TEMPLATE 3: INTERNAL REVIEW

Name Organisation under review: UNIVERSITA' DEGLI STUDI DI PADOVA

Organisation's contact details:

Università degli Studi di Padova

Via VIII Febbraio 1848, 2

35122 Padova

Person in charge of the HRS4R process: Marcella Bonchio (Vice Rector for Research)

hrs.ricercaue@unipd.it

Web-link to published version of organisation's HR Strategy and Action Plan: http://www.unipd.it/carta-europea-codice-reclutamento-ricercatori

Web-link to organisational recruitment policy (OTM-R principles): see section 3

SUBMISSION DATE TO THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION: 21/09/2017

1. ORGANISATIONAL INFORMATION

The following data regarding "staff & students" refer to the year 2013, data regarding "Research Funding" are not available.

STAFF & STUDENTS	FTE
Total researchers = staff, fellowship holders, bursary holders, PhD. students either full-time or part-time involved in research	4,334.37
Of whom are international (i.e. foreign nationality)	497.00
Of whom are externally funded (i.e. for whom the organisation is host organisation)	661.18
Of whom are women	1,797.04
Of whom are stage R3 or R41 = Researchers with a large degree of autonomy, typically holding the status of Principal Investigator or Professor.	2,059.62

---

[1] http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/pdf/research_policies/Towards_a_European_Framework_for_Research_Careers_final.pdf

Of whom are stage R2 = in most organisations corresponding with postdoctoral level	913.75
Of whom are stage R1 = in most organisations corresponding with doctoral level	1,361.00
Total number of students (if relevant)	57,646
Total number of staff (including management, administrative, teaching and research staff)	4,261
RESEARCH FUNDING (figures for most recent fiscal year)	**€**
Total annual organisational budget	*N/A*
Annual organisational direct government funding (block funding, used for teaching, research, infrastructure,…)	*N/A*
Annual competitive government-sourced funding (designated for research, obtained in competition with other organisations – including EU funding)	*N/A*
Annual funding from private, non-government sources, designated for research	*N/A*
ORGANISATIONAL PROFILE *(a very brief description of your organisation, max. 100 words)*	
Dating back to 1222, the University of Padova is one of Europe's oldest and most prestigious seats of learning. The University of Padova includes 61,000 students, 32 departments, 1 University Hospital, 1 Veterinary Hospital, 1 Experimental Farm, 39 doctoral degree courses activated this year, and 43 research and service centres across the spectrum of sciences, medicine, social sciences and humanities, with more than 2,000 professors and researchers employed . It has an annual budget of 603 million euro, out of which 60 million euro for research. *Moreover, the University of Padova is an Euraxess Contact Point.*	

2. NARRATIVE (MAX. 2 PAGES)

The analysis of the results achieved in the implementation of the actions plan (2014-2016) can be considered successful. The main board policy was therefore implemented respecting the overall expectations foreseen in the strategic plan of the top management, in accordance to the requirements of the national evaluation system and National Minister of Research (MIUR) respectively. Thanks to these efforts, the University of Padova received the acknowledgment of best Italian university among the biggest institutions (UNIPD students number > 60000, employees number > 11000). The acknowledgment regards research, infrastructures, including services for stakeholders, teaching and job placement levels respectively. Significant improvements were also reported by Stakeholders consultations in comparison with the results of 2012 surveys, especially in the following issues:

⎯ Recruitment processes: (i) clearer selection criteria in the recruitment processes better described in terms of working conditions, rights and requested competences, (ii) more open composition of the selection committees to include members outside the Institution, (iii) new policy in the young researchers recruitment through an increased number of positions as researchers (RTD) as well as higher salary for post-docs (C&C

issue: Recruitment and Selection and Working);

— Efforts in guaranteeing a better gender equality in giving opportunities and avoid discrimination (C&C issue: Ethical and Professional aspects);

— Financial support of research initiatives thanks to Unipd budget assignments (including projects and instruments) (C&C issue: Working Conditions)

— Investment in mobility programs and opportunities, including support in call applications and relative advertising (C&C issue: Ethical and Professional aspects; Training and Development).

The Top management policy of progressively allocating financial resources mainly to the departments with autonomy to invest on projects as well as researchers and post-docs recruitment, supported a better exploitation of the decreasing national budget for research and an optimised rationalization of the resources. In particular, the policy of including evaluation indicators for the department performances not limited to those required by the national evaluation system but also tailored on each department plan of research, has introduced a merit-based system in the assignment of resources. The aim of this policy was to offer better and more attractive conditions of working and professional recognition, to boost the internationalization of the recruited personnel as well as to address excellence and innovation (C&C Area of references: Ethical and Professional aspects and Working Conditions).

In general stakeholders positively commented on these achievements. They showed a deeper perception of the improvements given by the implemented actions aiming to improve the gender equal opportunity and mobility support (main areas of reference: Ethical and Professional aspects; Recruitment and Selection and Working Conditions and Social Security).

Although, on average, most of the actions were successful, the stakeholders still highlighted the limited impact of some actions. In particular more improvements were required in the Recruitment & Selection and in the Training and Development areas. The Top management made great efforts on introducing quantitative indicators in selection procedures aimed at standardising the selection committees formal documents, including analytical evaluation of each research achievement and CV advances in the candidates' application as well as in publishing all the intermediate scores at any level of selections. Despite these efforts the stakeholders were not satisfied by feedbacks they received on their performances during the selections processes. They complained that their strengths and weaknesses were not so detailed. This evidence definitively represents a weakness that has received high priority in the new action plan (period of reference 2017-2019) that will include the implementation of the OTMR-policy. Moreover, the training on teaching activities and mentoring competences as well as the real internationalisation of the selection committee demonstrated to be another critical point. Consequently the HR strategy plan 2017-2019 has included specific actions (C&C Areas of reference: Recruitment and Selection and Training and development).

In the development of this plan particular attention has been paid to remove gaps such as:

— Promotion of the internationalisation of PhD programs to attract more European candidates;

— Support of the stakeholders in the valorisation of their initiatives, in research and in connection with the private sector (including spin-off and patents development);

— Simplification of administrative procedures, reducing the bureaucratic burden of personnel involved in research.

As far as the actions priorities in the short and medium term are considered, it is worth mentioning that they were not changed in their content compared to the initial plans. Changes and upgrading were instead undertaken both in the implementation modalities and their relative schedule time. These changes were mainly connected to the following circumstances and strategic decisions that impacted on the HRS4R plan implementation:

— the Italian Minister of Research required new strategic plan approvals on a three-year base (Overall Strategic Plan - OSP) with specific targets that undergo the national evaluation and constrain the budget assignment from the Italian government. Consequently, it introduced a misalignment between Italian Minister policies and the HRS4R acknowledgment process, especially in the deadlines, that do not match.

Furthermore, in big institutions such as the University of Padova, it is mandatory that the HRS4R plan is totally integrated within the OSP to grant its sustainability, especially in a long time period. Actions schedule time were therefore realigned with the National requirements (especially as far as the Institution Performances assessment was under consideration);

— Although most of the administrative and budget related deadlines are on a solar-year base (i.e. from January to December), the majority of the university activities (such as those connected to teaching, PhD programs, election of the boards including the top management, evaluation windows of performance) are normally scheduled on an academic year-base (i.e. from October to September). The 2014-2016 HR-plan was initially drawn up at the end of 2013 independently of national deadlines, imposed later on. This negatively impacted on the monitoring of the HRS4R results and achievements. As the mid-term monitoring of the action plan evidenced this weakness, that was addressed in the new action plan (2017-2019);

— the University of Padova underwent the election of the new Rector in June 2015. He started his mandate in October 2015 (i.e in the middle of the action plan 2014-2016). This led to a complete reconfiguration of the top management compositions, including all the main board organisms such as the Senate and the Board of Directors. All the Rector delegates were renewed, with a re-definition of both their areas of competence and their relative tasks. Consequently, new responsibles were assigned to the undergoing actions. This strategic decision impacted on the HR implementation because of the natural transition period needed in the two management approaches. In particular, the new top management moved toward a greater autonomy of the departments, both in the administration of the assigned budget and in the relative performance monitoring (including the exploitation of different performance indicators). The impact on the HRS4R implementation should not be considered necessarily negative: although some delay in the actions implementation occurred, the simplification of the processes will implement more flexibility and improve the resources exploitation in the frame of maintaining the final goals.

In conclusion, the analysis of the stakeholders feedbacks together with the overall vision of the results in the action plan implementation underlined both strengths and weaknesses. These were the base for developing the new sustainable action plan, tuning the tools to fasten the goals achievements and optimise the monitoring system. The last action plan appeared more complicated than foreseen due to the misalignment between the initial deadlines and those of the national evaluation. This issue was progressively solved toward a totally integrated monitoring system

Title action	Timing	Responsible Unit	Indicator(s) / Target	Current status
P0.Implementation of the European chart for researcher				
Organization of seminars on C&C	Beginning: 11/2014	C&C commitee	Evidence of events Survey&feedbacks from	Done

that now exploits both self-assessment tools and external revisions feedback; it also includes stakeholders opinions and suggestions in a more formal way.

In particular the following issues were addressed as a priority and therefore were the core of the subsequent action plan:

— focussing on the implementation of a better open, transparent and meritocratic recruitment system that allows applicants to better understand their performance and to improve their curriculum;
— improving the policies aiming at promoting the autonomy and creativity of all researchers, including the early stage researchers;
— providing a stimulating and pleasant environment to work in, supporting the research activities and encouraging family and work matching;
— increasing the impact of the current program on training to teaching;
— elaborating plans to improve the researchers skills and competences as well as to support their mobility;
— improving web-access to information and data sharing.

3. ACTIONS

In tab.1 the Action Indicators/target are only reported in a main general form. Each action was evaluated with the use of specific and, when possible, quantitative indicators that are fully listed in the Performance Report. All the data resulting from statistical analyses were reported and published in different reports available on the net (Perfomance Report, NdV reports). In particular:

– Survey&Feedbacks from stakeholders refers to consultation of stakeholders with questionnaire/surveys/interviews: the results are analysed by means of a grid of values representative of agreement levels (typically 0-5). The action success is therefore determined when the result is greater than 3;

– Evidence of events refers to the realisation of the events and their level of attendance as well as Evidence of reporting/guidelines etc refers institutional approval including publication (including reporting focused for the main organisms such as Senate and Board of Directors)

	End: Action plan end		the stakeholders	
Realisation of support and advertising documents on C&C with clear references to HRS4R to be given. Seminars and courses on C&C and HRS4R for University personnel	Beginning: 9/2014 End: Action plan end	C&C commitee	Evidence of events Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders	Done
Realisation of events where promotion and dissemination of the C&C were undertaken (workshops, similar Veneto-Night event,..), communications by institutional channels.	Beginning: 7/2014 End: Action plan end	C&C commitee	Evidence of events Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders	Done
P1.Research environment				
Further valorisation of the research training as key-point of the overall research quality by means of qualified courses and routes (increase of the UNIPD attractiveness at a national and international levels, full integration of Young researchers in the research groups).	Beginning: 9/2014 End: Action plan end	ViceRector for research training	Increase % of new calls for research Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders	Done
Support to the post-doc career development and professional growth, promoting the scientific autonomy and	Beginning: 9/2014 End: Action plan end	ViceRector for research training	Evidence of Training events on career development Evidence of specific	Done

development of routes for accessing to permanent staff positions.			calls for post-docs Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders	
Focus on the recruitment of high scientific quality personnel favouring the income of foreigner professors from highly qualified Italian and international institutions.	Beginning: 9/2014 End: Action plan end	ViceRector for research training	Increase % of personnel coming from abroad % of personnel with research performance above the national average (evaluated by Italian indicators such as participation to projects, numbers of publications, number of citations,..)	Done
Enhance the research activities that will be carried out by foreign researchers who will be recruited at our University through the Piscopia Programme (26 positions provided for contracts of 12 or 24 months) http://www.unipd.it/en/piscopia-fellowships	Beginning: 9/2014 End: Action plan end	ViceRector for research training	Evidence of the call Piscopia Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders	Done
P.2 General principle: Stability and permanence of employment				
Monitoring of the active regulations (PhD, post-docs) in order to favour a further flexibility in the working conditions and improve the stability of employment conditions	Periodical	ViceRector for research training	Written guidelines and reporting on statistical analysis Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders	Done

for researchers.				
Promotion and dissemination of what needed to researchers on opportunities and issues about permanent and stability of employment.	Periodical	ViceRector for reasearch training	Evidence of events of dissemination Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders from stakeholders	Done
P.4 General principle: Funding and salaries				
Constant update in the UNIPD website of a section dedicated to the pension rights, social security provisions with particular care on questions related to the mobility between foreigner countries and public/private and early career.	Beginning: 7/2014 End: Action plan end	Delegate of the Rector for the promotion Young researcher opportuniti es (YR)	Evidence of updates Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders from stakeholders	Done
Monitoring the contract conditions and salaries on which the University autonomy can be exerted.	Beginning: 7/2014 End: Action plan end	Delegate of the Rector for YR	Written and reporting and statistical analysis Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders	Done
Promotion and dissemination of what needed to researchers on the questions regarding the funding and salary.	Beginning: 7/2014 End: Action plan end	Delegate of the Rector for YR	Evidence of events of dissemination Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders from stakeholders	Done
Preparation of new documents to integrate PhD student enrolment and post-doc contracts on	Beginning: 9/2014 End: Action plan end	Delegate of the Rector for YR	Written guidelines and reporting	Done

issues related to funding and salaries.				
P4. General principle: Gender balance				
Monitoring of the gender equilibrium and proposal of new actions to promote gender strategies in a coordinated way.	Beginning: 7/2014 End: Action plan end	Equal Opportunity Observatory	Written guidelines and reporting	Done
Promotions of new coordinated events to advise and disseminate gender initiatives (events, projects on gender issues and results dissemination).	Beginning: 7/2014 End: Action plan end	Equal Opportunity Observatory	Evidence of events Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders	90% Report: C&C4.pdf
P.5 General principle: Career development				
New Recruitment Plan with special care of opening new researcher positions coherently with the national law L.240 (RTDa e RTDb, ie.e not permanent Researcher type (a) and (b) respectively) and career development of young researchers.	Schedule time: Beginning: 9/2014 End: Action plan end	Rector	Evidence of plan approval and relative actuation by way of Departments' call	DOne
Completion of the previous plan with particular care to settle new recruitment call modalities to reduce job instability and favour RTD positions as required by national law L.240.	Beginning: 10/2014 End: 9/2015	Rector	Evidence of plan's end	Done
P6. General principle: Value of mobility				

Maintenance of the previous plan with particular care to strengthen the advertising and dissemination of new initiatives.	periodical	ViceRector for International Research	Evidence of events /initiatives Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders	Done
Extension of the collaboration network within the local territory to promote the integration of the Young Researchers in the private sector and relative dissemination and advertising toward stakeholders.	Beginning: 7/2014 End: Action plan end	ViceRector for international Research	Written agreements and collaborative venture and relative realisation Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders from stakeholders	Action status:90% Report: C&C5.pdf
P7. General principle: Access to research training and continuous development				
Organization of events dedicated to young researcher, post-docs and PhD student.	Beginning: 9/2014 End: Action plan end	ViceRector for Research training	Evidence of organised events Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders from stakeholders	Done
Strengthen initiatives of permanent training in the territory with special care mainly dedicated to: a) strengthen the integration of PhD programs in the Departments b) Support training paths oriented to the integration of PhD students in the private job by way of	Beginning: 7/2014 End: Action plan end	ViceRector for Research training	Evidence of project focused on integration of PhD in territorial institutions Evidence programs of dedicated to collaborations % of PhD students with performance better that the average (calculated on the previous year)	Action status:80% Report: C&C6.pdf

collaboration with enterprises and local institutions c) Define the correct duty-right system for an efficient stage of the PhD students. d) increase the number of free positions covered by fellowships.			% of positions covered by fellowships % of PhD occupying a permanent job position in the private sector after the PhD degree	
P8. General principle: Access to career advice				
Extension of the previous plan 2012-2014.	on going.	ViceRector for Research training , Delegate of the Rector for YR	Evidence of organised events Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders	Action status:100% Report: C&C6.pdf
Organization of seminars and events focused to Young Researchers and PhD students depending on their specific need (to be identified with questionnaire or survey eventually given to pilot target groups).	periodical	ViceRector for Research training , Delegate of the Rector for YR	Evidence of organised events Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders	Done
Consolidation of the University-enterprise dialogue by: a) Promoting the discussion between the Department and enterprise or enterprise	on going.	ViceRector for Research training, Delegate of the Rector for YR	Evidence of agreements University-dialogue and cooperative projects % of PhD positions financed by enterprises agreement	Action status:90% Report: C&C6.pdf

networks b) Consolidating and strengthening the Business Angel Network, favouring the direct meeting of University Start-up and business angel, Seed Fund and Venture Capital Funds. c) Supporting the Start Cube Incubator both for university spin-offs and for start-ups create outside the university.			Evidence of the foundation of the Ex-alumni association Number of patents Number of Start-ups Number of spin-offs Number of project including enterprise participation % of funds connected to business angels	
P9. General principle: Supervision.				
Confirmed Action from the previous action plan 2012-2014 To monitor the supervisor activity and the researcher working experience by and ex-post evaluation program that starts from questionnaire given periodically at the end of each working cycle. Promotion and dissemination of what needed to researchers on the questions related to supervision.	Start= 1/2015 (based on feedback coming from 2012-2014 results of action n.1)	ViceRector for Research Training	Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders Evidence of dissemination events	Action status:90% Report: C&C6.pdf
P10. General principle: Teaching.				

Teaching training focusing on RTD and post-doc profiles only including the study of a new strategy for stakeholders involvement and of a coordinated plan of training.		ViceRector for teaching	Evidence of project PRODID Evidence of the settlement of the system SADA (System for teaching quality and acknowledgment)	Action status:80% Report: C&C6.pdf
P11. General principle: Complaints/appeals.				
Maintenance of the action n.2 of the previous plan 2012-2014	on-going process	Rector	Evidence of monitoring	Done
P.12 General principle: Participation in decision-making bodies				
Confirmed Action from the previous action plan Monitoring of the election procedure of the representatives and relative efficiency.	On going	Rector	Evidence of Stakeholders' representative elections Survey&feedbacks from the stakeholders	Done

Comment on the implementation of Open, Transparent, Merit-Based Recruitment principles:

The University of Padova entered in the HRS4R process in 2012 (logo acknowledgment) and consequently it has not developed OTMR plan yet. However specific actions has been introduced in the Action plan 2017-2019 with the highest priority. The attached checklist refers to the current state of recruitment system updated at July 2016. Although the actual recruitment system already includes many features regarding an open, transparent and merit based system,a comprehensive and integrated OTMR policy is still missing and will be a matter of concern in the Action plan 2017-2019.

4. IMPLEMENTATION (MAX. 1 PAGE)

The HRS4R strategies were fully integrated in the institutional policies, being a part of the Strategic plan of Research formally approved by the Top Management and relative organisms (i.e Senate and Main Administrative board respectively). The Action plan implementation, optimised and revised during its evolution toward 2014-2016, was carried out through:

IMPLEMENTATION process: The progress in the HRS4 action plan implementation was overseen by a Steering Group (HRS4R-SG), composed by both Top-management (including administrative and Research-teaching personnel) and main Stakeholders representatives. Nominated by the Rector, the HRS4R-SG coordinated the monitoring and final reporting processes, and was in charge for presenting the actions status to the main board organisms.

STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVEMENT: Stakeholders were involved by way of both representatives in the main decisional organisms and direct feedbacks. Stakeholders representatives contributed to the action implementation, with special attention to fill the eventual gaps, with suggestions and proposals. Direct feedbacks (including survey, questionnaires, public consultations, customer-and-care interviews) were carried out to gather information on the perception of the action effectiveness, and to decide action modifications and correction. Different feedbacks were later compared and combined to extract info on the action plan implementation and its effectiveness.

MONITORING: The monitoring management was carried out by defining a specific monitoring process for each action, held by the responsible of the action. The UNIPD monitoring process has been improved meanwhile, with fine tuning toward administrative simplification. Each action result was evaluated by using those indicators specifically addressed for the action as summarised in the Action plan, whilst the final success rate were therefore defined by using the stakeholders feedback as well as the indicators thresholds. The Action Impact was therefore overseen by the HRS4R Steering group, coordinator of all the monitoring process.

REPORTING: The reporting process has been standardised by 3 different levels:

Action Results Report: including list of achievements, raw data, data statistical analysis, gaps and data relative to the stakeholder feedback (including consultations results and relative statistical analysis). This report was provided by the person in charge of the action on at least a 6 months base, being a technical internal report accessible to the UNIPD staff.

Action Progress Report: overview of the action implementation compared to the action Objective and Time Schedule. This report was delivered by the person in charge of the action (at least on an annual base), and published on the UNIPD accessible e-platform.

Action Plan Assessment: it was carried out by internal review process (Top management reporting and annual assessment on the achieved results and future planning regarding the UNIPD performance (http://www.unipd.it/trasparenza/performance) and external review processes (by the NdV, External Nucleus of evaluation, http://www.unipd.it/nucleo and by the national evaluation system (ANVUR and VQR) .

A Commission for the implementation of the C&C principles was appointed by the Rector and was in charge of supervising and coordinating the activities regarding the internal review.

Open, Transparent and Merit-based Recruitment of Researchers OTM-R Checklist for Institutions

	Open	Trasparent	Merit-Based	Answer	Suggested indicators (or form of measurements)	Comments on answers
OTM-R system						
1. Have we published a version of our OTM-R policy online (in the national language and in English?				No	Deliverable of the action n. (action plan 2017-2019)	Deliverable of the action n. (action plan 2017-2019)
2. Do we have an internal guide setting out clear OTM-R procedures and practices for all types of positions?	x	x	x	Yes Partially	Existense of standard internal guide	Deliverable of the action n. (action plan 2017-2019)
3. Is everyone involved in the process sufficiently trained in the area of OTM-R?	x	x	x	Yes Partially	Existence of training programmes for OTM-R (for Department Deans and selection commitee members)	Training programmes dedicated to all selection commitee members are under scheduling - Deliverable of the action n. (action plan 2017-2019)
4. Do we make (sufficient) use of e-recruitment tool?	x	x	x	Yes	Web-based tool for (all) the stages in recruitment process	Applications submission on-line and Skype-interviews
5. Do we have a quality control system for OTM-R in place				No	Deliverable of the action n. (action plan 2017-2019)	Deliverable of the action n. (action plan 2017-2019)
6. Does our current OTM-R policy encourage external candidates to apply?	x	x	x	Yes	Relative % of applicants from outside the institution	

7. Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to attract researchers from abroad?	x	x	x	Yes Partially	Relative increment (%) of application from researchers from abroad	
8. Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to attract underrepresented groups?	x	x	x	Yes Partially	Relative increment (%) of application from underrepresented groups	
9. Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to provide attractive working conditions for researchers?	x	x	x	Yes Partially	Relative % of applicants from outside the institution	
10. Do we have means to monitor whether the most suitable researchers apply?	x	x			Yes Partially	Survey / results of Interviews	
Advertising and application phase						
11. Do we have clear guidelines or templates (e.g., EURAXESS) for advertising positions?	x	x		Yes	existence of templates	
12. Do we include in the job advertisement references/links to all the elements foreseen in the relevant section of the toolkit? [see Chapter 4.4.1 a)]	x	x		Yes Substantially	Written guideline and template standardisation	
13. Do we make full use of EURAXESS to ensure our research vacancies reach a wider audience?	x	x		Yes	Relative % of applicants from outside the institution	
14. Do we make use of other job advertising tools?	x	x		Yes	Survey / results of Interviews	
15. Do we keep the administrative burden to a minimum for the candidate? [see Chapter 4.4.1 b)]	x	x		Yes Substantially	Survey / results of Interviews	

Selection and evaluation phase						
16. Do we have clear rules governing the appointment of selection committees? [see Chapter 4.4.2 a)]		x	x	Yes	Statistics on the composition of panels	
17. Do we have clear rules concerning the composition of selection committees?		x	x	Yes	Written Guidelines fulfilling national law of recruitment	
18. Are the committees sufficiently genderbalanced?		x	x	Yes Substantially	Relative % of selection commission composition	
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		x	x	Yes	Written guidelines and indicators published in each selection procedure	
Appointment phase						
20. Do we inform all applicants at the end of the selection process?	x	x		Yes	web-info and e-mail contact	
21. Do we provide adequate feedback to interviewees?	x	x		Yes Substantially	web-info of the application of selection criteria	
22. Do we have an appropriate complaints mechanism in place?		x		Yes Partially	written guidelines	
Overall assessment						
23. Do we have a system in place to assess whether OTM-R delivers on its objectives?				No	Deliverable of the action n. (action plan 2017-2019)	