recognition of mobility experience - Code (18): -/+

Any mobility experience, e.g. a stay in another country/region or in another research setting (public or private) or a change from one discipline or sector to another, whether as part of the initial research training or at a later stage of the research career, or virtual mobility experience, should be considered as a valuable contribution to the professional development of a researcher.

Gap:

Internationalisation of research is a core element of UPV's character. Pioneering mobility with Latin-America during the 90's set the ground-base to build a solid reputation around internationalisation during the first two decades of the 21st Century with a renewed focus on Europe, China and the United States of America.

UPV's Strategic Plan includes concrete references to remark the importance of mobility as a fundamental part of the researcher career development (i.e. one of the goals of the strategic project 5.2 is "to promote in-coming and out-going mobility"). Moreover, the strategic goal established in 2015 to promote mobility among R1 researchers has been completely achieved. Not only R1 researchers are obliged to spend part of their time on a different institution by their contractual obligations, but UPV also offers financial support by means of internal calls aimed to them. In addition, there are other mobility calls aimed to researchers

in other career stages, like those aimed to visiting scholars and those other aimed to the research community as a whole. UPV also encourages mobility by providing structured information and support to ask for financial support to other funding bodies or info days about specific programs, like the Marie Skłodowska Curie.

The university has been recognised twice as “International Campus of Excellence”, a program supported by the Ministry of Education, which aims to differentiate the Spanish Higher Education System by promoting the creation of international poles of excellence. A sister initiative of other programs in Europe like the German Initiative of Excellence or the “Pôles de Recherche et d’Enseignement Supérieur” in France. As a result of this selection, new funding was directed to the university and additional programs to support internationalisation and mobility were funded, like the one with UC Berkeley.

Mobility is conveniently recognised in all scales used to hire new researchers or for R3 - R4 researchers. The legal framework also requires that international mobility is sufficiently recognised as part of the selection criteria. Nonetheless, participants expressed that there were some kind of contracts that does not reflect the internationalisation spirit through mobility of the university. At a certain extent, those contracts are part of research projects where researchers are hired to perform a very specific project related task, and mobility is not something to be taken into consideration.

Though professional experience is part of the scale against researchers’ CV is evaluated, intersectoral mobility is not taken in account. Even participants considered “risky” to abandon the research career temporary (See criterion 17), so an improvement action at this respect should be encouraged.

Links of interest:

Mobility calls for R1 researchers: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/VIIT/info/900578normalc.html>

UPV’s Strategic Plan: https://www.upv.es/noticias-upv/documentos/plan_estrategico_upv2020.pdf

Mobility calls for visiting professors: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/VIIT/info/694155normali.html>

Mobility aids: (1) <http://www.upv.es/contenidos/TD/info/775780normalc.html>

Mobility aids (2): <http://www.upv.es/contenidos/DTSB/info/841987normalc.html>

Mobility calls for visiting professors (master programs): <http://www.upv.es/entidades/VECA/info/1064796normalc.html>

Marie Skłodowska Curie (MSC) <https://www.upv.es/entidades/EDOCTORADO/info/872976normalc.html>

UC Berkeley - UPV agreement: <http://www.upv.es/noticias-upv/noticia-6285-nuevo-centro-en-es.html?tl=Aindex-va.html>

Example of a call to hire a new researcher: <https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/pdi/U0827551.doc>

Contractual obligations at UPV for researchers: <https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/pdi/U0787424.doc>

Legal framework on access to the research career: <https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/pdi/U0430152.doc>

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007)	UPV Bylaws
Organic Law 6/2011, of 21st December, of Universities	Directive for pre-docs
Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	Research Activity Index regulation
Royal Decree 1/1995 of 24 March, approving the revised text of the Law of the Workers' Statute	Regulation on temporal academic staff selection
Royal Decree 1313/2007 on access to the research career	Regulation on permanent academic staff selection
	Regulation on R2 recruitment

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Explore alternatives to assess professional experience in academic curricula
- Consider the option of assess virtual mobility as part of the assessment criteria

Recognition of qualifications - Code (19): +/-

Employers and/or funders should provide for appropriate assessment and evaluation of the academic and professional qualifications, including non-formal qualifications, of all researchers, in particular within the context of international and professional mobility. They should inform themselves and gain a full understanding of rules, procedures and standards governing the recognition of such qualifications and, consequently, explore existing national law, conventions and specific rules on the recognition of these qualifications through all available channels.

Gap:

Participants agree on the existence of serious difficulties to incorporate international researchers to the UPV, mainly because it is not well defined a system to recognise merits from other countries than Spain. The lack of an efficient and effective mechanism to recognise foreign accreditations becomes the first and most important barrier to hire international researchers.

In terms of recognition of non formal activities, like skills, it is not a common practice. It is a fact that only formal activities can be accredited, because only formal activities can be backed by an external body.

Regarding existing regulations, participants consider that it is needed an effort to introduce them more effectively to the research community.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
<p>Order CIN/2657/2008 to regulate the administrative procedure for research activity assessment. Pre-Researchers</p> <p>Organic Law 6/2011, of 21st December, of Universities</p> <p>Spanish Law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science , Technology and Innovation</p> <p>Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007)</p> <p>Royal Decree 63/2006 of January 27 approving the Statute for research personnel in training</p> <p>Royal Decree 1837/2008, of November 8, by which are incorporated into Spanish law the Directive 2005/36/EC of the European Parliament and the Council, of 7 September 2005 and Directive 2006/100/EC, Council of November 20 of 2006</p> <p>Royal Decree 778/1998 of 30 April, regulating the third cycle of university studies, obtaining and forwarding a PhD and other postgraduate studies</p> <p>Royal Decree 56/2005, regulating official university postgraduate studies</p> <p>Royal Decree 1393/2007, 29th October, establishing the organisation of the official University Studies.</p> <p>Royal Decree 99/2011, 28th January, regulating official Doctorate Studies.</p>	<p>Research Activity Index regulation</p> <p>General framework for academic activities (NOA)</p> <p>UPV Bylaws</p> <p>Doctorate School regulation</p>

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Open seminar on the existing regulation regarding recognition and qualifications
- Establish an automatic recognising system for every researcher coming from the European Union

Seniority - Code (20): ++

The levels of qualifications required should be in line with the needs of the position and not be set as a barrier to entry. Recognition and evaluation of qualifications should focus on judging the achievements of the person rather than his/her circumstances or the reputation of the institution where the qualifications were gained. As professional qualifications may be gained at an early stage of a long career, the pattern of lifelong professional development should also be recognised.

Gap:

On the examples provided in previous criteria, several cases covering different researcher career stages can be found reveal that UPV focus on “judging the achievements of the candidate rather than his/her circumstances or the reputation of the institution where the qualifications were gained”, as the C&C requires.

It is worth to mention that qualifications are defined in accordance to the needs of the position advertised in the recruitment and selection section of the Human Resources Department website (see “links of interest”, below in this section).

Though OTM-R policy as such is to be implemented, current legal framework and existing practices guarantee that our recruitment and selection processes are open, transparent, merit based and internationally comparable. Candidates are scored against a fixed criteria that takes into account “seniority”, and they are ranked according the scoring obtained during the whole process.

Links of interest:

Recruitment and selection for R&D projects: <https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/conypi/591169normalc.html>

Recruitment and selection for researchers with academic background (R2): <https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/pdi/579888normalc.html>

Recruitment and selection for researchers with academic background (R3-R4): <https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/pdi/579825normalc.html>

Example of the scoring process: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/conypi/U0871957.pdf>

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
<p>Order CIN/2657/2008 to regulate the administrative procedure for research activity assessment. Pre-Researchers</p> <p>Organic Law 6/2011, of 21st December, of Universities</p> <p>Royal Decree 5/2015, of 30th October approving the restated text of Law on the Statute of Rights of Workers. Articles 55 - 61, 76-79</p> <p>Spanish Law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science , Technology and Innovation. Articles 13, 21 to 23, 26 and 31</p> <p>Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007) Royal Decree 63/2006 of January 27 approving the Statute for research personnel in training</p> <p>Royal Decree 778/1998 of 30 April, regulating the third cycle of university studies, obtaining and forwarding a PhD and other postgraduate studies</p> <p>Royal Decree 56/2005, regulating official university postgraduate studies</p> <p>Royal Decree 1393/2007, 29th October, establishing the organisation of the official University Studies.</p> <p>Royal Decree 99/2011, 28th January, regulating official Doctorate Studies.</p>	<p>Research Activity Index regulation</p> <p>General framework for academic activities (NOA)</p> <p>UPV Bylaws</p> <p>Doctorate School regulation</p>

Postdoctoral appointments - Code (21): +/-

Clear rules and explicit guidelines for the recruitment and appointment of postdoctoral researchers, including the maximum duration and the objectives of such appointments, should be established by the institutions appointing postdoctoral researchers. Such guidelines should take into account time spent in prior postdoctoral appointments at other institutions and take into consideration that the postdoctoral status should be transitional, with the primary purpose of providing additional professional development opportunities for a research career in the context of long-term career prospects.

Gap:

Participants were concerned about the vague definition of the long-term career at UPV. Facts point out that there are no great possibilities to build a professional career as a researcher in the same institution. Some researchers face the situation of working project after project on a cycle that seems to have no end. UPV has no clear appointment for only-research figures that could be working on permanent basis. It also creates discrepancies between the research focus and the contract itself.

In terms of recruitment criteria, participants agree that there are no clear rules. They complain about the researcher career as a highly unstable choice with high personal cost that can refrain you from other possibilities. It could be said that uncertainty is the norm for full time researchers. The system is focused on researchers with teaching profile but seems not to be determined to implement the figure of a permanent pure researcher. Nonetheless there are evident constraints to implement such a policy, mainly because the university is financed on regular basis according to teaching credits. Therefore, those researchers with no teaching profile must be financed from other sources, mainly coming from research projects financed by external bodies. Therefore they are subjected to short-term contracts with no perspective to become full time researcher permanente employee

It is also detected another factor that will affect conditions and working environment: pre or post doctoral activity is highly determined by the research structure where you develop your activity. Participants outline a research environment highly fragmented, working like a compound of many “micro-systems” instead of a uniform university system for research.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007)	Research Activity Index regulation
Organic Law 6/2011, of 21st December, of Universities	UPV Bylaws
Spanish Law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science , Technology and Innovation	Research Activity Index regulation
Royal Decree 63/2006 of January 27 approving the Statute for research personnel in training	Regulation on temporal academic staff selection
Royal Decree legislative 5/2015, of 30th October approving the restated text of Law on the Statute of rights of workers	Regulation on permanent academic staff selection

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- To analyse the existing working conditions in the different research structures
- To create common access rules for all researchers that are non-dependant of the research structure or the type of project
- To analyse alternatives for the existing short-term contracts for research that could match legal requirements of research projects, external funding bodies and researchers' expectations

Working Conditions and Social Security

Recognition of the profession (22): -/+

All researchers engaged in a research career should be recognised as professionals and be treated accordingly. This should commence at the beginning of their careers, namely at postgraduate level, and should include all levels, regardless of their classification at national level (e.g. employee, postgraduate student, doctoral candidate, postdoctoral fellow, civil servants).

Gap:

The existing research environment is very demanding, with a lot of pressure coming from external funding bodies and external evaluation agencies. In addition, the rewards that the system provides never compensates the effort don by researchers, specially does with no teaching profile. It could be said that existing conditions destroy any motivation that the researcher could have. The lack of motivation is mainly because there is no perspective (for researchers with no teaching profile) to progress in the career ladder. They are stuck in short-term contracts with no other alternative than starting an academic career as a way to improve their situation. It could be said that the fact of being “recognised as professionals” is very dependent on your teaching profile: if you have a teaching profile you have a different status than if you have not.

Some PhD candidates are hired by the university under a contract aimed to support them to become a PhD. They are supposed to be part of a learning process to become a researcher. Nonetheless, the existence of a contract creates the impression in the PhD candidate that they are performing a job for the university, whilst the fact is that this contract is aimed to support their learning process. They consider that the condition of being on a learning process diminish their role as professional researchers.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	Research Activity Index regulation
Organic Law 6/2011, of 21st December, of Universities	General framework for academic activities (NOA)
	UPV Bylaws

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Design of the Researcher Career Professional Development Strategy

Research environment (23): +/-

Employers and/or funders of researchers should ensure that the most stimulating research or research training environment is created which offers appropriate equipment, facilities and opportunities, including for remote collaboration over research networks, and that the national or sectoral regulations concerning health and safety in research are observed. Funders should ensure that adequate resources are provided in support of the agreed work programme.

Gap:

It is a fact that UPV possesses the required infrastructure to guarantee the working conditions to develop all kind of research activities. Yet the university has cutting-edge equipment, suitable to perform advanced research in a wide range of areas, there is no central management for this equipment. It could be said that research equipment management is fragmented, making almost impossible to achieve the full potential of it.

Some participants claim that motivation is undermined by the existing research framework, both internal and external. So that, talking about a “stimulating research environment” needs to be backed with more than good infrastructure.

The university distinguishes two types of labs: teaching labs and research labs. Support personnel for labs is assigned according to teaching needs, so the main focus of that personnel are teaching labs. That makes that some research labs do not have the necessary support personnel.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007) Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011) Organic Law 6/2011, of 21st December, of Universities	Regulation of research structures Directive for teaching collaborations and research personnel

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Build a database of research equipments and potential services to extend access to those equipment to the whole research community
- Design a new service to manage centrally research equipment
- Launch an internal regulation aimed to facilitate the use of existing research equipment (currently allocated to individuals) to the whole research community

Working conditions (24): +/-

Employers and/or funders should ensure that the working conditions for researchers, including for disabled researchers, provide where appropriate the flexibility deemed essential for successful research performance in accordance with existing national legislation and with national or sectoral collective-bargaining agreements. They should aim to provide working

conditions which allow both women and men researchers to combine family and work, children and career. Particular attention should be paid, inter alia, to flexible working hours, part-time working, tele-working and sabbatical leave, as well as to the necessary financial and administrative provisions governing such arrangements.

Gap:

One of the main obstacles to fulfil this aspect is the absence of a collective bargain agreement. This agreement should cover the main points of this aspect. Some progress is being done in recognising the fact that researchers usually travel and have to do part of their work remotely. The most striking point is the personal-work balance benefits, that some researchers opt out of the general framework that covers the whole university personnel

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Royal Decree (70/2000) January 21st	Regulation for doctorate studies
Organic Law 6/2011, of 21st December, of Universities	Directive for pre-docs
Organic Law for the effective equality between women and men (3/2007) of 22 March	Gender balance regulation
Royal Decree 5/2015 Basic law civil servants Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	Regulation on temporal academic staff selection
Royal Decree legislative 5/2015, of 30th October approving the restated text of Law on the Statute of rights of workers	Regulation on permanent academic staff selection
Royal Decree legislative 2/2015, 23rd October, approving the restated Text of the Law of rights workers.	Regulation on R2 recruitment
Royal Decree Legislative 1/2013, of 29th November approving the restated text of General Law on rights for disabled people and their social inclusion.	Regulation for effective work-family balance
Organic Law 3/2007 for effective gender balance	

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Proposal to better recognise remote-working in research
- Open seminars about the existing legal framework for a better balance between work and personal life

Stability and permanence of employment (25): -/+

Employers and/or funders should ensure that the performance of researchers is not undermined by instability of employment contracts, and should therefore commit themselves as far as possible to improving the stability of employment conditions for researchers, thus implementing and abiding by the principles and terms laid down in the EU Directive on Fixed-Term Work.

Gap:

It could be said that this has been one of the most intriguing aspects of the gap analysis. This aspect evidences a deep division between researchers with teaching profile against those with no teaching background, driving a wedge between them. Whilst stability and permanence seems to be the norm in researchers with teaching profile, researchers with non academic profile suffer from recurrent short-term contracts. Moreover, those short contracts are always linked with specific research projects. Unless there is a research project financed by an external body, researchers cannot be hired, even if the university has the necessary economic resources to do so. This paradox seems to be derived directly from the existing legal framework according to which no short contract can be done unless there is a research project to work on.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Directive 1999/70/CE regarding Framework agreement of CES, la UNICE y el CEEP about Fixed- Term Work	Doctorate School regulation
Royal Decree (70/2000) January 21st	Regulation on temporal academic staff selection
Royal Decree 5/2015 Basic law civil servants Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	Regulation on permanent academic staff selection
Law 48/2015, 29th October, on General State Budget	Regulation on R2 recruitment

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Explore alternatives to short-term contracts based on research projects
- Analyse the concept of “research lines” as a way to involve the same person on different research projects
- Explore the possibility to have full-time researchers as part of the payroll of the university

Funding and salaries (26): -/+

Employers and/or funders of researchers should ensure that researchers enjoy fair and attractive conditions of funding and/or salaries with adequate and equitable social security provisions (including sickness and parental benefits, pension rights and unemployment benefits) in accordance with existing national legislation and with national or sectoral collective bargaining agreements. This must include researchers at all career stages

including early-stage researchers, commensurate with their legal status, performance and level of qualifications and/or responsibilities.

Gap:

Conditions are strictly defined by the existing legal framework. All the university staff is considered to be part of the public administration, meaning that wages and salaries are fixed by the National Ministry or the Regional Government. Hence, it could be said that there is no room to establish incentives or bonuses based on results, except for researchers with teaching profile that, a small part of the salary could be increased based on productivity indicators. It is widely admitted that wages scales are aged and that need some sort of actualisation. We could conclude that salaries are not related with individual performance, meaning that a flat rate is applied to all personnel. The rate applied depends on the type of contract or the level you achieve.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Royal Decree (70/2000) January 21st	Research Activity Index regulation
Royal Decree legislative 2/2015, 23rd October, approving the restated Text of the Law of rights workers.	Research and Teaching personnel regulation on incentives and bonuses
Royal Decree Legislative 8/2015, 0th October, approving the restated text on the General Law of Social Security (several provisions)	Regulation on temporal academic staff selection
Royal Decree 5/2015 Basic law civil servants Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	Regulation on permanent academic staff selection
Royal Decree Law 1/1994, General Social Security Law	Regulation on R2 recruitment
Royal Decree 1/1995 of 24 March, approving the revised text of the Law of the Workers' Statute	
Royal Decree 63/2006 of January 27 approving the Statue for research personnel in training	
Resolution 3 November III Collective Agreement for the General National Administration. CAPVIII. Art 45. Art 46. Art 47. CAP xIII -	

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Actualise existing scales to determine salaries

- Explore the possibility to add economic incentives for researchers with non teaching profile
- Design of the Researcher Career Professional Development Strategy

Gender balance (27): -/+

Employers and/or funders should aim for a representative gender balance at all levels of staff, including at supervisory and managerial level. This should be achieved on the basis of an equal opportunity policy at recruitment and at the subsequent career stages without, however, taking precedence over quality and competence criteria. To ensure equal treatment, selection and evaluation committees should have an adequate gender balance.

Gap:

If we analyse the different research positions, we find that most of R1 positions considered “full professors”, are men. Part of the reason comes from a domino effect coming from the lower number of female technical students in comparison with other disciplines. The legal framework is trying to reshape this situation. The institution has established an internal unit to follow up gender balance, not only in research, but at the whole university. Despite the fact the number is continually rising, the pace of it does not allow us to make a certain prediction of when a real gender balance will be achieved.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
<p>Spanish Constitution 1978</p> <p>Organic Law for the effective equality between women and men (3/2007) of 22 March</p> <p>Royal Decree legislative 5/2015, of 30th October approving the restated text of Law on the Statute of rights of workers</p> <p>Royal Decree legislative 2/2015, 23rd October, approving the restated Text of the Law of rights workers</p>	<p>Gender balance regulation</p>

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Analyse the existing trends in research recruitment in terms of gender balance
- STEM: a special attention should be given to the policies of recruitment of female students in the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths)

Career development (28): +/-

Employers and/or funders of researchers should draw up, preferably within the framework of their human resources management, a specific career development strategy for researchers at all stages of their career, regardless of their contractual situation, including for researchers on fixed-term contracts. It should include the availability of mentors involved in providing support and guidance for the personal and professional development of researchers, thus

motivating them and contributing to reducing any insecurity in their professional future. All researchers should be made familiar with such provisions and arrangements.

Gap:

As mentioned in other aspects, there is a clear division between those researchers with teaching responsibilities and those who has no teaching responsibilities. In general terms, we could say that career development is deeply biased by seniority: the longer years in the same institutions the better chances you have to get promoted, provided you are a researcher with teaching profile.

Given the cuts in research and education public spending in Spain, researchers who have retired has not been replaced by younger researchers. In addition to that, some knowledge domains are struggling in personnel. Though the situation is improving, there is still a lot to do to recover from that policy.

Broadly speaking, it is difficult to identify a concrete career development policy in researchers working under short-term contracts. Some participants described the situation as “daunting”, mainly because once the project ends, the contract is dead and there are no prospects unless another project is awarded. In addition, they have no other option than working under those conditions or trying to become a researcher with teaching background.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Royal Decree 5/2015 Basic law civil servants	
Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007)	
Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Design of the Researcher Career Professional Development Strategy
- Define the figure of full time researcher
- Find new mechanisms to avoid researchers to be linked with specific research projects

Value of mobility (29): -/+

Employers and/or funders must recognise the value of geographical, inter-sectorial, inter- and trans-disciplinary and virtual mobility as well as mobility between the public and private sector as an important means of enhancing scientific knowledge and professional development at any stage of a researcher's career. Consequently, they should build such options into the specific career development strategy and fully value and acknowledge any mobility experience within their career progression/appraisal system. This also requires that the necessary administrative instruments be put in place to allow the portability of both grants and social security provisions, in accordance with national legislation.

Gap:

UPV considers mobility as an integral part of the researcher's curriculum (See criterion 18). The weight assigned to mobility on the scales used during the selection process varies between 5% and 10%, depending on which part of the research career you are. It can be said that UPV promotes mobility by different means, like different internal calls, participation in international programs like MSCA, ITN or Erasmus+ and the contractual conditions for R1 and R2 researchers (i.e. R1 are required to spend abroad part of their time if they want to be as researchers). Most of the contracts for R1 researchers are supported by an internal program financed by UPV called Researchers Training Program, and by an external program sponsored by the Ministry called University Personnel Training. In both cases, contractual conditions included the obligation to have international experience.

Participants complain of administrative burdens that prevent them to be more active on mobility, specially for researchers from R2 to R4. At this respect they claim that it is unfair that the researchers have to pay in advance part of the stay, and that bureaucracy around budgetary issues is so time consuming that it undermines motivation to be even more active on this field.

The Strategic University Plan considers mobility as a pre-condition to be internationally relevant. The requirement number 6 of the Strategic Plan recognises that it is necessary to "foster UPV researcher's mobility and to facilitate researchers from other institutions to stay at UPV as part of their research career". Therefore, it can be said that there is a two-way approach perspective that can be considered the cornerstone of all mobility initiatives. In addition, the strategic project related with PhD studies, in its objective number. 5 declares that UPV will "increase mobility actions in a way that every PhD student spends, at least, 3 months on a different institution". This goal has become a major action plan, carried on by the Doctoral School and the Vice-Rectorate for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer.

UPV's participation in international programs is one of the biggest in Spain. During 2019, a total of 3178 research actions have been approved to be implemented at UPV, representing more than 75M€.

Research collaborations, memorandum of understanding and other forms of collaboration agreements are set every year to facilitate mobility. Though not directly related with research, but certainly a relevant part of the grassroots for becoming an authentic international institution, it is worth to mention that UPV is the third university in Spain in terms of its participation on the Erasmus Student Mobility Program.

Inter-sectorial mobility is a challenge at the university, and it is usually not considered by the researcher as an option because of perceived drawbacks for their research career. The main reason behind this rationale is that professional merits are not considered enough on a research career. A researcher could work on the private sector by establishing a spin-off

(See criterion 17), but at a maximum of 5 years. Another option would be to ask for a gap year to work on the private sector. Nonetheless, once you get back, private experience is not recognised sufficiently, so the situation is certainly unbalanced towards not leaving temporary the research career.

We can hardly say that trans-disciplinary mobility exists, mainly because administrative procedures are complex and contracts are tightened to specific domains of knowledge.

Links of interest:

Researchers Training Program: <https://www.upv.es/entidades/VIIT/info/763950normalc.html>

University Personnel Training Program: <http://www.educacionyfp.gob.es/servicios-al-ciudadano/catalogo/general/99/998758/ficha/998758-informacion-comun.html>

Strategic plan: https://www.upv.es/organizacion/la-institucion/documentos/UPV_Strategic_Plan_2015-2020_Executive_Summary.pdf

Participation in international networks: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/I2T/info/988140normalc.html>

International Research Actions: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/I2T/info/U0852918.pdf>

Mobility programs for R1: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/EDOCTORADO/info/963361normali.html>

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007)	Directive for pre-docs
Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	Doctorate School regulation
	Regulation for doctorate studies

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Proposal to recognise remote work in research
- Design of the Researcher Career Professional Development Strategy
- Design a new scale to recognise inter-sectorial mobility
- Facilitate longer periods in private companies for researchers
- Reduce the administrative burden related with mobility programs
- Preliminary payments for research mobility
- OTM-R strategy

Access to career advice (30): - -

Employers and/or funders should ensure that career advice and job placement assistance, either in the institutions concerned, or through collaboration with other structures, is offered to researchers at all stages of their careers, regardless of their contractual situation.

Gap:

Career advising, as a formal process, is focused on R1 researchers, as can be seen on criterion 28, about career development, or criterion 37, about supervision and managerial

duties. The tutor is the one who provides direct advice for the R1 researcher. In addition to that, the Doctoral School provides a set of courses related with transversal skills, including topics directly connected with career advice, like:

- Research career
- Scientific Documentation
- Research Ethics
- Disclosure and Scientific Communication
- Protection of Research Results
- Knowledge Transfer
- Research Methodologies
- Entrepreneurship

The Personnel Training Unit also offers specific activities for researchers in all stages that can be also understood as a career advice.

Nonetheless, out of the framework of doctorate studies, it is hard to talk about a formal career advice system for researchers. Whilst supervisors are supposed to be the key element on the mentoring process, it is true to say that, from R2 and so on, it is a very informal process that is mostly done at individual basis. Though the university has defined a mentor program as part of its Strategic Plan, its application is far from being considered successful. Participants suggest to establish a career advising service that provide such kind of mentoring for researchers even beyond academia.

Developing research careers beyond academia have been sparked by the launch by the Ministry of a call for Industrial Doctorates. Though still not considered sufficient, participants points out this as a path to explore. In this case, career advice is done by both the university and the company, and opportunities for researchers beyond academia may arise.

Links of interest:

Doctoral School: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/EDOCTORADO/>

Personnel Training Unit: <https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/ufasu/944333normalc.html>

Continuing Education Center: <https://www.cfp.upv.es>

Industrial Doctorate at UPV. <https://www.upv.es/entidades/EDOCTORADO/info/1021537normalc.html>

Financial Aids for Industrial Doctorates (Ministry): <https://www.ciencia.gob.es/portal/site/MICINN/menuitem.dbc68b34d11ccbd5d52ffeb801432ea0/?vgnextoid=2e6be8ade1e01610VgnVCM1000001d04140aRCRD>

Financial Aids for Industrial Doctorates (Regional Government): http://innova.gva.es/es/web/ciencia/d.4-formacio-de-doctors-en-empreses-fedgent/-/asset_publisher/jMe1UDRYZMHO/content/iv-subvenciones-para-la-formacion-de-doctores-y-doctoras-en-empresas-valenciana-s-fddegent-2020?redirect=http%3A%2F%2Finnova.gva.es%2Fes%2Fweb%2Fciencia%2Fd.4-formacio-de-doctors-en-empreses-

fedgent%3Fp_p_id%3D101_INSTANCE_jMe1UDRYZMHO%26p_p_lifecycle%3D0%26p_p_state%3Dnormal%26p_p_mode%3Dview%26p_p_col_id%3Dcolumn-2%26p_p_col_pos%3D1%26p_p_col_count%3D2;

Financial Aids for Industrial Doctorates (Valencian Agency of Innovation): <https://innoavi.es/es/promocion-del-talento-agentes-de-innovacion-incorporacion-de-tecnologos-en-empresas-y-doctorandos-empresariales/>

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Law of Biomedical Research (14/2007)	Directive for pre-docs
Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)	Doctorate School regulation
Order ECC/1402/2013, 22nd July, modified by Order ECC/1820/2014, 26th September, and by Order ECC/2483/2014, 23rd December, approving the regulatory basis to grant aids within the State Programme for Talent promotion and Employment Framework of State Plan on Science and Technique Research & Innovation 2013-2016.	Regulation for doctorate studies
Royal Decree 99/2011 on the regulation of doctoral studies	

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

Establish a service for career advise aimed to support researchers.

Design of the Researcher Career Professional Development Strategy

Support research career advising beyond academia

Intellectual Property Rights (31): +/-

Employers and/or funders should ensure that researchers at all career stages reap the benefits of the exploitation (if any) of their R&D results through legal protection and, in particular, through appropriate protection of Intellectual Property Rights, including copyrights. Policies and practices should specify what rights belong to researchers and/or, where applicable, to their employers or other parties, including external commercial or industrial organisations, as possibly provided for under specific collaboration agreements or other types of agreement.

Gap:

Benefits from exploitation of their R&D results are subject to existing legal framework but researcher does not get recognised his/her part of intellectual property on an invention. As mentioned on earlier aspects, exploitation of R&D results are not sufficiently recognised by existing assessment system, like the Research Activity Index.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
<p>Law of Research Patent and utility models (11/1986) 20 March</p> <p>Royal Decree Law 1/1996, Intellectual Property Law (Book I. art.7 and art.10) - Law 10/2002, 29 abril adapting the Law of Patents to EU Directive related to legal protection of biotechnology inventions (art.1, 2, 3, 4)</p> <p>Law of Science, Technology and Innovation (14/2011)</p> <p>Royal Decree (55/2002) of 18 January - exploitation inventions in public research bodies</p> <p>Law 3/2000, 7th January, on Plant variety legislation</p> <p>Law 20/2003, 7th July, on the Legal protection of Industrial Designs</p> <p>Organic Law 6/2011, 21st September, on Universities.(Article 80)</p>	<p>Code for good practices in research</p> <p>Ethics Commission</p>

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Design of the Researcher Career Professional Development Strategy
- Revise the existing Intellectual Property Right processes

Co-authorship (32): +/-

Co-authorship should be viewed positively by institutions when evaluating staff, as evidence of a constructive approach to the conduct of research. Employers and/or funders should therefore develop strategies, practices and procedures to provide researchers, including those at the beginning of their research careers, with the necessary framework conditions so that they can enjoy the right to be recognised and listed and/or quoted, in the context of their actual contributions, as co-authors of papers, patents, etc, or to publish their own research results independently from their supervisor(s).

Gap:

Co-authorship is evaluated positively by the university. The Research Activity Index recognises publications with more than one author. Nonetheless, participants regret that the existing method penalise those papers with more than one author.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
<p>Law of Research Patent and utility models (11/1986) 20 March</p> <p>Royal Decree Law 1/1996, Intellectual Property Law (Book I. art.7 and art.10)</p> <p>Spanish Law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science , Technology and Innovation</p>	UPV Bylaws

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Analyse the existing Research Activity Index in order to better recognise co-authorship
- Design of the Researcher Career Professional Development Strategy

Teaching (33): -/+

Teaching is an essential mean for the structuring and dissemination of knowledge and should therefore be considered a valuable option within the researchers' career paths. However, teaching responsibilities should not be excessive and should not prevent researchers, particularly at the beginning of their careers, from carrying out their research activities. Employers and/or funders should ensure that teaching duties are adequately remunerated and taken into account in the evaluation/appraisal systems, and that time devoted by senior members of staff to the training of early stage researchers should be counted as part of their teaching commitment. Suitable training should be provided for teaching and coaching activities as part of the professional development of researchers.

Gap:

As mentioned several times, there is a big difference between those researchers with teaching responsibilities (academic background) against those with no teaching responsibilities. Hence, we could say that some researchers have no option to teach, mainly because they are hired for a specific research project and his/her work is intended to be only for the project. Nonetheless, teaching is the only way to access a stream that can guide researchers to better job prospects. Non academic researchers do not feel comfortable with the existing situation, where teaching is very dependent of the type of contract you have. Short-term contracts are considered full-time jobs with no spare space to dedicate to other activities like teaching.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Organic Law of Universities (6/2001) Spanish law (RD 14/2012) - Public finances rationalisation Spanish Law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science , Technology and Innovation	Directive for teaching collaborations and research personnel

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Design a process aimed to recognise teaching activities done by pre-doctoral researchers
- Find new ways to allow researchers with short-term contracts to teach
- Design of the Researcher Career Professional Development Strategy

Complains / appeals (34): + -

Employers and/or funders of researchers should establish, in compliance with national rules and regulations, appropriate procedures, possibly in the form of an impartial (ombudsman-type) person to deal with complaints/appeals of researchers, including those concerning conflicts between supervisor(s) and early-stage researchers. Such procedures should provide all research staff with confidential and informal assistance in resolving work-related conflicts, disputes and grievances, with the aim of promoting fair and equitable treatment within the institution and improving the overall quality of the working environment.

Gap:

The Ombudsperson is a mandatory figure according to the Spanish Organic Law 6/2011 on Universities. The legal text already states functions that are in line with what this principle claims, as can be read on this excerpt from the law: "In order to guarantee the rights and freedom of the university personnel, universities must establish, as part of their permanent university structure, the role of the Ombudsperson. Her actions, which always have to be aimed to the improvement of the university quality as a whole, cannot be constrained or subjected to decisions by any other university body, as his independence must be preserved". The law leaves every university a degree of freedom on how to elect the Ombudsperson and which processes best fit with the university culture to guarantee the highest standards on the provision of the service and, simultaneously, fulfil the general claims made by the law. UPV statutes, Article 133, further elaborate the figure of the Ombudsperson, with details regarding how she is elected and, eventually, appointed. The election process and its internal regulations are described on the Ombudsperson internal regulation (*BOUPV 117 20th July 2018*). It must be noted that the Ombudsperson is ex officio, member of different university bodies, like the Ethics Commission, where he holds the chairperson position. The roles of the Ethics Commission is of the utmost relevance, becoming a guarantor and protector of good research practices at the university, in accordance with the highest ethical standards. Additionally, the Ombudsperson regulation ensures an active collaboration of all university at the Ombudsperson request, provided an existing investigation is on progress. The Legal Department of the University has the obligation to assist the Ombudsperson in any request needed to pursue the goals of the

Ombudsperson legal framework. Appeals to the Ombudsperson are filed by the researcher by direct communication with the Ombudsperson. The last available annual report from the Ombudsperson Office collects a total of 25 cases related with researchers at UPV, that have been duly attended. The protection of the whistleblower is also guaranteed by law.

To further protect the rights of R1 researchers, the Doctoral School Regulations mandate to create the “R1 Student Union”, which is the representative body of the PhD candidates in front of the university and, eventually, the one responsible of defending the interests of the collectivity. All material and financial means of the R1 Student Union are provided by the university. The Student Union will nominate representatives on the governing bodies of the Doctoral School, such as the Executive Committee. Additionally, PhD candidates can apply individually for a position on the Doctoral School Executive Committee. Academic Commissions, those dealing with each UPV Doctorate Program, have the obligation to include an R1 as a full right member.

Additionally, every research, with a legal contract with the university, can appeal to the trade unions to protect her legal rights in case she feels those are being compromised, or even subdued, by any other person or statutory body of the institution.

Hence, it can be said that the university has enacted sufficient and adequate means and resources to deal with “complaints and appeals of researchers, providing all research staff with confidential and informal assistance in resolving work-related conflicts, disputes and grievances” as the principle states. Nonetheless, the current paradigm could be considered “reactive”, as an intervention from a whistleblower is needed to initiate the process, so a shift to a more “proactive” approach would be highly welcomed, with the expectation of surfacing existing situations that might currently be underestimated due to the nature of the current practice.

Links of interest:

The role of the Ombudsperson at the Organic Law of Universities: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/DCU/info/U0485320.pdf>

The role of the Ombudsperson at UPV statutes: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/DCU/info/U0485319.pdf>

Internal regulation of the Ombudsperson at UPV: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/DCU/info/U0793697.pdf>

Ombudsperson Office: <https://www.upv.es/entidades/DCU/>

Doctoral School Regulation: <http://www.upv.es/entidades/EDOCTORADO/info/U0707540.pdf>

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
The role of the Ombudsman at the Organic Law of Universities: http://www.upv.es/entidades/DCU/info/U0485320.pdf	The role of the Ombudsman at UPV statutes: http://www.upv.es/entidades/DCU/info/U0485319.pdf Internal regulation of the Ombudsman at UPV: http://www.upv.es/entidades/DCU/info/U0793697.pdf Ombudsman Office: https://www.upv.es/entidades/DCU/ Doctoral School Regulation: http://www.upv.es/entidades/EDOCTORADO/info/U0707540.pdf

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

A process to assess the tutoring and mentoring process of researchers on the early career will be established as part of the implementation of the HRS4R. This process will include preemptive monitoring of every tutor, random tests to doctorate students and guidelines for tutors on how to successfully comply with her function. This process will be complementary to those already implemented, such as the Ombudsperson, the R1 Student Union and the UPV Trade Unions.

Participation in decision-making bodies (35): + +

Employers and/or funders of researchers should recognise it as wholly legitimate, and indeed desirable, that researchers be represented in the relevant information, consultation and decision-making bodies of the institutions for which they work, so as to protect and promote their individual and collective interests as professionals and to actively contribute to the workings of the institution.

Gap:

It can be said that most European universities are autonomous institutions, self-governed by members and with some institutional practices breeding from traditions which date back from many centuries ago, and UPV is not an exception. The preeminence of collegiate decisions is certainly the norm, and most of its decision-making bodies are conformed by university personnel, mainly academics, as its constituency demands. Therefore, researchers are wholly legitimated, represented and consulted in all decision-making bodies of the university. Moreover, it constitutes a legal obligation according to the Spanish Organic Law 6/2011 on Universities. As a matter of fact, it can be consulted the composition of the Executive Committee of the Doctoral School, the regulation of research institutes at UPV or the UPV statutes, for a comprehensive view of the role of the researcher in every single aspect of the university life. In addition to that, it should be remarked that as part of the development of the Strategic Plan, the bed-stones of the UPV policy, all university staff has been represented. Moreover, the development of this Human Resources Strategy for Researchers has accounted for one of the highest direct participation of the research community.

Eventually, the implementation of the HRS4R strategy, will be mainly in the hands of the research community.

It is worth to say that no bias has being detected during the process, in terms of a researcher group who claims to be under represented, but the gender gap, which has been addressed separately. However, as a precautionary measure, a new action to monitor participation of R1 and R2 researchers will be put in place as a result of the HRS4R process.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Spain's law RD 2/2015, of October 23, approving the restated text of the Law of rights workers. Articles 4, 62-76 Spain's law RD 5/2015, of 30th October approving the restated text of Law on the Statute of Rights of Workers. Articles 15, 39-44. Spain's law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science, Technology and Innovation Articles 8, 9, 10, 14 and 15). Spain's Law of Universities OL 6/2001, 21st. December.	UPV Bylaws Internal regulation for Research Institutes: http://www.upv.es/entidades/VIIT/info/U0743465.pdf

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

Monitor participation of R1 and R2 researchers in decision-making bodies

Training and Development

Relation with supervisors (36): +/-

Researchers in their training phase should establish a structured and regular relationship with their supervisor(s) and faculty/departmental representative(s) so as to take full advantage of their relationship with them. This includes keeping records of all work progress and research findings, obtaining feedback by means of reports and seminars, applying such feedback and working in accordance with agreed schedules, milestones, deliverables and/or research outputs.

Gap:

Participants remarked the absence of a formal procedure to assess the role of the PhD supervisor. There are no concrete metrics to determine how good was a PhD supervisor. It is also impossible to compare 2 different PhD supervisor with any standardised process.

Heterogeneity seems to be the norm in this field, mainly because topics are very specific. Hence, it could be said that it is difficult to find a common ground for PhD supervision, but would be welcomed to have some sort of training, aimed at PhD supervisors, to set common standards on PhD supervision.

Multitasking was a source of controversy. Participants manifested their reaction against a policy that force researchers to focus on excellence whilst they are also required to deal with many other things, very time consuming, not recognised and not related with developing a researcher profile.

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Spanish law (RD 99/2011) - Doctorate studies regulation	Directive for pre-docs
Spanish Law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science , Technology and Innovation.	Doctorate School regulation
	Regulation for doctorate studies

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Produce a guide good practices guide for PhD supervision
- Create a training program for PhD supervision
- Set up personalised training curricula for researchers
- Assess PhD supervision

Supervision and managerial duties (37): +/-

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.

Gap:

See aspect 36

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Spanish law (RD 99/2011) - Doctorate studies regulation	

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Set up a group of senior researchers to mentor younger researchers
- Create a training program for researchers regardless the type of contract they have and the content provider
- Set up an internal committee for researcher curriculum update

- Produce a guide good practices guide for PhD supervision
- Create a training program for PhD supervision
- Set up personalised curricula for researchers
- Design a welcome pack for new researchers
- Assess PhD supervision

Continuing Professional Development (38): +/-

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.

Gap:

Most of the discussion has been dominated by topics related with training R1 and R2 researchers. Nonetheless, it has also been manifested several drawbacks connected with training R3 and R4 researchers. As mentioned in previous aspects, it was made clear that there is a necessity to train PhD supervisor to set up a common ground on PhD supervision. It is a fact that the unit responsible for training R3 and R4 does not observe this kind of training as relevant on their curricula.

It was discussed the high level of fragmentation in terms of content providers inside the university: researchers are deeply constrained by their contract in terms to what courses or learning materials they have access. More over, it could be said that there are three types of trainings: central provided training, de-centralised training and individual training. The first case is supported by 3 different units that are not coordinated at all. The second one depends on each research structure, and the last one is done on individual basis.

In conclusion, there is no training program tailored to the necessities of researchers according their progress in the career ladder (R1 to R4).

Relevant legislation	Internal regulation
Law 7/2007, of 12th April, of Public Employee Basic Statute	Doctorate School regulation
Spanish Law 14/2011, 1st June, of Science , Technology and Innovation	Regulation for doctorate studies

Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:

- Set up a group of senior researchers to mentor younger researchers
- Create a training program for researchers regardless the type of contract they have and the content provider
- Set up an internal committee for researcher curriculum update
- Create a training program for PhD supervision

- Set up personalised curricula for researchers
- Design a welcome pack for new researchers

Access to research training and continuous development (39): -/+

Employers and/or funders should ensure that all researchers at any stage of their career, regardless of their contractual situation, are given the opportunity for professional development and for improving their employability through access to measures for the continuing development of skills and competencies. Such measures should be regularly assessed for their accessibility, take up and effectiveness in improving competencies, skills and employability.

Gap:

See aspect 38

Supervision (40): +/-

Employers and/or funders should ensure that a person is clearly identified to whom early-stage researchers can refer for the performance of their professional duties, and should inform the researchers accordingly. Such arrangements should clearly define that the proposed supervisors are sufficiently expert in supervising research, have the time, knowledge, experience, expertise and commitment to be able to offer the research trainee appropriate support and provide for the necessary progress and review procedures, as well as the necessary feedback mechanisms.

Gap:

See aspect 36

Open Transparent Merit based Recruitment

OTM-R matrix

The table below represents the institutional situation against the OTM-R checklist. Column headed “A” stands for “Answer”, and represents the level of implementation of each principle according to the following scale: ++ Yes, completely, +/- Yes, substantially, -/+ Yes, partially, -- No

Nr.	OTM-R System	O	T	M	A	Indicators
1	Have we published a version of our OTM-R policy online (in the national language and in English)?	•	•	•	-/+	Partially
2	Do we have an internal guide setting out clear OTM-R procedures and practices for all types of positions?	•	•	•	-/+	Partially
3	Is everyone involved in the process sufficiently trained in the area of OTM-R?	•	•	•	-/+	Partially
4	Do we make (sufficient) use of e-recruitment tools?	•	•		+/-	https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/
5	Do we have a quality control system for OTM-R in place?	•	•	•	++	https://aplicat.upv.es/pegasus-app/public/unit_results/unit.xhtml?harvestId=12&unitId=3
6	Does our current OTM-R policy encourage external candidates to apply?	•	•	•	-/+	http://www.upv.es/entidades/VIIT/info/1030032normalc.html
7	Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to attract researchers from abroad?	•	•	•	-/+	http://www.upv.es/entidades/VIIT/info/1030032normalc.html
8	Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to attract underrepresented groups?	•	•	•	+/-	Trend in the share of applicants among underrepresented groups
9	Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to provide attractive working conditions for researchers?	•	•	•	+/-	Trend in the share of applicants from outside the organisation
10	Do we have means to monitor whether the most suitable researchers apply?				--	Not implemented
Nr.	Advertising and application phase	O	T	M	A	Indicators
11	Do we have clear guidelines or templates (e.g., EURAXESS) for advertising positions?	•	•		++	https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/
12	Do we include in the job advertisement references/links to all the elements foreseen in the relevant section of the toolkit?	•	•		+/-	https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/
13	Do we make full use of EURAXESS to ensure our research vacancies reach a wider audience?	•	•		-/+	MSKCA

14	Do we make use of other job advertising tools?	•	•		-/+	Outreach Plans for each Call
15	Do we keep the administrative burden to a minimum for the candidate?	•			-/+	Number of fields to fill in
Nr.	Selection and evaluation phase	O	T	M	A	Indicators
16	Do we have clear rules governing the appointment of selection committees?		•	•	++	https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/
17	Do we have clear rules concerning the composition of selection committees?		•	•	++	https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/
18	Are the committees sufficiently gender-balanced?		•	•	-/+	https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/
19	Do we have clear guidelines for selection committees which help to judge 'merit' in a way that leads to the best candidate being selected?			•	++	https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/
Nr.	Appointment phase	O	T	M	A	Indicators
20	Do we inform all applicants at the end of the selection process?		•		++	https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/
21	Do we provide adequate feedback to interviewees?		•		+/-	https://www.upv.es/entidades/SRH/
22	Do we have an appropriate complaints mechanism in place?		•		-/+	Statistics of complaint
Nr.	Overall assessment	O	T	M	A	Indicators
23	Do we have a system in place to assess whether OTM-R delivers on its objectives?				--	Not implemented

Action Plan

Organisational information

Key figures

Staff and Students	FTE
Total researchers = staff, fellowship holders, bursary holders, PhD. students either full-time or part-time involved in research	3654
Of whom are international (i.e. foreign nationality)	183
Of whom are externally funded (i.e. for whom the organisation is host organisation)	694
Of whom are women	1227
Of whom are stage R3 or R4 = Researchers with a large degree of autonomy, typically holding the status of Principal Investigator or Professor.	2598
Of whom are stage R2 = in most organisations corresponding with postdoctoral level	434
Of whom are stage R1 = in most organisations corresponding with doctoral level	622
Total number of students (if relevant)	25556
Total number of staff (including management, administrative, teaching and research staff)	5058

RESEARCH FUNDING (figures for most recent fiscal year)	M€
Total annual organisational budget	317,8
Annual organisational direct government funding (designated for research)	111,5
Annual competitive government-sourced funding (designated for research, obtained in competition with other organisations – including EU funding)	36,3
Annual funding from private, non-government sources, designated for research	18,1

Organisational profile

The Universitat Politècnica de València is a public technological institution focused on the fields of engineering, business administration and arts and design. It is the only technical university in Spain present in the most relevant higher education rankings, like the Academic ranking of World University, QS-Ranking or the Times Higher Education Ranking. It is a leading institution research, being one of the most relevant actors in Spain of the Horizon 2020 Program. In teaching has embraced the development of soft-skills as an integral part of its curriculum and the use of ICT in teaching. Its public commitment is also visible on all its

technology transfer activities, leading patents and licensing national rankings, and in continuing education activities.

Strengths and weaknesses of the current practice

This section presents an overview of the organisation in terms of the current strengths and weaknesses of the current practice under the four thematic headings of the Charter and Code.

Ethical and Professional aspects

Ethics is pinnacle to the university activity. UPV is a public institution, the result of public welfare spending. Using tax payer money efficiently is part of our ethics commitment but, in addition, there are several other initiatives that convert UPV on a pioneering institution in terms of ethics: the Ethic Commission that assess activities according to ethical standards, the Commission in Bioethics and Animal Research, and a specific Vice-Rectorate on Social Responsibility.

In Spain there are more than 70 universities. The Universitat Politècnica de València is always ranked in the Top-5 in terms of technology transfer, showing a strong demand from the society regarding the activities of the university. Nonetheless, it was detected that some researchers are too focused and their career development but not so much on the impact of their research in the social good.

It can be said that the existing organisational structure provides sufficient opportunities to all researchers, regardless their background or their contractual situation, in order to target their research efforts into the fields they consider best. All researchers are linked to one research structure, and most of the researchers can also perform their research activity at departments. Researchers are allowed to change their affiliation to different research structure or, moreover, to create new ones provided they reach the required thresholds established. Nonetheless, during the gap analysis, it was detected that less experienced researchers are not always in equal conditions respect their more experienced counterparts. In all cases existing funding schemes can bias the process.

The university has enforced an automatic system to detect plagiarism. This system allow to score every publication in terms of originality. In addition to that, the university is very active on scientific publications, where the peer review process is also supposed to guarantee originality.

The Research Activity Index, already mentioned in different parts of the UPV HRS4R, is monitored by a committee. This committee has dedicated personnel to assess that merits are accredited conveniently. Nonetheless, there have been detected certain drawbacks on this system that have already been mentioned in the GAP analysis.

The exhaustive economic monitoring system conveys a professional attitude on the researchers: they need to amount to certain standards to do their work. Nonetheless, this

system has also been considered “bureaucratic” and a potential threat to some activities if a better balance between effectiveness and control is not found.

Contractual obligations, in the case of researchers with no teaching profile, are considered fragmented. Nonetheless, the proposed action plan already consider several actions to improve the situation.

In terms of intellectual property, there is an extensive training options within the university. Moreover, ad-hoc training in this matter is also possible. Nonetheless, the Gap Analysis reflected some weaknesses, like the fragmentation of this kind of training according to different contractual situations.

Recruitment and Selection

The Human Resources Department provides support for recruitment and selection. There is professional staff knowledgeable of the existing legal frameworks, capable of initiate, monitor and finalise the whole process. Nonetheless, some concerns were raised regarding the duration of the whole process. Some improvements could be done on this area, though it is true to say that there are legal requirements in terms of deadlines that are not always in line with the quick reaction researchers are expected to have.

The University is subjected to a strict regulation in terms of recruitment and selection. It is a legal requirement that every job position is open to all potential candidates and is publicly available. Nonetheless, during the GAP Analysis several situations have been detected that need to be improved. Also the OTM-R Analysis has also shed light in some circumstances that need to be tackled. Regardless the fact that the Human Resources Department support also international contracts, it is true to say that the absence of information in English regarding the calls is an important weakness. The Action Plan suggests several improvements.

Researchers with teaching background have a very well defined recruitment process. First they need to be accredited externally, later they can opt to a position at the university. Nonetheless, provision of new positions are constrained by external rules damaging the university autonomy in this field. The Gap Analysis has also shown that this process is not so well defined for researchers with no teaching profile. The Action Plan is also intended to improve this situation.

The University participates in different programs to recruit new researchers, like the Beatriz Galindo Program or the Marie-Sklodowska Curie Action. Universitat Politècnica de València is very active in both programs therefore, we could clearly say that the intention is there. Nonetheless, there is quite a lot of room for improvement, like the lack of a well structured procedure to advertise job positions in English.

In terms of OTM-R we could say that recruitment is open, transparent and merit based, but it is true to say that there is still work to be done in order to state that we fulfil all the OTM-R

Criteria. For instance, there is no OTM-R published online and there is no sufficient training in the OTM-R area. This topic is well covered later in this document.

All selection committees include experts in different areas and skills. The existing legal framework has reduced the gender gap on the composition of this committees. In addition to that, the R&D Committee is responsible to back the different selection criteria, adding an extra layer of assessment to the process.

Working Conditions

Universitat Politècnica de València has an active program to facilitate a balance between working requirements and personal life. The program is called “Plan Concilia” and has been working for more than a decade. In addition, the university has a kinder-garden in the campus, organises activities aimed for kids like summer camps and other activities to facilitate well-being. There is a Health Center where all the university community can access for free to different medical services, like blood tests, medical image, cardiology or consultancy. The University is also member of the Spanish Network of Healthy Universities, to promote a health life style among their employees. Nonetheless, the Gap Analysis has shown that some researchers are not aware of those social benefits, specially those regarding “Plan Concilia”, and an action to better disseminate “Plan Concilia” is also foreseen.

In terms of physical infrastructure, the University has one of the biggest Science Parks in Spain, providing cutting edge infrastructure to do professional research in almost all fields of knowledge. There is also important research equipment, like the lab for electronic microscopy, that can be used by the whole research community and assisted by professional staff. The Gap Analysis has also shown that this kind of service should be extended to other equipment that currently is assigned to specific researchers and not available for the whole community. There are certain actions proposed to offer better access to those services.

Researchers with teaching profile are well recognised as professionals, and they have a very well defined career that lead to a long-term contract. This is mainly because they become civil servants of the public administration, and they hold a permanent position at the university. Nonetheless, those researchers with no teaching profile suffer from different conditions that difficult the same recognition than on the other group and not the same stability. In the Action Plan is suggested different options to reduce this gap.

Training and Development

There are 3 units in charge of training and development of researchers at the university: the Doctoral School, the Career Development Unit and the Educational Institute.

The Doctoral School at Universitat Politècnica de València (UPV) is responsible for doctoral studies, at both the academic and administrative level. It is a multidisciplinary school offering doctoral programs in different fields: Engineering and Architecture, Sciences, Arts & Humanities and Social Sciences. The School has its own strategy, which is tied to the strategies of the University's different research programmes. As part of the framework of the 2020 Strategic Plan the UPV has defined as a strategic project a doctoral model that encourages the internationalisation of UPV doctoral programmes (among other objectives). One of the actions to achieve this goal encourages the participation of internationally recognised researchers in events organised as part of doctoral training. In this context, a new call is made to collect applications from the different doctoral programs with the objective of launching a series of seminars and work days to be developed throughout 2018. The Doctoral School is responsible for training R1 researchers. It offers a program of soft skills taught online. In addition to that, some other training activities are organised to guarantee that R1 researchers get the best training.

The Career Development Unit is part of the Human Resources Service. It is in charge of providing training to administrative personnel and to researchers with no teaching profile. The main goal is to enhance competitiveness of university personnel by enhancing skills and professional capabilities in accordance with societal challenges. Training is provided according to 3 main streams:

- The bi-annual training plan aimed to deliver training based on transversal content and suited for all professional fields, including research
- Training grants to support those employees that do not find their needs fulfilled with the existing bi-annual training plan
- Training in foreign languages in partnership with the Center for Languages Development

In addition, a new self-learning strategy has been launched. It is based on a series of online activities available to every employee.

The Educational Institute pursues improve academic skills on everything related with their work as teachers and researchers. It also supports other agents like students, deans and the university community broadly speaking. In terms of teaching the Educational Institute suggests the following goals:

- To provide a coherent training catalogue in accordance with the needs expressed by the different stakeholders
- Fulfil individual and collective needs for training

- Analyse the impact of training in their daily activities.

As mentioned in the Gap Analysis, the current organisational structure does not provide a coherent view of training for researchers. Each unit is aimed to a different group, and researchers can only apply to those learning activities that are part of the unit they “belong” to. The action to provide a single curriculum for research is considered to help on providing a better option for researchers.

It is worth to mention the online learning platform called Poliformat, based on Sakai platform, and that serves as the basis for all online training at the university.

Actions

This document and the rest of files related with the UPV Human Resources Strategy For Researchers are easily accessible on the following website: <https://hrs4r.blogs.upv.es>

A1: Program for better dissemination, exploitation and science outreach

Specific: What will we achieve?

The goal of this action is to increase the number of dissemination, exploitation and communication activities in the field of research, so science from UPV is better accessed by scientists worldwide, more demanded by companies as a resource, and better embraced by society at large.

Specific: How will we know when it is done?

- I1.1: There is an online course about exploitation of research results available for the research community at UPV. This course is available for the whole research community.
- I1.2: There is an online course about dissemination of research results available for the research community at UPV. This course is available for the whole research community.
- I1.3: There is an online course about the importance of science outreach. This course is available for the whole research community.
- I1.4: A new budget line of the university is allocated exclusively for research dissemination, exploitation and science outreach
- I1.5: An annual science fair is host at each of the city centres where UPV has a campus (i.e. Valencia, Alcoy and Gandía)
- I1.6: An annual “inventions fair” is host at UPV premises, on each of UPV’s campuses (i.e. Valencia, Alcoy and Gandía)
- I1.7: An annual conference on dissemination and exploitation of results is host at UPV

- I1.8: Agreements with civil society institutions are reached in order to increase UPV's science outreach capacity
- I1.9: A rewards system, aimed at researchers, is established in order to foster dissemination, exploitation and communication activities
- I1.10: There is a continuous yearly increasement on the recognition of technology transfer activity by researchers at UPV on the assessment carried out by the National Agency of Accreditation
- I1.11: The UPV maintains its position on the U-Ranking as one of the most renowned Spanish universities in technology transfer
- I1.12: There are more collections publicly available at the open repository "Riunet"
- I1.13: More research objects are flagged as open at UPV by the Open Access Monitor

Measurable: Metrics

- M1.1: Percentage of researchers that complete the online course about exploitation of research results
- M1.2: Percentage of researchers that complete the online course about dissemination of research results
- M1.3: Percentage of researchers that complete the online course about science outreach
- M1.4: Euros invested on the new budgetary lines dedicated to encourage researchers on disseminating, exploiting and communicating research results
- M1.5.1: Number of researchers participating in the annual science fair
- M1.5.2: Number of participants in the annual science fair
- M1.6.1: Number of researchers participating in the annual "inventions fair"
- M1.6.2: Number of participants in the annual "inventions fair"
- M1.7: Number of participants in the annual conference on dissemination and exploitation of results
- M1.8: Number of agreements signed with civil society institutions
- M1.9: Research Activity Index updated
- M1.10.1: Percentage of researchers that obtain the recognition from the National Agency for Accreditation on their work on exploiting research results
- M1.10.2: Number of patents, licenses and research contracts
- M1.11: UPV's position at U-Ranking on the Technology Transfer fold
- M1.12: Number of collections available at the open research repository, "Riunet".
- M1.13: Percentage of research objects flagged as "open" by the Open Access Monitor

Measurable: Standards

- S1.1: On S4 50% of researchers have followed the online course about exploitation of research results available for the research community at UPV. All researchers should have followed the online course by S6
- S1.2: On S5 50% of researchers have followed the online course about dissemination of research results available for the research community at UPV. All researchers should have followed the online course by S7.
- S1.3: On S3 50% of researchers have followed the online course about the importance of science outreach. All researchers should have followed the online course by S7.

- S1.4: At least 500.000 € are allocated to the promotion of dissemination, exploitation and communication activities
- S1.5.1: At least 30 researchers per year present research actions at the annual science fair
- S1.5.2: At least 1000 people visit the annual science fair
- S1.6.1: At least 30 researchers per year present research actions at the annual science fair
- S1.6.2: At least 500 people visit the annual science fair
- S1.7: At least 300 people attend the annual conference on dissemination and exploitation of results
- S1.8: 10 new agreements per year are signed with civil society institutions for science outreach
- S1.9: Research Activity Index updated by S5
- S1.10.1: At least 60% of researchers get the recognition for their work on research exploitation from the National Agency of Accreditation
- S1.10.2: A sustained increase of 5% per year in number of patents, licenses and research contracts
- S1.11: Maintain UPV on the top-5 of the U-Ranking monitoring research exploitation activities by universities in Spain
- S1.12: Reach 300.000 collections at the open research repository “Riunet) by S7
- S1.13: Reach 90% of objects flagged as open by the Open Access Monitor by S5

Achievable: Skills

- Proficiency in English
- Science outreach
- Distance learning
- Communication
- Event management
- Technology Transfer

Achievable: Resources

An increase in the budget dedicated to this activity will be needed. The goal is to reach 500.000€ per year. Additionally, it will be necessary campus facilities, municipality facilities, IT resources and human resources to implement this action. The UPV already has personnel dedicated to technology transfer, open access and science outreach. There are different units responsible for the implementation (See Responsible Unit field).

Relevant: Which priorities does it relate to?

It address several Charter and Code criteria (i.e. 7, 8, 9, 11, 24 and 38). Additionally, the UPV's Strategic Plan includes different strategic projects to foster dissemination, exploitation and science outreach, like project 3.3, named “Creation, dissemination, visibility and accessibility of information and research results”, strategic project 3.1, named “Build a portfolio of products and services related to technology transfer” or project 4.1, named “Networking with companies”.

Relevant: Why should it be done?

During the qualitative analysis participants showed no common understanding of public engagement, and maintained that activities like exploitation, dissemination and science outreach were not sufficiently taken into consideration by the university, specially on what it represents on the Research Activity Index. In addition, the tools available for dissemination and exploitation were vaguely described, denoting a superficial knowledge of what the university was offering on this field. As a result, an improvement area was detected, related with criteria 8 and 9. Several actions were defined and subjected to prioritisation, by an internal survey were the vast majority of researchers participated. Eventually, this action was selected among those most voted ranked the third over 41 actions.

Time oriented: When does need to be done?

The implementation of the different tasks is planned to start on January 2021 (S1) and expected to conclude on December 2025 (See the work chronogram for more details), but the different activities expand trough the whole HRS4R process. See “Standards” row for further details.

Breakdown of the action in activities:

To better understand how this action is going to be implemented, it has been broken down in smaller activities. Each activity is related to a metric, a standard and an indicator. Only those activities needed in addition to the regular activity are listed here.

- A1.1: Prepare an online course about exploitation of research results available for the research community at UPV
- A1.2: Prepare an online course about dissemination of research results
- A1.3: Create an online course about science outreach
- A1.4: Budgetary provisions
- A1.5.1: Annual science fair in Valencia
- A1.5.2: Annual science fair in Gandía
- A1.5.3: Annual science fair in Alcoy
- A1.6.1: Annual inventions fair in Valencia
- A1.6.2: Annual inventions fair in Gandía
- A1.6.3: Annual inventions fair in Alcoy
- A1.7: Organise the annual conference on dissemination and exploitation
- A1.8.1: Monitor civil society institutions interested on science outreach
- A1.8.2: Prepare agreements to be signed with civil society institutions
- A1.9.1: Agreement on a new revised version of the Research Activity Index
- A1.9.2: Approve, in the Governing Council, the new Research Activity Index
- A1.10.1: Apply for the recognition from the National Agency for Accreditation on their work on exploiting research results
- A1.10.2: Add extra points for each patent, license or research contracts
- A1.11: Monitor U-Ranking on the Technology Transfer fold
- A1.12: Add extra points at the research activity index for each collection published on the open research repository, “Riunet”.

- A1.13: Add extra points at the research activity index for each collection published on the open research repository, “Riunet” objects flagged as “open” by the Open Access Monitor

Responsible units:

This action will be coordinated by the Vice-Rectorate for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer. Other units involved on the implementation of this action are listed below.

- Career Development Unit
- Doctorate School
- Institute for Educational Sciences
- Communications Office
- Technology Transfer Office
- Human Resources Department
- Legal Department
- Bursar

A2: Observatory and learning program on legal and financial aspects for R&D activities

Specific: What will we achieve?

The goal of this action is to show the relevance of contractual and legal obligations to R1 and R2 researchers

Specific: How will we know when it is done?

- I2.1: The course is open for registration
- I2.2: Learning achievement is recognised by means of a certification
- I2.3: The observatory on the needs of legal and financial aspects for R&D is set up

Measurable: Metrics

- M2.1.1: Percentage of R1 and R2 researchers that complete the online course M2: Percentage of researchers that complete the online course about dissemination of research results
- M2.1.2: Number of researchers certified
- M2.2: Satisfaction level with the course
- M2.3: Number of researchers consulted

Measurable: Standards

- S2.1.1: On S4 50% of R1 and R2 researchers have followed the online course. All researchers should hold a certification by S7
- S2.1.2: By S8, the whole population of R1 and R2 should have been certified. From that moment new editions will be done to cover newcomers

- S2.2: 80% of participants are highly satisfied with what they learned during the course
- S2.3: Every year, a sample of 15% of researchers should be consulted as part of the observatory on needs of legal and financial aspects of R&D

Achievable: Skills

- R&D funding mechanisms
- International calls aimed to fund R&D
- R&D contractual obligations
- European legal framework for R&D
- National legal framework for R&D
- Regional legal framework for R&D

Achievable: Resources

Personnel from the Research Management Service will be in charge of preparing this course and conducting annually the observatory. External experts should be hired in some specific fields, like the ones about the different research programs. For additional information see “Responsible units” below.

Relevant: Which priorities does it relate to?

Criterion 5 is considered highly impacted by this action, specially for mentioning that “Researchers at all levels must be familiar with the national, sectoral or institutional regulations governing training and/or working conditions”. However, criteria 4 and 6 are also considered affected by this action. In addition, UPV’s Strategic Plan defines a learning program aimed to researchers. The Doctoral School priorities are also in line with this action. There were several comments made by participants about the lack of understanding of the legal and financial aspects of R&D, specially in the case of R1 and R2 researchers. It is true to say that the regulatory framework for R&D is wide and complex, and sometimes difficult to attain when researchers are still trying to set their path in their research field. Not been knowledgeable of this field constrain the opportunities to obtain finance and, as a result, to progress in their research careers. In addition, it is considered of the highest importance, the understanding of the legal terms of the contract signed by a R1 and R2.

Time oriented: When does need to be done?

The implementation of the different tasks is planned to start on July 2021 (S2) and expected to conclude on December 2025 (See the work chronogram for more details), but the different activities expand trough the whole HRS4R process. See “Standards” row for further details.

Breakdown of the action in activities:

To better understand how this action is going to be implemented, it has been broken down in smaller activities. Each activity is related to a metric, a standard and an indicator. Only those activities needed in addition to the regular actions are listed here.

- A2.1.1: Prepare the syllabus of the course
- A2.1.2: Select the tutors and experts
- A2.1.3: Prepare the online material
- A2.2.1: Certificate participants
- A2.2.2: Perform a satisfaction survey among participants
- A2.3.1: Prepare the survey
- A2.3.2: Select the sample
- A2.3.3: Produce a report on the needs of researchers on legal and financial aspects of R&D

Responsible units:

This action will be coordinated by the Research Management Service. Other units involved on the implementation of this action are listed below.

- Career Development Unit
- Institute for Educational Sciences
- Technology Transfer Office
- Vice-Rectorate for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer
- Doctoral School

A3: Assessment and enhancement of existing R&D practices in project management, IT security and health and safety procedures

Specific: What will we achieve?

The goal of this action is to improve researchers working conditions at UPV by confronting 4 essential requisites on an R&D environment deemed successful : R&D grant management, R&D project management, IT security and health and safety procedures.

Specific: How will we know when it is done?

- I3.1: An external IT risk assessment audit has been performed
- I3.2: Health and safety procedures on every R&D facility are vetted by an external expert
- I3.3: Improvement actions are set in practice as a result of the IT risk assessment and health and safety assessment
- I3.4: An online repository of best practices for R&D grant management is available for the whole research community
- I3.5: An online course of R&D project management is available for the whole research community

Measurable: Metrics

- M3.1: Number of improvement areas detected in the course of the IT risk assessment
- M3.2: Number of improvement areas detected in the course of the health and safety external audit
- M3.3: Percentage of improvement actions set in practice vs the total improvement areas detected (M3.1+M3.2)
- M3.4: Number of best practices available at the online repository
- M3.5: Percentage of researchers that follow the online course

Measurable: Standards

- S3.1: All IT resources are assessed
- S3.2: All R&D facilities are assessed
- S3.3: At least 90% of improvement actions have been addressed by S10
- S3.4: More than 100 best practices for R&D grant management are collected
- S3.5: At least 90% of researchers have followed the online course

Achievable: Skills

- IT security: there is an internal IT service to assist the process
- Personnel from the R&D facilities will help on the process
- Financial resources are already available for these actions
- Health and Safety at work
- Distance learning

Achievable: Resources

Personnel from the Research Management Service will be in charge of compiling best practices. People from the IT service will assist the process. Personnel from the Health and Safety Service will support to the external assessment. The Career Development Unit will provide the courses. There are sufficient financial resources to finance the external audits. See "Responsible units" for further details.

Relevant: Which priorities does it relate to?

Criterion 7, will be the most affected by this action, but also 3, 4, 6, 23, 38 and 39. Necessary precautions for health, safety, information disaster or back up strategies will be on the spot.

Relevant: Why should it be done?

During the qualitative analysis participants expressed that though there is a general framework for labor risk prevention, the heterogeneity of research activities needed a broader approach than the existing one. During the quantitative analysis, this action was ranked the 12th over a total of 41 potential actions.

Time oriented: When does need to be done?

The implementation of the different tasks is planned to start on January 2021 (S1) and expected to conclude on December 2025 (See the work chronogram for more details), but the different activities expand through the whole HRS4R process.

Breakdown of the action in activities:

To better understand how this action is going to be implemented, it has been broken down in smaller activities. Each activity is related to a metric, a standard and an indicator. Only those activities needed in addition to the regular actions are listed here.

- A3.1.1: Select an external company for the IT assessment
- A3.1.2: Perform the IT assessment
- A3.2.1: Select an external company for the Health and Safety assessment
- A3.2.2: Perform the Health and Safety assessment
- A3.3.1: Define an implementation plan
- A3.3.2: Implement the improvement actions
- A3.3.3: Assess the level of completion of the implementation plan
- A3.4.1: Setup an online repository
- A3.4.2: Feed the system with best practices
- A3.4.3: Ask users to feed the system with their own best practices
- A3.4.4: Verify user supplied best practices
- A3.4.5: Setup a search engine for best practices
- A3.4.6: Make the online repository publicly available
- A3.5.1: Construct the syllabus of the course
- A3.5.2: Prepare materials
- A3.5.3: Open the course for registration
- A3.5.4: Monitor course development
- A3.5.5: Certification

Responsible units:

This action will be coordinated by the Vice-Rectorate for Sustainability and Campuses. Other units involved on the implementation of this action are listed below.

- Career Development Unit
- Institute for Educational Sciences
- Technology Transfer Office
- Human Resources Department
- Vice-Rectorate for Digital Resources
- Doctoral School

A4: To setup the Researcher's Career Development Unit

Specific: What will we achieve?

A comprehensive approach to human resources management related with research. A new unit will be set up aimed to support all facets of a researcher's career, including training, mentoring, professional guidance, and human resources management. The new unit will surpass the current fragmentation existing in research learning provision, with a Career Development Unit for non academic staff and an Institute for Educational Sciences for researchers with teaching profile. The new Researcher's Career Development Unit will overcome existing overlapping, inefficiencies and inequalities in learning provision.

Specific: How will we know when it is done?

- I4.1: A comprehensive list of training, based on researchers demands, is open for registration
- I4.2: Mentoring services are available for R1 and R2 researcher
- I4.3: Professional guidance seminars are open for every researcher at the university
- I4.4.1: Dedicated personnel for managing exclusively human resources management is designated
- I4.4.2: A new unit dedicated to manage research related human resources issues is giving service to the whole UPV community
- I4.5: PhD tutoring assessment is ready

Measurable: Metrics

- M4.1: Number of courses available at the catalogue
- M4.2: Number of queries to the new mentoring service
- M4.3: Number of participants on the seminars
- M4.4.1: Number of persons assigned to the new unit
- M4.4.2: Satisfaction with the new service
- M4.5.1: Number of Thesis tutoring assessed
- M4.5.2: Improvement actions implemented

Measurable: Standards

- S4.1: At least 20 courses are available at the catalogue
- S4.2: All queries responded in less than 5 days
- S4.3: At least 50% of researchers participate annually on the professional guidance seminar
- S4.4: Satisfaction with the new service is higher than 90%
- S4.5: At least 20% of the total thesis are assessed every year

Achievable: Skills

- Human Resources management
- Research grants management
- Training
- Quality control
- Pedagogy

- PhD tutoring

Achievable: Resources

Currently there is a central human resources department that would provide part of the personnel for the new unit. In addition, staff offering training for researchers from different units (Education Centre, Continuing Education Centre, Human Resources Department), would become part of the staff of the new unit. In addition, new staff should be hired in order to manage the monitoring program and the professional advice of the new unit. For further information on the implementation needs, please see below (Responsible Units).

Relevant: Which priorities does it relate to?

This relate with several criteria from the Charter and Code (i.e. 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 23, 24, 28, 30, 31, 32, 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40).

Relevant: Why should it be done?

During the qualitative analysis participants expressed concerns about the practices related with the central human resources department. This department is in charge of managing teaching staff, research staff and non academic staff. The specific necessities of research, like the multitude of external bodies financing contracts, the role of R&D projects and so on, made it relevant to have a new unit specialised only in research personnel. We consider this will be one of the most relevant actions in terms of improving working conditions for researchers at UPV

Time oriented: When does need to be done?

The implementation of the different tasks is planned to start on July 2021 (S2) and expected to conclude on December 2025 (See the work chronogram for more details), but the different activities expand trough the whole HRS4R process.

Breakdown of the action in activities:

To better understand how this action is going to be implemented, it has been broken down in smaller activities. Each activity is related to a metric, a standard and an indicator. Only those activities needed in addition to the regular actions are listed here.

- A4.1.1: Launch a survey on training needs
- A4.1.2: Prepare a catalogue of courses
- A4.1.3: Set up a platform with the courses
- A4.2.1: Set up a platform to collect queries from researchers
- A4.2.2: Select senior researchers in charge of the mentoring process
- A4.3.1: Hire experts for the seminars
- A4.3.2: Organise seminars on professional guidance for researchers
- A4.4.1: Select the personnel for the new unit
- A4.4.2: Hire new personal for the unit
- A4.4.3: Design the process for service provision at the new unit

- A4.4.4: Create a web portal to provide e-services related with human resources management in research, including tools like e-Recruitment
- A4.5.1: Select a sample of thesis to be analysed
- A4.5.2: Audit the sample
- A4.5.3: Produce a report
- A4.5.4: Implement improvement actions

Responsible units:

This action will be coordinated by the Human Resources Department. Other units involved on the implementation of this action are listed below.

- Career Development Unit
- Institute for Educational Sciences
- Vice-Rectorate for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer
- Vice-Rectorate for Digital Resources
- Doctoral School

A5: UPV researcher development framework

Specific: What will we achieve?

A significant improvement on the researchers' career development from R1 upwards by reducing the existing fragmentation of the researcher's career at UPV detected during the gap analysis.

Specific: How will we know when it is done?

- I5.1: A high level policy monitoring group has been established
- I5.2: Curated relevant information about research career development at UPV is available online
- I5.3: A dataset of key indicators about research career development at UPV is open for consultation online
- I5.4: A map of activities and strategies related to research career development is published on the UPV's website
- I5.5: The UPV researcher Development Tool is developed

Measurable: Metrics

- M5.1: Number of participants in the policy monitoring group
- M5.2: Number of learning objects available online about research career development
- M5.3.1: Number of queries to the online service
- M5.3.2: Percentage of research activity covered on the datasets
- M5.4: Number of visits to the map of activities and strategies related to research career development webpage
- M5.5: Number of queries to the research career development tool

Measurable: Standards

- S5.1: At least 20 people become part of the policy monitoring group, with representatives from R1 upwards. Half of its members come from companies and civil society.
- S5.2: More than 20 learning objects available. Information updated on year bases
- S5.3.1: 50% of the UPV research community use regularly the online service. The rest of queries come from other researchers not yet part of the UPV research community
- S5.3.2: At least 90% of the UPV research community is covered on the datasets
- S5.4: All UPV research community has accessed at least once to the map of activities and strategies related to research career development
- S5.5: 50% of the UPV research community use regularly the online service

Achievable: Skills

- Research Policy
- Information Technologies
- Networking

Achievable: Resources

The UPV IT Service will be in charge of setting up the platform. Additional budget will be allocated for the development of such a platform. The Social Council will nurture 50% of the policy group. For further information on the implementation needs, please see below (Responsible Units).

Relevant: Which priorities does it relate to?

This action relates to the following criteria from the Charter and Code: 5, 12, 13, 14, 16, 25, 26, 28, 30 and 38. Additionally, the action is well in line with the existing UPV's Strategic Plan.

Relevant: Why should it be done?

While conducting the qualitative analysis, it was detected that participants complained about the lack of specific actions to foster research careers at UPV. Fragmentation seemed to be the norm. Additionally, it was stated the importance of following the "High level policy recommendations to foster research career development in Europe" by Euraxess¹.

Time oriented: When does need to be done?

The implementation of the different tasks is planned to start on January 2021 (S1) and expected to conclude on December 2023 (See the work chronogram for more details).

Breakdown of the action in activities:

To better understand how this action is going to be implemented, it has been broken down in smaller activities. Each activity is related to a metric, a standard and an indicator. Only those activities needed in addition to the regular actions are listed here.

¹ Euraxess - "High level policy recommendations to foster research career development in Europe". Pipers Project

- A5.1.1: Select researchers from R1 to R4 from UPV as members of the group
- A5.1.2: Select members from the Social Council for the group
- A5.2.1: Perform a survey to determine the most relevant information about research career development at UPV
- A5.2.2: Produce learning objects based on the conclusions from the survey
- A5.2.3: Publish the learning objects online
- A5.3.1: Select key indicators about research career development based on the survey done in A5.2.1
- A5.3.2: Create a dataset available online with the indicators selected
- A5.4: Prepare the map of activities and strategies related to research career development and publish online
- A5.5: Setup the research career development tool

Responsible units:

This action will be coordinated by the Vice-Rectorate for Teaching and Academic Affairs. Other units involved on the implementation of this action are listed below.

- Human Resources Department
- Vice-Rectorate for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer
- Vice-Rectorate for Teaching and Academic Affairs
- Vice-Rectorate for Digital Resources
- Bursar
- Legal Department

A6: Enhance recruitment practices for R2 short term research contracts

Specific: What will we achieve?

Researchers with short-term contracts, usually R2, will have a new recruitment framework, flexible enough to engage them with research career developments, overcoming the current over-specific rigid short-term contracts hiring scheme.

A significant improvement on the researchers' career development from R1 upwards by reducing the existing fragmentation of the researcher's career at UPV detected during the gap analysis.

Specific: How will we know when it is done?

- I6.1: Instead of being just a list of active research projects, the catalogue of projects is grouped by themes, in the so called "thematic lines". People will be allowed to move through a row of projects provided they all belong to the same "thematic line"

- I6.2: A legal service is contracted to define a new contract scheme that reduce the existing job instability associated with short research contracts linked to projects
- I6.3: The new contract is defined and researchers can be hired according to that one
- I6.4: The average duration of a researcher's contract at UPV is increased

Measurable: Metrics

- M6.1: Number of projects per thematic line
- M6.2: New contract scheme defined
- M6.3: Percentage of R2 researchers that can apply for the new contract scheme
- M6.4: Average of months per research contract

Measurable: Standards

- S6.1: 100% of research projects are linked to at list one thematic line.
- S6.2: The new contract scheme covers at least 90% of the existing cases
- S6.3: 90% of R2 researchers can apply under the new contract scheme
- S6.4: The average duration of a researcher contract at UPV is doubled
- S6.5: 50% of the UPV research community use regularly the online service

Achievable: Skills

- Labour law
- UPV's research regulatory framework
- National laws on research

Achievable: Resources

A legal expert will be hired, who will work with the university legal services and the department of human resources. For further information on the implementation needs, please see below (Responsible Units).

Relevant: Which priorities does it relate to?

This action relates to the following criteria from the Charter and Code: 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 25 and 29. Additionally, the action is alined with the existing UPV's Strategic Plan and was among the most voted during the quantitative analysis

Relevant: Why should it be done?

The gap analysis set current contractual practices for R2 on the sport. They are the victims of a contractual system that is at odds with stability and the development of a research career. Additionally, it was voted among the top 10 by the research community, as part of a list of 41 different actions. The university is concerned with this situation and wants to improve the situation.

Time oriented: When does need to be done?

The implementation of the different tasks is planned to start on January 2022 (S3) and expected to conclude on December 2025 (See the work chronogram for more details).

Breakdown of the action in activities:

To better understand how this action is going to be implemented, it has been broken down in smaller activities. Each activity is related to a metric, a standard and an indicator. Only those activities needed in addition to the regular actions are listed here.

- A6.1: Analysis of the current research projects portfolio and proposal of a classification in thematic lines
- A6.2.1: Open a public call for a legal expert procurement
- A6.2.2: Analysis of the current legal framework
- A6.2.3: Proposal of a new contractual scheme
- A6.3: Approval of the new contractual scheme
- A6.4: Hiring researchers according the new contractual scheme

Responsible units:

This action will be coordinated by the Vice-Rectorate for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer. Other units involved on the implementation of this action are listed below.

- Human Resources Department
- Vice-Rectorate for Teaching and Academic Affairs
- Research Management Service
- Legal Department

A7: A one-stop shops for EU researchers merits recognition at UPV

Specific: What will we achieve?

An increase in the number of international researchers at UPV by the establishment of a one-stop shops' for advice, information and guidance, which will develop existing information portals and databases of recognition practices, will promote and streamline existing tools, awareness-raising and networking for employers, will reduce costs for recognition, and will establish an entitlement to recognition.

Specific: How will we know when it is done?

- I7.1: Personnel from the Human Resources Department is dedicated exclusively to merits recognition
- I7.2: A web portal is established with information, guidance and access to database about merits recognition
- I7.3: Webinars are done about EU merits recognition

- I7.4: The total number of international researchers coming from the EU has increased

Measurable: Metrics

- M7.1: Number of persons dedicated to merits recognition
- M7.2: Number of visits to the web portal
- M7.3: Number of attendees to the webinars
- M7.4: Percentage of international EU researchers

Measurable: Standards

- S7.1: At least 2 people is dedicated to merits recognition.
- S7.2: The web portal receive more than 1000 visits monthly
- S7.3: More than 100 people attend each of the planned webinars
- S7.4: The percentage of EU international researchers is doubled

Achievable: Skills

- International Higher Education Systems
- EU regulatory framework for research
- National legislation of each member state

Achievable: Resources

Two persons will be hired for this purpose. Additionally, the portal will be developed in house. Experts that participate in the seminar will come from other institutions. For further information on the implementation needs, please see below (Responsible Units).

Relevant: Which priorities does it relate to?

This action relates to the following criteria from the Charter and Code: 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 29, 39. Additionally, the action is aligned with the existing UPV's Strategic Plan and was among the most voted during the quantitative analysis

Relevant: Why should it be done?

The percentage of international researchers at UPV is strikingly low. The lack of a proper system to recognise the skills and qualifications of other EU countries is one of the root causes lurking behind this situation. Such recognition is essential to ensure speedy and quality access to the UPV research environment. Participants on the qualitative analysis pointed out this situation, and was one of the actions with the highest number of votes during the quantitative analysis.

Time oriented: When does need to be done?

The implementation of the different tasks is planned to start on January 2023 (S5) and expected to conclude on December 2025 (See the work chronogram for more details).

Breakdown of the action in activities:

To better understand how this action is going to be implemented, it has been broken down in smaller activities. Each activity is related to a metric, a standard and an indicator. Only those activities needed in addition to the regular actions are listed here.

- A7.1: Set up a new team to deal with EU merits recognition
- A7.2: Develop the web portal
- A7.3: Prepare 2 webinars per year about EU merits recognition
- A7.4: Hire international researchers

Responsible units:

This action will be coordinated by the Human Resources Department. Other units involved on the implementation of this action are listed below.

- Human Resources Department
- Career Development Unit
- Vice-Rectorate for Teaching and Academic Affairs
- Legal Department
- Vice-Rectorate for Digital Resources

A8: Research incentives and salaries

Specific: What will we achieve?

A more attractive research environment by improving economic conditions in terms of fixed and variable remuneration.

Better economic conditions, by updating the salary scales on which the R1 and R2 fixed remuneration is based and

Specific: How will we know when it is done?

- I8.1: Salary scales on which R1 and R2 fixed remuneration is based are updated
- I8.2: A new system to calculate economic incentives is in place

Measurable: Metrics

- M8.1: Percentage of increasement
- M8.2: Research Productivity Index
- M8.3: Number of attendees to the webinars
- M8.4: Percentage of international EU researchers

Measurable: Standards

- S8.1: Salaries are increased according the inflation rate
- S8.2: The average research productivity index increases at least 10%

Achievable: Skills

- Research Management
- Economics
- Financing

Achievable: Resources

People from the Research Management Office and from the Bursar Office.

Relevant: Which priorities does it relate to?

Criteria 16, 24 and 26. It was among the most voted during the quantitative analysis.

Relevant: Why should it be done?

The existing salary scales on which fixed remuneration for R1 and R2 is based are outdated, diminishing the buying power of researchers due to the effect on inflation rates. Additionally, results from the existing incentive scheme is not producing the expected results.

Time oriented: When does need to be done?

The implementation of the different tasks is planned to start on January 2024 (S7) and expected to conclude on December 2025 (See the work chronogram for more details).

Breakdown of the action in activities:

To better understand how this action is going to be implemented, it has been broken down in smaller activities. Each activity is related to a metric, a standard and an indicator. Only those activities needed in addition to the regular actions are listed here.

- A8.1: Create a committee to analyse the existing remuneration scales
- A8.2: Make a new proposal for the remuneration scales
- A8.3: Prepare a new incentives system
- A8.4: Organise annual seminars to explain how the system works

Responsible units:

This action will be coordinated by the Bursar. Other units involved on the implementation of this action are listed below.

- Human Resources Department
- Career Development Unit
- Institute of Educational Sciences

- Vice-Rectorate for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer
- Legal Department

A9: Teaching and Research

Specific: What will we achieve?

A better link between research and teaching will be made by establishing a system to recognise teaching to R1 and R2 researchers and a way to allow researchers with no teaching profile be principal investigator on a research project.

Il researchers will be allowed to be principal investigator in a research project regardless their teaching profile.

Better economic conditions, by updating the salary scales on which the R1 and R2 fixed remuneration is based and

Specific: How will we know when it is done?

- I9.1: The number of teaching hours by pure researchers has increased
- I9.2: There is a process to allow the participation of pure researchers as principal investigators

Measurable: Metrics

- M9.1: Number of credits taught by pure researchers
- M9.2: Number pure researchers receiving training for better teaching
- M9.3: Number of projects coordinated by a pure researcher

Measurable: Standards

- S9.1: An increase of 10% in the number of credits taught by pure researchers
- S9.2: The whole community of pure researchers receive training on better teaching
- S9.3: At least 10% of the total research projects are coordinated by pure researchers

Achievable: Skills

- Research Management
- Law
- Higher Education Systems

Achievable: Resources

People from the Research Management Office, the Bursar Office, the Legal Department and the Human Resources Department

Relevant: Which priorities does it relate to?

Criteria 33, 37, 39 and 40

Relevant: Why should it be done?

Since 2 of the backbone university missions are teaching and research, pure researchers was quite an uncommon figure on the Spanish Higher Education System. The steady pace at which Spanish universities have been incorporated at different research programs, transitioning from a teaching oriented institution to a more research based entity, made that the population of pure researchers hired as a result of research projects funding, has increased notably. Nowadays, at UPV, around 1000 people are considered pure researchers. However, the system is still tamed to the teaching obligations, so those research-only persons are lacking some of the basic skills to improve their working conditions. The action aims to counterbalance this situation, giving those pure researchers the option to teach, so they can be better positioned on the career ladder, and letting them be principal investigator regardless their teaching responsibilities.

Time oriented: When does need to be done?

The implementation of the different tasks is planned to start on January 2021 (S1) and expected to conclude on December 2025 (See the work chronogram for more details).

Breakdown of the action in activities:

To better understand how this action is going to be implemented, it has been broken down in smaller activities. Each activity is related to a metric, a standard and an indicator. Only those activities needed in addition to the regular actions are listed here.

- A9.1: Set up a committee to explore how promoting teaching among pure researchers and enabling pure researchers as principal investigator can fit in the Spanish Organic Law of Universities
- A9.2: Produce a set of recommendations to improve the situation of pure researchers at the university
- A9.3: Facilitate the access to learning methodologies courses for pure researchers
- A9.4: Select a group of projects as a pilot test and extend

Responsible units:

This action will be coordinated by the Vice-Rectorate for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer. Other units involved on the implementation of this action are listed below.

- Human Resources Department
- Career Development Unit
- Institute of Educational Sciences
- Vice-Rectorate for Teaching and Academic Affairs

A10: Definition of an action to implement and monitor the OTM-R policy at UPV

Specific: What will we achieve?

To ensure that the best person for a research job is recruited, guaranteeing equal opportunities for all and the development of an international portfolio (cooperation, competition, mobility) that makes research careers more attractive by the implementation of an OTM-R policy at UPV in line with C&C principles

Specific: How will we know when it is done?

- I10.1: There is a concrete OTM-R policy in Spanish, Valencian and English, available on the UPV's website
- I10.2: A collection of guidelines, processes and procedures are publicly available on the UPV's website
- I10.3: University personnel, with direct or indirect relation with research, has followed an online training about OTM-R
- I10.4: University personnel, with direct or indirect relation with research, has attended the OTM-R seminars
- I10.5: All research recruitment processes can be done online by means of e-recruitment tools, publicly available at the researchers recruitment portal
- I10.6: The OTM-R policy has been internationally verified by an external body, and an annual revision is put in place
- I10.7: All research job offers are translated into English
- I10.8: All job posts are advertised on Euraxess, Research Gate and LinkedIn
- I10.9: A compilation of the current working conditions at UPV is available at the researchers recruitment portal
- I10.10: The job posting communication strategy is defined and is publicly available at the researchers recruitment portal
- I10.11: Processes for the application phase have been redefined and inefficiencies have been overcome, making the recruitment UPV's processes a reference for other institution
- I10.12: Participants on a selection process receive useful inspiring feedback aimed to improve their research careers
- I10.13: Complaints during the appoint phase can be filed by means of a web platform

Measurable: Metrics

- M10.1: Satisfaction level with the UPV's OTM-R policy
- M10.2: Number of times that the collection of guidelines, processes and procedures are consulted online
- M10.3: Percentage of research personnel that has followed the OTM-R online training
- M10.4: Percentage of research personnel that has attended the OTM-R seminars
- M10.5: Percentage of recruitment tools that have been converted to online
- M10.6: Percentage of non conformities

- M10.7: Percentage of research job offers translated into English
- M10.8: Percentage of job offers advertised on Euraxess, Research Gate and LinkedIn
- M10.9: Visits to the working conditions section of the website
- M10.10: Communication strategy ready
- M10.11: Percentage of recruitment and selection processes analysed and improved
- M10.12: Satisfaction with the new feedback report
- M10.13: Percentage of complaints filed online

Measurable: Standards

- S10.1: On S3 at least 90% of people surveyed are satisfied with OTM-R practices
- S10.2: On S3 The number of times that the collection of guidelines, processes and procedures are consulted is in line with the existing recruitment and selection activity
- S10.3.1: On S3 at least 50% of the research personnel has followed the OTM-R online training
- S10.3.2: On S5 100% of the research personnel has followed the OTM-R online training
- S10.4: On S5 80% of the research personnel has attended the OTM-R seminars
- S10.5.1: On S4 80% of the recruitment tools have been converted to online
- S10.5.2: On S5 100% of the recruitment tools have been converted to online
- S10.6.1: On S6 the first international auditing of the OTM-R practices takes place and the number of non conformities is below 10%
- S10.6.2: On S10 the second international auditing of the OTM-R practices takes place and the number of non conformities is below 10%
- S10.6.3: On S10 the third international auditing of the OTM-R practices takes place and the number of non conformities is below 10%
- S10.6.4: Percentage of non conformities is always 0%
- S10.7: On S3 all research job offers are translated into English and a translation service has been enacted
- S10.8: On S3 all research job offers are advertised on Euraxess, Research Gate and LinkedIn
- S10.9: Visits to the working conditions page is in line with the recruitment and selection activity
- S10.10: On S5 the communication strategy is available online and frequently updated with the number of job posts advertised on international recruitment platforms
- S10.11: On S3 100% of the recruitment and selection processes have been analysed and improved
- S10.12.1: On S4 the new feedback report is ready
- S10.12.2: On S5 90% of the candidates are satisfied with the feedback report
- S10.13.1: On S4 the platform to file complaints is available online
- S10.13.2: On S5 100% of complaints are filed online

Achievable: Skills

- Quality assurance
- Proficiency in English
- Knowledge of the research activities
- Project management

- Communication

Achievable: Resources

Additional budget will be needed for translation and the development of the e-recruitment tools. Personnel costs will be included on the university payroll.

Relevant: Which priorities does it relate to?

It is in line with the Strategic Plan of the university and contributes to the development of several criteria of the HRS4R process (i.e. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34 and 39).

Relevant: Why should it be done?

To improve working conditions of researchers at UPV

Time oriented: When does need to be done?

Time oriented: When does need to be done?

The implementation of the different tasks is planned to start on January 2021 (S1) and expected to conclude on December 2025 (See the work chronogram for more details).

Breakdown of the action in activities:

To better understand how this action is going to be implemented, it has been broken down in smaller activities. Each activity is related to a metric, a standard and an indicator.

- A10.1: Develop an OTM-R policy in Spanish, Valencian and English
- A10.2: Develop a collection of guidelines, processes and procedures
- A10.3: Create an online course about the OTM-R
- A10.4: Design face to face seminars about OTM-R customised for the different research stages
- A10.5: Develop e-recruitment tools
- A10.6: Hire an external auditor to verify the OTM-R policy
- A10.7: Translate all research related job offers into English
- A10.8: Publish job posts on Euraxess, Research Gate and LinkedIn
- A10.9: Publish a compilation of the working conditions on the recruitment portal
- A10.10: Define a job posting communication strategy
- A10.11: Analyse and improve processes for the application phase
- A10.12: Design a new feedback report
- A10.13: Develop a platform to file complaints online

Responsible units:

This action will be coordinated by the Human Resources Department. Other units involved on the implementation of this action are listed below.

- Career Development Unit

- Institute of Educational Sciences
- Vice-Rectorate for Teaching and Academic Affairs
- Vice-Rectorate for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer
- Vice-Rectorate for Digital Resources
- Communication Office

Open Recruitment Policy

The establishment of an Open Recruitment Policy is a key element in the HRS4R strategy. Here we indicate how the university will use the Open, Transparent and Merit-Based Recruitment Toolkit and how we intend to implement the principles of Open, Transparent and Merit-Based Recruitment. Although there may be some overlap with a range of actions listed above, please provide a short commentary demonstrating this implementation. Finally we make the link between the OTM-R checklist and the overall action plan.

The university is a public institution subjected to strict norms related to public employment. The legal framework requires that all positions are open to everyone. In addition, it establishes the necessity to publish the call in order to facilitate all potential candidates to apply. Scores and selection criteria are publicly available, and defined by committees subjected to strict regulation. It could be said that the legal framework guarantees an Open Transparent Merit Recruitment process.

Procedures date back from long time ago and are mainly design to provide with employees to the Public Administration broadly speaking. The University has some special requirements that do not fit well in those procedures, so the application of the OTM-R principles and the HRS4R is considered to be greatly beneficial. Attracting international researchers is not part of the core public employment policies of the Public Administration. The action A08 aimed to establish an automatic merits recognition framework for EU researchers will be highly beneficial on this issue, and will encourage the application of checkpoints 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

Action A11 will facilitate the creation of better economic conditions for researchers, so checkpoint 9 will be greatly affected.

The OTM-R checklist, part of the HRS4R process, establish 23 checkpoints that confront existing practices with those required to have a full OTM-R process. The Universitat Politècnica de València has defined an action plan with 15 actions to be conducting during a 5 years timeframe. Those actions contribute to implement the high standards suggested by the HRS4R process. For instance, the action A06 to setup a new merits recognition scheme, will help on better accomplish checkpoints number 6, 7, 10, 12, 16 and 18. During the Gap Analysis participants raised concerns about the lack of an authentic “professional development strategy”. Action A09 will deliver on it, and will help on checkpoints number 1, 2, 3 and 4.

As part of our OTM-R commitment we will launch some specific OTM-R actions, like one to better balance our audience to guarantee a more balanced gender provision.

In our action plan it can also be checked how we plan to translate all job positions into English and our commitment to publish everything in the Euraxess portal.

Implementation

General Overview

Our assumption is that a project to be implemented needs to have a resource allocation scheme and a monitoring system. Hence, we consider of the utmost relevance that the HRS4R strategy becomes part of the UPV Strategic Plan 2021-2025. It will provide additional monitoring systems beyond those described in the next section and the necessary allocation of resources.

For the implementation, a new committee will be defined, the so called “Implementation Committee”. This committee will be chaired by the Director of Human Resources, who is also member of the Steering Committee and will be in charge of the implementation itself. The chairperson will coordinate a group that will be conformed by representatives from those units in charge of implementing actions (see Action Plan for more details): Vice-Rectorate for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer, Vice-Rectorate for Sustainability and Campuses, Vice-Rectorate of Digital Resources, Vice-Rectorate for Teaching Affairs and Academics, Bursar, Legal Department, Doctorate School, Educational Institute, Human Resources, Research Management Service, Technology Transfer Office, Communications Office, Career Development Unit.

We also consider key to involve end users in the implementation, therefore, the existing working groups related with ethical and professional aspects, working conditions and social security, recruitment and selection and training and career development will be transformed into “Consultation Groups”, that will monitor how the implementation affects each of their areas. Those groups include representatives from the research community and the support staff of research activities. In addition to that, the annual conference about the HRS4R strategy and the annual survey of end-user satisfaction with the HRS4R process will also be a crucial part of our implementation process.

Finally, the Steering Committee will oversee the whole process and will be in charge of informing the main decision making bodies of the university about how the HRS4R process evolves.

Checklist

How will the implementation committee and/or steering group regularly oversee progress?

We plan to keep the same Steering Committee and Working Group structure set up during the design phase.

The Steering Committee, chaired by the Vice-Rector for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer, includes representatives from the different researchers groups (R1 to R4), representatives from the research support staff and a representative from the trade

unions. The Steering Committee will meet every semester to oversee progress. As a result of the meeting, a monitoring report will be produced, documenting the situation of each action in terms of indicators, risks and potential adjustments to be done. Changes in existing actions will have to be approved by the Steering Committee.

The working groups related with professional and ethical aspects, working conditions and social security, recruitment and selection and training and career development will be transformed into Consultation Groups. Each one will be chaired by a representative of the Steering Committee and will oversee how the HRS4R implementation affects to each area. They will also report to the Steering Committee. There will be a report from each group to assess how the project evolves in each area.

The Implementation Committee will be participated by representatives from each unit in charge of implementing each action: Vice-Rectorate for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer, Vice-Rectorate for Sustainability and Campuses, Vice-Rectorate of Digital Resources, Vice-Rectorate for Teaching Affairs and Academics, Bursar, Legal Department, Doctorate School, Educational Institute, Human Resources, Research Management Service, Technology Transfer Office, Communications Office, Career Development Unit. The Implementation Committee will be chaired by the Director of Human Resources who will be responsible of overseeing the implementation process in practice and reporting to the Steering Committee during the semester meeting.

The Steering Committee will be in charge of preparing the internal evaluation (3 years after the project starts) and the final evaluation (5 years after the project starts).

How do you intend to involve the research community, your main stakeholders, in the implementation process?

During the design of the HRS4R strategy we have defined 4 working groups: the ethical and professional working group, the working conditions and social security working group, the recruitment and selection working group and the training and career development working group. They include representatives from R1 to R4 researchers and from the support staff related with research activities. Each of these working groups is chaired by a person who is member of the Steering Committee

We plan to maintain the working groups mentioned before so they become consultations groups that will advise the Implementation Working Group (see later). The Consultation Working Groups will meet every quarter to assess that the project is being implemented in their field and to treat any potential deviation that the project faces or potential adjustments necessary to be done. In the eventuality some actions need to be adjusted, the Consultation Working Group of each field will have the power to amend the existing definition of the project to include the necessary changes.

The implementation of the HRS4R strategy is going to be part of the agenda of the existing governing bodies of the university, like the Governing Council, the Social Council and the University Senate. In addition to that, the Vice-Rector for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer, who is also member of the University Management Council, will inform to the Rector and Vice-Rectors about the evolution of the HRS4R strategy.

It is planned to organise an annual conference about the HRS4R strategy at the university. Though the format is still to be defined, we plan to include keynote speakers and a round table with the implementation committee to discuss publicly how the project is being implemented. The conference will be opened to all the research community of the university but it will also be possible to have participants from other institutions. The conference will be recorded and will be accessible from the HRS4R website.

How do you proceed with the alignment of organisational policies with the HRS4R? Make sure the HRS4R is recognised in the organisation's research strategy, as the overarching HR policy.

In 2007 the university approved its first strategic plan. In 2015 a new strategic plan was approved to cover the period 2015-2020. The plan is structured according to challenges and projects, which can be financed by the university budget. Assigning economic resources to strategic projects has been a key factor on the implementation of the strategic plan ultimately. One of the strategic projects was to apply for the HRS4R recognition, as a way to spark the implementation of the European Charter and Code at the whole university.

This proposal is the result of the strategic project aforementioned. In 2020 we will be working on the the planning phase of the new strategic plan 2021-2025. All actions included in the HRS4R Action Plan will be part of the new strategic plan 2021-2025. This will be crucial to align the HRS4R process and the institutional policy. In addition to that, if the HRS4R is approved during 2020 by Euraxess, the process will be perfectly in sync with the institutional strategic plan.

How will you ensure that the proposed actions are implemented?

The implementation of the Action Plan relays on two pillars. First, it is necessary to setup an Implementation Working Group that is in charge of implementing the actions. In the Action Plan it has already been defined which units will implement each action: Vice-Rectorate for Research, Innovation and Technology Transfer, Vice-Rectorate for Sustainability and Campuses, Vice-Rectorate of Digital Resources, Vice-Rectorate for Teaching Affairs and Academics, Bursar, Legal Department, Doctorate School, Educational Institute, Human Resources, Research Management Service, Technology Transfer Office, Communications Office, Career Development Unit. It is planned that each unit designates one representative to setup the Implementation Working Group. The working group will be chaired by the Director of Human Resources, who will be in charge of coordinating the implementation of the HRS4R strategy. In addition, the Director of Human Resources will inform the Steering Committee of how the project evolves.

Second, the allocation of resources is pinnacle to guarantee that the implementation progress at the right page. As mentioned earlier, the HRS4R strategy will be part of the UPV 2021-2025 Strategic Plan. The University has already established a system to allocate resources to the strategic projects of the Strategic Plan. The HRS4R strategy is going to receive funds from the Strategic Plan as part of the regular budgetary process of the University.

How will you monitor progress (timeline)?

The Action Plan has already established a set of indicators. Those indicators will serve as the grassroots to setup balance scored card to monitor key indicators of the implementation. In addition to that we will use the Logical Framework Matrix, which will be set up once the HRS4R Strategy is approved by Euraxess. The Matrix includes general goals, specific goals, results, actions, indicators and assumptions. The assumptions section will serve as a way to define contingency plans in case existing conditions and regulation change during the implementation process.

The Director of Human Resources, who is a member of the Steering Committee and be also the chairperson of the Implementation Working Group, will report to the Steering Committee on regular basis (see earlier).

We consider crucial to involve the whole university community on the implementation of the HRS4R strategy. The HRS4R website is going to include a section called “monitoring” where every person can check the existing planning and how each project evolves against the existing planning. Indicators for each action will be publicly available. Every individual will be in the position to send feedback about each action so implementation can be conveniently adapted.

In addition to monitor actions and indicators, we will be assessing satisfaction from end-users, like researchers from different levels or the administrative staff dealing with the changes implemented. For that purpose we will conduct an annual survey to analyse user satisfaction. This survey will include several dimensions related with ethical and professional aspects, working conditions and social security, recruitment and selection and training and career development. We consider the HRS4R implementation will be a success if, in addition to the implementation itself, we can assess higher levels of satisfaction from the end users about the new conditions created by the HRS4R process.

How will you measure progress (indicators) in view of the next assessment?

As mentioned earlier, the Steering Committee will be in charge of the HRS4R internal assessment and final assessment. The report will include a collection of indicators, targets, challenges and goals. The report will be classified in 4 areas: ethical and professional aspects, recruitment and selection, working conditions and social security and training and career development.

In addition to that, the next assessment will include information about the impact of the HRS4R implementation. Hence, we consider that the addition of the satisfaction indicators, comments from end-users and the feedback we collect during the annual conference will be of the most relevance.

Additional remarks

To conclude, the Steering Committee would like to remark the uniqueness participatory character of the process followed at the university. Besides the number of people who participated during the qualitative analysis phase, that was by itself relevant, we are really proud of the engagement of the university research community with the HRS4R process. Having more than 60% of replies on a voluntary survey shows the level of commitment of the research community with the process. In addition to the results that we show in this report, there are hundreds of comments and remarks made by researchers that will for sure help on building a very promising future for researchers. We commit ourself with this plan and we expect to deliver according the expectations. Finally, we would like to express our gratitude to Euraxess for spurring this process and inspire us to become a better self.