

Attachment n. 1: Response to the Consensus Report

1. Have the Strategy and Action Plan been formally endorsed by the organisation's highest authority? NO

Assessors Recommendation: Please do not forget comments regarding the commitment of the HRS4R by the highest authority. The cover letter for your resubmission will have to be signed by the General Secretary and use words saying when it was approved by the board (when) and how committed and supportive the board is to the implementation

FBK Response: Please find at above the "*Cover Letter – Declaration of Commitment*" for our resubmission, signed by the General Secretary as a delegate of the board of directors, stating the steps of the process and the commitment to the implementation.

2. Is the organisational information provided sufficient to understand the context in which the HR Strategy is designed? NO

Assessors Recommendation: Information on FBK can be found on the web as well as organigrams. Please provide additional information on the board members, research centres and the working group who worked and designed the HR strategy: who, level, representation, relation to the organisation, relations between the groups. If not integrated as a text in the published HR (Template 2), please refer to this information (application + implementation) using a link on your website.

FBK Response: in order to provide additional information regarding the stakeholders of the HRS4R process and give further information about how the different steps involved the different groups, we have created a new document which is called "Description of FBK HRS4R Process".

3. Is the Action Plan coherent with the Gap Analysis? NO

Assessors Recommendation: the problem is that the gap analysis is mostly based on regulation and results of the survey. Having regulation related to principles does not mean that all the researchers applies the principles. It is not evident (evidence is missing) that the gap analysis is really covering all pertinent issues because the survey covered only 23 questions. What do the researchers say regarding ethical issues/problems? What do the PhD think about their supervision?

FBK Response: Please find the extended response to this in the "*Description of FBK HRS4R Process*" document under Methodology paragraph – Phase 1. Assessment.

Assessors Recommendation: You have >200 R2 and say that you have no appointment of postdocs. What does it mean?

FBK Response: Please find the extended response to this in the "*Description of FBK HRS4R Process*" document under paragraph 1. Participants: Premise. FBK contractual levels are inverted comparing to universities, there are no "Post Doc appointments" as such.

Assessors Recommendation: Perhaps could you be solved this problem by saying how the R1 and R2 were integrated in the process, and how and why you choose not to address all the principles in

the survey. How do you plan to develop your gap analysis/survey in the next future and revision of the AP?

FBK Response: after organizing the focus groups in order to review the proposed actions, we described how researchers at all level were integrated in the process in the “*Description of FBK HRS4R Process*” Document. In the same document we have outline also Future Development in paragraph n.3.

4. Has the research community been sufficiently involved in the process, with a representation of all levels of a research career? NO

Assessors Recommendation: Assessors have only your text and cannot imagine more that what you say. It is not clear how the researchers were involved in the process. Not as beneficiaries of the actions but as actors of the design and the implementation. See above: add a clear description on how your rely on them for the analysis, the priorities and the validation. Perhaps could you organize within next month a public presentation/consultation of the AP in your institution, with a possibility to comment the AP or to add gaps if any (explain if you delay actions to the next cycle).

FBK Response: in the first submission of the action plan and gap analysis the research community was involved through a survey, therefore following the above suggestion we have structured a series of 5 focus group homogeneous and representative of FBK Research Community, sampled by age, seniority, gender, research centre and contract level and type (both fixed-term & permanent). Please refer to the document “*Description of FBK HRS4R Process*” paragraph 2. Methodology, Phase v. Define participated action plan for the details on how focus group were organized and how the action plan was revised based on the feedback obtained by the research community (revising or adding actions).

5. Are the goals sufficiently ambitious considering the context of the organization? NO

Assessors Recommendation: it is difficult to estimate ambition vs organisation. What can be said here is that the application seems to be top-down driven. It is not convincing that the concerns of all the researchers are taken into account. The AP spreads on 2 years and will fill all the identified gaps. And what next? Will you then consider that you will fulfil all the C&C principles? What about the process within the first 6y-cycle? Please explain how this HRS4R is/will be challenging for your institution.

FBK Response: Please find details about the future steps in the HRS4R process in the document “*Description of FBK HRS4R Process*” in paragraph 3. and as well in the action plan part 4. Implementation.

Assessors Recommendation About evaluation/appraisal : “ Probably in this sentence “A9: The aim is to implement a continuous monitoring/performance evaluation tool for the research centres” we used the wrong term as we referred to research centres actually meaning research individuals working in that center.”

FBK Response: Clarification will indeed be convenient. Response: the wording was adjusted on A9 specifying that the action is intended for the individuals, not for the research centres.