TEMPLATE 1 – GAP ANALYSIS

Name Organisation under review: **University of Banja Luka**

Organisation's contact details: **Univerzitetski grad, Bul. v. Petra Bojovica 1A, 78.000 Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

SUBMISSION DATE: NOVEMBER 1ST, 2017

DATE ENDORSEMENT CHARTER AND CODE: JANUARY 30TH, 2013

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

PROCESS (MAX. 300 WORDS)

The HRS4R process must engage all management departments directly or indirectly responsible for researchers' HR-issues. [1] 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[2], as well as appoint a Committee overseeing the process and a Working Group responsible for implementing the process.

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

At the University level, in the scope of work of Vice-Rector for Science, Research and University Development, on regular basis are held meetings with Vice-Deans for Science and Research, as representatives of researchers' community on behalf of their respective faculties. Vice-Deans were informed about whole process and consulted on HRS4R strategy during the meetings.

Due to internal changes, the University has been late with nominating a Working Group and Committee as well as with delivering reports to EC.

On September 7th, 2017, Senate has formed Working Group for Implementation of Charter and Code[3] (Senate Decision attached) as well as Committee for Implementation of Charter and Code[4] (Senate Decision attached).

---

[1] *The term 'Human Resources' is used **in the largest possible sense**, to include all researchers (Frascati definition: Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development, Frascati Manual, OECD, 2002) disregarding the profile, career 'level', type of contract etc. etc.*

[2] *For a description of R1-R4, please see*
http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/pdf/research_policies/Towards_a_European_Framework_for_Research_Careers_final.pdf

[3] *Members of the Working Group for Implementation of Charter and Code are following: 1. Vice-Rector for Science and Research, Professor Radoslav Gajanin (President), 2. Vice-Dean for Science and Research, Professor Gordana Rokvic (member), 3. Senior Associate for Science, Research and University Development, MSc. Dragana Radulovic (member), 4. Senior Associate for Publishing, MSc. Dusan Vrucinic (member) and 5. Associate for Science and Research, Dijana Bilanovic (member).*

[4] *Members of the Committee for Implementation of Charter and Code are following: 1. Rector, Professor Milan Mataruga, 2. Vice-Rector for International and Inter-University Cooperation, Professor Biljana Antunovic, 3. Vice-Rector for Teaching and Student Affairs, Professor Strain Posavljak, 4. Vice-Rector for Science and Research, Professor Radoslav Gajanin, 5. Vice-Rector for Human and Material Resources, Professor Luka Kecman, 6. Secretary General, MSc. Djordje Markez and 7. Financial Director, Dusko Lazic.*

So far, Working Group held two meetings (September 14th and 28th, 2017) where Internal Review and GAP analysis were discussed. Upon delivering draft versions of the discussed documents, the Committee has held two meetings (October 9th and 16th, 2017) in order to monitor work of the Group and progress explained in the documents. Finalized documents were sent to the Senate of the University, held on October 26th, 2017. The Senate has decided to adopt both documents and to address it to the European Commission.

Documents are visible at the University's web link: http://unibl.org/en/science/charter-and-code

GAP ANALYSIS

The Charter and Code provides the basis for the Gap analysis. In order to aid cohesion, the 40 articles have been renumbered under the following headings. Please provide the outcome of your organisation's GAP analysis below. If your organisation currently does not fully meet the criteria, please 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. In order to help the organisation's recruitment strategy, a specific self-assessment checklist is provided for Open, Transparent and Merit-Based Recruitment.

European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers : GAP analysis overview			
Status: to what extent does this organisation meet the following principles?	+ = **fully** implemented +/- = **almost but not fully** implemented -/+ = **partially** implemented - = **insufficiently** implemented	In case of -, -/+, or +/-, please **indicate the actual "gap"** between the principle and the current practice in your organisation. If relevant, please list any national/regional legislation or organisational regulation currently impeding implementation	Initiatives already undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement
Ethical and Professional Aspects			
1. Research freedom	+/-	Researchers are free to choose the subject of their research, but limitations are usually lack of finances, insufficient facilities or lack of well-equipped laboratories, access to journals and data bases in order to collect more information on relevant subject.	
2. Ethical principles	+		
3. Professional responsibility	+/-	University has provided software for plagiarism. Proposal for a Rulebook covering this subject will be nominated at the Senate very soon.	Initiative already undertaken
4. Professional attitude	+		
5. Contractual and legal obligations	+		
6. Accountability	+		
7. Good practice in research	+/-	This principle largely depends on every, single researcher and his/hers responsibility. The University is doing its best	Initiative already undertaken

		to make all information transparent and available.	
8. Dissemination, exploitation of results	-/+	Major bottleneck with regard to this principle is lack of cooperation between academia and industry. Having in mind that industry was largely destroyed after the war and privatization process, it seems that there is a lot of space for improvement relations between these two.	Increase commercialization of results obtained in research At the University is established Center for Entrepreneurship and Transfer of Technologies
9. Public engagement	+/-	Increase activities of researchers with regard to raising public awareness on performed researches.	Initiative already undertaken
10. Non discrimination	+		
11. Evaluation/appraisal systems	-/+	Evaluation system exists but criteria are low. It is very difficult to change the Law on Higher Education due to political issues, complicated nomination procedures, etc. Also there is a resistance of one part of academic staff with regards to increasing criteria.	
Recruitment and Selection – please be aware that the items listed here correspond with the Charter and Code. **In addition**, your organisation also needs to complete the checklist on **Open, Transparent and Merit-Based Recruitment** included below, which focuses on the operationalization of these principles.			
12. Recruitment	+		
13. Recruitment (Code)	+		
14. Selection (Code)	+/-	Public interview was recognized as a missing part of selection procedure that is still not introduced in practice.	
15. Transparency (Code)	+		
16. Judging merit (Code)	+/-	Quality criteria are not included in evaluation of candidates.	
17. Variations in the chronological order of CVs (Code)	-/+	National regulation is very rigid and does not provide possibility of making a break in research career, which is	

		increasing a pressure to researchers (fear of losing a job).	
18. Recognition of mobility experience (Code)	+/-	Stimulation and evaluation of mobility is not fully recognized and considered as significant contribution of professional development.	In preparation a Rulebook on International Exchange of Students and Staff
19. Recognition of qualifications (Code)	-/+	Our country is not interesting to international researchers in larger scale due to difficult economic situation and underdeveloped industry. Our main problem is "brain drain" and in this context we still do not have demands regarding recognition of international qualifications.	The procedure for the recognition of foreign doctoral degrees was developed both at the University of Banja Luka (for the purpose of continuing education) and at the Ministry of Education of the Republika Srpska (for the purpose of employment).
20. Seniority (Code)	+		
21. Postdoctoral appointments (Code)	-	Appointment of post-doctoral researchers as such is not recognized in employment policy of the institution.	
Working Conditions and Social Security			
22. Recognition of the profession	+		
23. Research environment	-/+	Lack of financial support that would ensure stimulating research environment is evident. Researchers also refer to lack of finances invested by Ministry of Science, and State in general. Laboratories and facilities are mainly equipped through projects, not University investments.	
24. Working conditions	-	This principle is not recognized by our legislation.	
25. Stability and permanence of employment	+/-	At the moment, new contracts with academic staff are being signed. However, these contracts do not guarantee permanent employment if the researcher or academic staff member fails to meet the requirements for periodic selection/re-election (other than a regular professor), or	

		verification of academic standards.	
26. Funding and salaries	-/+	The institution does not stimulate and reward researchers who go out to perform part of their doctoral studies, but reduces salary during their absence.	Try to change the decision of the Governing Board of the University on the limitation of stay of researchers abroad.
27. Gender balance	-	"Gender" provisions are not included in our existing legislation that regulates the field of scientific research, but generally there are no complaints with regard to gender issue.	
28. Career development	+		
29. Value of mobility	-/+	Paid leave from a few months for the specialization in foreign country, during which wages decrease by 30 % is the most discouraging act that does not allow young researchers to go abroad and educate. Also one of the non-stimulating measures is the possibility given by the University as employer that only once in five years researcher can take paid a leave.	Make decisions about providing financial resources and support mobility of researchers.
30. Access to career advice	-/+	This principle is partially covered by EURAXESS Center that is situated at the University, which provides information about job opportunities and offers job assistance.	Enable promotion of EURAXESS services to researchers at all faculties
31. Intellectual Property Rights	+/-	The Law on Copyright and Related Rights Act exits but researchers refer to lack of mechanisms for its implementation.	
32. Co-authorship	+		
33. Teaching	-/+	Academic staff considers that due to teaching obligations they are overloaded. Another problem is that salaries of academic staff depend on number of lectures and time spent in research is not valuated properly.	Make changes to the Rules on Standards and Norms for financing public higher education institutions.

34. Complains/ appeals	-/+	Conflicts between supervisor(s) and early-stage researchers are extremely rare and therefore it was not emphasized a need for assistance in processing complaints.	
35. Participation in decision-making bodies	+		
Training and Development			
36. Relation with supervisors	+/-	The legislation does not recognize explicitly this principle. Legal certainty, researchers, and mentors, Mentoring is not properly defined, nor the regulations provided such a relationship mentors and researchers. It is necessary to introduce public access to mentoring.	Recognize mentoring and research as a separate categories in national legislation
37. Supervision and managerial duties	+/-	Senior researchers would be more motivated if the evaluation of the mentoring work with the candidates would be valuated (e.g. through norm-hour during the week). Work with candidates is not recognized in terms of time and knowledge transfer.	
38. Continuing Professional Development	+/-	After rewarding title of full-time professors, our academic staff is not obliged or monitored about their work. Besides full-time professors, everyone else is obliged to continue with professional development. However, neither regular full-time professors were completely excluded from this obligation.	Compulsory participation at minimum one international conference per year
39. Access to research training and continuous development	-/+	This principle cannot be easily achieved due to lack of finances (institutional level, ministry level etc.).	
40. Supervision	+/-	Legislation recognizes mentoring, but obligations of mentors are not sufficiently regulated (obligations of mentors should be more precise and binding, but also	

		rewarding for well-done mentoring).		
Any additional issues				

Template 1 – Annex: Open, Transparent and Merit-based Recruitment Check-list[5]

OTM-R checklist for organisations

	Open	Trans-parent	Merit-based	Answer: ++ Yes, *completely* +/-Yes, *substantially* -/+ Yes, *partially* -- *No*	Suggested indicators (or form of measurement)
OTM-R system					
1. Have we published a version of our OTM-R policy online (in the national language and in English)?	--	--	--	--	[web link]
2. Do we have an internal guide setting out clear OTM-R procedures and practices for all types of positions?	--	--	--	--	[Date of latest update; ensure that it is sent to all staff]
3. Is everyone involved in the process sufficiently trained in the area of OTM-R?	--	--	--	--	- Existence of training programmes for OTM-R - Number of staff following training in OTM-R
4. Do we make (sufficient) use of e-recruitment tools?					Web-based tool for (all) the stages in the recruitment process
5. Do we have a quality control system for OTM-R in place?	--	--	--	--	
6. Does our current OTM-R policy encourage external candidates to apply?	-/+	-/+	-/+	-/+	Trend in the share of applicants from outside the organisation
7. Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to attract researchers from abroad?	-/+	-/+	-/+	-/+	Trend in the share of applicants from abroad

---

[5] http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/index.cfm/services/researchPolicies

8. Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to attract underrepresented groups?	-/+	-/+	-/+	-/+	Trend in the share of applicants among underrepresented groups (frequently women)
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?	--	--	--	--	
Advertising and application phase					
11. Do we have clear guidelines or templates (e.g., EURAXESS) for advertising positions?	++	++	++	++	
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) of the OTM-R expert report*[6]]	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	Few elements from the **Chapter 4.4.1 a** are missing (entitlements – salary and other benefits), professional development opportunities and career development projects
13. Do we make full use of EURAXESS to ensure our research vacancies reach a wider audience?	++	++	++	++	- The share of job adverts posted on EURAXESS; - Trend in the share of applicants recruited from outside the organisation/abroad
14. Do we make use of other job advertising tools?	++	++	++	++	Advertising job positions in national newspapers
15. Do we keep the administrative burden to a minimum for the candidate? [*see Chapter 4.4.1 b)* [45]]	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	From applicants is required to provide original or translated certificates related to qualifications
Selection and evaluation phase					
16. Do we have clear rules governing the appointment of selection committees? [*see Chapter 4.4.2 a)* [45]]	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	The University has rules governing the appointment of selection committees, but they not entirely match the criteria from the Chapter 4.4.2 a
17. Do we have clear rules concerning the composition of selection committees?	++	++	++	++	Written guidelines
18. Are the committees sufficiently gender-balanced?	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	The University considers not having a gender issues; on the contrary. But, sometimes it is very difficult to have gender-balanced committee due to the fact there are only a few experts from the certain scientific fields.
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?	++	++	++	++	Written guidelines

---

[6] http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/index.cfm/services/researchPolicies

Appointment phase					
20. Do we inform all applicants at the end of the selection process?	++	++	++	++	The best candidate chosen by the selection committee is informed by the Rectorate, Legal Unit of the University, and other candidates are informed via faculties
21. Do we provide adequate feedback to interviewees?	++	++	++	++	
22. Do we have an appropriate complaints mechanism in place?	++	++	++	++	With this regard the University does not have statistics
Overall assessment					
23. Do we have a system in place to assess whether OTM-R delivers on its objectives?	--	--	--	--	There is no such system