



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



2023

Report on R&I structures, cultures and processes



ENGAGE·EU

The European University Engaged in Societal Change

Report on R&I structures, cultures and processes

D70 - R&I cultures

1. Introduction: Objective and Methodology.....	3
2. Research Output.....	4
2.1 Goals, Ambitions, and Priorities of Research Output.....	4
2.2 Incentives to Perform and Consequences of Underperformance.....	5
2.3 Culture for Research and Academic Discussion.....	6
3. Interdisciplinarity.....	6
3.1 Interdisciplinarity as Universities' Priority.....	6
3.2 Interdisciplinarity as Part of the Organizational Structure.....	7
3.3 Interdisciplinary Research Projects at the University.....	8
4. Open Science.....	8
4.1 General Attitude Towards Open Science.....	8
4.2 Open Science in Recruiting Researchers and HR.....	9
4.3 Open Science in Teaching.....	9
4.4 Open Science in Research Process.....	10
5. Funding.....	10
5.1 Sources of Funding.....	10
5.2 Internal Distribution of Research Funds.....	10
5.3 Research Incentives.....	11
5.4 Spending.....	11
6. Hiring and Resource Management.....	11
6.1 Hiring of New Employees.....	11
6.2 Onboarding Activities for New Hires.....	12
6.3 Attractive Working Conditions.....	13
6.4 Career Development.....	14
6.5 Academic/Non-Academic Staff.....	15
7. Ethics and IRB.....	15
7.1 Ethics Concerns by Discipline.....	15
7.2 Ethics and IRB.....	16
7.3 Ethics and IRB - Alternative Solutions.....	17
8. Outcome of the Study and Conclusions.....	17

1 Introduction: Objective and Methodology

The goals of Task 3.5 "Map R&I structures, cultures and processes" are threefold:

- i) Explore research & innovation cultures and processes within the ENGAGE.EU consortium
- ii) Get an overview on structures, cultures, and processes for research and innovation
- iii) Develop a strong fundament for conducting excellent research & innovation.

This report completes the development of the first two goals as, on the one hand, it gives an overview of research innovations and best practices in terms of processes and cultures, on the other hand, it draws a picture of the current structures, cultures, and processes that assist research and practices in terms of innovation.

To investigate the areas in which Research & Innovation processes take shape, we have isolated six main characterizing topics:

- 1) Research Output
- 2) Interdisciplinarity
- 3) Open Science
- 4) Funding
- 5) Hiring and Resources Management
- 6) Ethics and IRB.

Determining the topics was a big effort, as it was necessary to cover all the most important practices in innovation and research: fundamental in this sense was the dialogue and collaboration between the various universities in the identification of transversal topics.

For each topic, a questionnaire was created to be circulated. To guarantee a standardized answering of the questionnaire, a sample filled questionnaire for each topic was also produced, on which the various partners of

the consortium could base their answers in terms of what information was required and what data had to be provided. Even this aspect was not free of difficulties since the individual universities are structured differently and have different dimensions. In addition to this, there is also the frame beyond the university's jurisdiction, i.e., the national regulations that impact on the universities' organization. Further challenges are due to coexistence in the consortium of public and private universities. However, thanks to the constant interaction and the sharing of comments between the partners, it was possible to overcome these obstacles by designing and developing a set of questionnaires that take these differences into account.

The drafting and compilation of these questionnaires according to a uniform approach allowed the acquisition of valuable information on how the partner universities are organized in terms of structures, cultures, and processes for Research & Innovation. This was a major effort by the project partners as each university had to fill in 6 questionnaires, making a total of 42 questionnaires. In this sense, the questionnaires can give a complete and detailed overview of each partner's organization and situation.

At the end of this laborious process of data and information collection, six short summary documents were produced, one on each topic. These documents constitute the sections of this report. Attached to the report are six spreadsheets -one for each topic- that contain all the information from the filled questionnaires.

Section 2 will cover the topic Research Output, analysing in particular how universities address both the issue of quantification of research outputs and the valorisation of research. The third

section, Interdisciplinarity, will analyse the interdisciplinary approach of universities from the point of view of organisational communication and organisational structure as well as of interdisciplinary research topics and projects. The fourth section will investigate the Open Science dimension of recruitment policies, teaching methods, and research processes. The section on Funding will instead explore the funding sources of the different universities and the distribution of funds, looking at both incentives and spending procedures. Section 6 entitled Hiring and Resource Management will focus on policies related to recruitment processes, working conditions, and career development in partner universities. The last thematic Section 7, Ethics and IRB, deals with the various areas in which codes or ethical rules have been developed and the functioning of the bodies that monitor and implement them.

Some final considerations will be made in the Outcome of the Study and Conclusions Section.

2 Research Output

Regarding the topic of Research output, from the answers provided to the questionnaire some common practices seem to emerge as well as some divergences. Divergences are almost exclusively between different universities, and not between departments within the same university.

As far as (main) dimensions of research output is concerned, the dimension which all the universities involved in the survey monitor (research/scientific) is publications, almost all monitor awarded (competitive) external funding, two also monitor impact. Various other dimensions are also mentioned (by WU) such as bibliometric measures, placement and research communication.

With regard to the quantity of research output, the parameter is typically the number of publications. NHH is also facing a national point system awarded per publication. Awarded projects are monitored in terms of number and/or amounts.

The quality of research is measured at all the universities, both internally and/or by external parties/governments, and in a wide variety of ways. Some mentioned are external national evaluations, ranking/reputation of publishing journals/publications (e.g., the Academic Journal Guide issued by the Chartered Association of Business Schools or RePEc ranking), and reputation of external institutions that award research funds.

All the universities perform some kind of comparison or benchmarking of their research quality/output with other universities nationally and/or internationally, either through own systems, networks or publicly available rankings (e.g., CHE ranking, Financial Times Master's in Management Ranking, Times Higher Education Ranking, RePEc ranking, QS World University Ranking by Subject, Global Ranking of Academic Subjects (Shanghai Ranking), CHE University Ranking.). What defines the most important benchmark institutions used by the universities is that they are considered leading in their fields by some measure or ranking.

2.1 Goals, Ambitions, and Priorities of Research Output

Faculty at all universities are required to do both research and teaching. It appears most common with an approximately equal weight between the two tasks, i.e., either 50/50 or 40/40/20 where the latter is administrative duties. UMA has no set ratio. However, Luiss has by far the greatest emphasis on research where full professors and associate

professors have 77% of annual hours to be spent on research and 23% on teaching activities. For the other faculty positions there is no homogeneous ratio.

While several universities have similar shares of full time dedicated to teaching, the actual amount of coursework or lecture hours this amounts to may differ. In Italy, the law establishes a minimum of 350 hours for teaching activities (120 hours of lectures) for Full and Associate professors. For other categories, there is no formal requirement. At UMA, the standard teaching duties comprise 9 hours/week. At NHH, teaching 60% of full time (no administrative duties) would roughly translate to either teaching two full/large mandatory bachelor courses (about 450 students each), or three full master courses (about 60 students each), or supervising 15 master theses (one thesis is usually written by two students during a full semester equivalent to 30 ECTS each). This would leave the remainder of the time (40%) for research.

Most universities do not have a generally set measure of research output expected or required annually by their faculty. However, both NHH and the UNWE have explicit expectations where quality may substitute for quantity. At NHH the expectation is one authored upper level (according to a national system) or about two lower-level publications annually. The UNWE has a similar, but more detailed expectations with three quality levels (at least one publication in Scopus/Web of Science annually or more at lower levels) and an expectation of research project participation/leadership. UTC1 has qualitative and quantitative criteria for considering professors to be “research active”. At UMA, junior professorships with a tenure-track procedure must achieve certain research achievements, e.g., a certain number

of publications in highly ranked journals or the acquisition of third-party funding. UNWE implements an attestation system (3 years period for junior and 5 years for senior staff) which sets minimum quantitative thresholds for research outputs for each position to be kept.

All institutions emphasize a goal of excellence in research (further to the research dimensions named above). Some also mention a goal of excellence also in teaching, i.e., a balance between research and teaching.

The funding of research (and teaching) is mainly by lump sum transfer from the government. To a modest extent the government funding is also dependent on output for two institutions (NHH and WU Vienna). It appears most or all institutions may raise external funds for research (which implicitly means these particular funds are dependent on research output).

2.2 Incentives to Perform and Consequences of Underperformance

While some universities point out that many incentives are intrinsic (curiosity and satisfaction) and implicit (academic standing among peers, career perspectives), all have some form of extrinsic and explicit (monetary) incentives in place. Luiss seems to have the most formal system, one of research score calculated based on the previous three years of publications determining research funds received by the researcher. Several universities mention that salary increases depend on research output, and/or that they have bonuses of some sort tied to research dimensions such as excellent publications or external funding acquired.

Almost all universities seem to follow a similar process where underperformance in terms of research output is dealt by

dialogue between the underperforming faculty and their superior. The UNWE has the most explicit system with evaluations ("attestations") every five (three) years for full/associate (assistant) professors where two consecutive underperformances terminate the labor contract.

2.3 Culture for Research and Academic Discussion

Several factors are mentioned as important for mutual respect and esteem among colleagues: interpersonal relationships, proactivity, transparency, fairness and courtesy, excellence in research and/or teaching, sense of community and collegial/partnership atmosphere. One university emphasizes the consensus that scientific disciplines are not comparable.

All universities describe cooperation among researchers in positive terms, and several also emphasize considerable interdisciplinary cooperation as a good example.

Most universities describe competition among researchers in terms like healthy or constructive, or in relative neutral terms. No institutions raise concerns of too hard or destructive competition.

All universities emphasize good cooperation between disciplines.

The competition between disciplines is described as ranging from no competition to moderate competition. The competition is mainly described in positive terms, i.e. there is a mutual respect. The source of competition in some cases seems tied to rivalry for funding.

3 Interdisciplinarity

3.1 Interdisciplinarity as Universities' Priority

With regard to the issue of interdisciplinarity, we can start by emphasising that all

universities communicate explicitly the topic "Interdisciplinarity" (in case of TiU: "Multidisciplinarity") in their central documents. They do this above all in documents like Strategic/Development Plan and Annual Report. In the documents examined, the universities communicate "Interdisciplinarity" 5-15 times on average, whereas in the Development Plan of the University of Mannheim references to interdisciplinarity are much more frequent. At the level of the entire organisation, the topic "Interdisciplinarity" is linked most often to the following university areas, structures and processes: interdisciplinary research institutes/centres, study programs and degree courses, international collaboration/cooperation.

The topic "Interdisciplinarity" is also explicitly communicated by several central structural units of every university, such as departments, faculties, schools etc. They do this primarily on their websites 2-3 times on average. At Luiss all departments mention the terms "interdisciplinarity" and "interdisciplinary" as part of their communication and self-presentation. At the other universities, especially the departments of Law, Computational Sciences, Business and Management, Socioeconomics/Social Sciences and Economics communicate the topic on their websites or in their internal documents. At the level of the central structural university units, the topic "Interdisciplinarity" is most often linked to the following areas, structures and processes: interdisciplinary research, in terms of personnel (interdisciplinary teams and research groups), in terms of teaching (interdisciplinary degree courses).

3.2 Interdisciplinarity as Part of the Organizational Structure

Regarding the interdisciplinary research orientation of the central structural units of the participating universities, a clear and complete result cannot be determined because the answers of the universities are very heterogenic. Luiss suggests that it is strongly interdisciplinary by nature, with strong interdisciplinary interactions between the "Department of Economics and Finance" and the "Department of Business and Management" on the one hand and between the "Department of Law" and the "Department of Political Science" on the other hand. NHH do not have any information on this issue. At WU Vienna and Mannheim, the disciplines Socioeconomics/ Social Sciences, Computational Sciences and partially Business Administration (Mannheim) are characterized by a strong interdisciplinary research orientation. At both universities, less interdisciplinary work is done in the fields of Economics and Law.

In terms of structural possibilities for establishment of additional interdisciplinary research units such as research centres/ institutes, competence centres, labs etc. the situation is different at the participating universities. WU and Luiss have developed formal regulations in this area. At WU the By-Laws allows and regulates the establishment of intrauniversity organizational units (research institutes and competence centres) with focus on interdisciplinary research. At these units, researchers from different departments work together across disciplines. It should be mentioned that the activities of WU's research institutes are financed to a large extent through third-party research funding. At Luiss the Research Centres Regulation explicitly provides for two types of centres that can

be created for interdisciplinary research – intra- and interuniversity centres on the one hand and centres in collaboration with other institutions on the other hand. At Mannheim there are no special structures, but the President's Office promotes the establishment of interdisciplinary research institutions, e.g., by giving funding. At NHH faculty and departments are periodically invited to suggest new research centres, most recently in 2019. Several new centres were established. Similar practice is implemented at UNWE where periodically the departments update (close or establish) associated research centres and renew the related staff and fellows. At TiU in the past, supporting funds were available to set up Centers of Excellence (top research institutes with a prerequisite of interdisciplinarity). Now, setting up interdisciplinary centers is up to the Schools.

At WU Vienna there are 21 additional interdisciplinary units – 14 research institutes and 7 competence centres. From 212 habilitated researchers at WU 104 (almost 50%) are assigned to one or more research institutes and/or competence centres. The most involved (in percent of habilitated staff) departments are Computational Sciences and Socioeconomics with 60-70% of their habilitated researchers assigned to one or more of these units.

University of Mannheim has 5 research centres, the two biggest of them have more than 100 members.

At NHH there are currently 12 research centres involving five of six departments: Accounting, Auditing and Law; Business and Management Science; Economics; Finance; Strategy and Management.

At Luiss there are 15 Departmental Research Centres and 1 Interdepartmental Centre.

Of the 15 Departmental Research Centres, 12 involve staff from various Departments. In absolute terms, the most involved departments are Business and Management and Political Science.

At UNWE there are about 35 Research Centres of which about 15 adopting interdisciplinarity approach. Each of them encompasses typically 3 to 5 individuals (core group) supported by associates (including PhD students and external experts). Part of the core group as well as the associates may come from other departments and from outside the university.

At UT1C there are several such units (primarily labs), 2 of them have been specifically created to achieve interdisciplinarity – 1 intrauniversity unit mainly with researchers from the Toulouse School of Economics Research and 1 interuniversity unit with researchers from several UT1C-institutes.

At TiU the university website mentions 34 research institutes of which 9 are based in two or more schools.

Many different topics are researched in all these interdisciplinary units. A brief listing of some topics mentioned in the case of more universities:

- (International) Taxation
- Sustainability/sustainable business
- (Digital) Innovation
- Inequality
- Supply Chain Management/Shipping and Logistics
- Democratization
- Experimental research/studies
- Financial Studies/corporate finance
- Leadership

3.3 Interdisciplinary Research Projects at the University

None of the participating universities have internal funding schemes and/or prizes that explicitly fund or promote only interdisciplinary projects. One possible reason for this could be that interdisciplinary projects are common practice at the universities and there is no necessity for further promoting interdisciplinarity.

There were 10 large to medium-sized third-party funded projects with a clear interdisciplinary orientation started from 2018 to 2020 in the case of WU and NHH and 24 in the case of Luiss.

4 Open Science

The term Open Science (OS) bundles strategies and procedures that aim to make all elements of the scientific process openly accessible, transparent and sustainable via the Internet. There are six dimensions of OS: Open Access (OA), Open Data, Open Methods, Open Source, Open Educational Resources and Open Peer Review.

Open access to scientific publications, research data and scientific software not only enhances the supply of information within science and academia. It also makes research processes more transparent and improves the quality assurance of scientific work. Open Science is thus essential for safeguarding good scientific practice.

The following four basic principles of Open Science boost knowledge transfer into the whole of society: transparency, reproducibility, reusability and open communication.

4.1 General Attitude towards Open Science

All partner universities have already dealt with the topic of OS and practice OS in one

way or another – although not (yet) to the full extent, but with a focus on a specific dimension, usually Open Access.

The extent to which Open Science is practiced and promoted varies greatly among the partner universities. For the most part, OS efforts focus on the area of OA, while other dimensions of OS play little or no role.

In all countries represented at ENGAGE.EU, politics or important funding bodies have made efforts in the past years to strengthen OS at universities and to encourage researchers to practice OS. For example, the Netherlands adopted a National Plan for Open Science already in 2017, France in 2018, and Bulgaria in 2021. In Italy and Norway, national efforts have been made to make OA publications the standard: the Italian Call for Research Projects of National Interest 2020 requires OS as does the Norway Research Council since 2021. Third-party funders responded even earlier in many places: Important funding agencies in Austria, Finland, France, Italy and Netherlands endorse “cOAlition S”, a consortium of national research agencies and funders from twelve European countries that launched Plan S in 2018. Plan S is an initiative for open-access science publishing and requires researchers who benefit from state-funded research organizations and institutions to publish their work in open repositories or in journals that are available to all by 2021. In Germany, the largest provider of third-party funding, the DFG, has set new standards in OS with the new version of the Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice. Accordingly, researchers should make research data, materials and information as well as the methods and software used, available and should fully explain the work processes in order to be eligible to receive DFG funding.

Various measures have also been taken at the universities themselves to advance OS – mainly in relation to OA, but not only. Until now, no universities have a true OS policy yet, but UT1C plans to issue an OS Charta, and LUISS, NHH and WU already have an OA policy. At the other universities TiU, UMA, UNWE and WU guidelines for OA publications are anchored in other central guidelines for research practice and in various strategic plans. As far as the aspect of Open Data is concerned, all universities already have data repositories, either on a national or a university-wide level, or at least have access to data repositories of other institutions.

In addition to mandatory OS policies and the like, all universities except UT1C have established advice centers or go-to-persons for OS activities – but again mainly with the focus on OA. The same is true for incentives to encourage scientists to engage in OS activities: All universities support OA publishing in a financial way, only at UMA there are also special grants for research projects and events with OS relevance.

4.2 Open Science in Recruiting Researchers and HR

No university monitors OS activities in a structured way within the process of recruitment and promotion or makes it a criterion for HR decisions. However, some universities are planning to give more consideration to the topic.

Until now, the universities do not offer special OS training to researchers but have support measures that range from low-threshold activities to individual support on demand.

4.3 Open Science in Teaching

In teaching OS does not play a major role at any university, at least not with regards to teaching student. However, some

universities are making initial advances in the area of doctoral education and training: The UT1C offers two training courses on OA each year at the doctoral school of law, UMA and TiU are planning to integrate OS in the curriculum of doctoral education.

4.4 Open Science in Research Process

All universities have infrastructure to support OS activities in research, again mainly with focus on OA publications, e.g. advice and financial support for OA and providing platforms to publish open data/open methods/open source. UMA additionally offers OS grants. Regarding the FAIR data principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Re-usable), they are known at all universities, but they are not everywhere promoted or mandatory for research projects. Only at NHH and WU the principles are communicated at the university homepage.

When it comes to promote OS, no university except LUISS makes use of training senior researchers to raise the awareness of OS.

Inclusion of the broader public in research activities are not yet very developed. TiU and UNWE are the most advanced in this respect: At TiU there is an 'Impact team' that connects and communicates with society at large. Besides, there is an in-house studio and a magazine specially for this purpose. UNWE has agreements with several media for disseminating short resumes and other messages to the society and business community on hot topics. Special domain is provided for a series of video presentations of UNWE scholars specifically designed to wider audience and distributed by the Bulgarian Telegraph Agency.

At WU, there is a research project involving Citizen Science. The project INTER-ACT seeks to develop an electronic interaction

and discussion platform that serves as an experimental demonstrator for drafting and discussing concrete proposals for legal norms in an open, transparent, evidence-based and consensus-based process. Thereby, model regulatory proposals will be drafted in an open and dynamic process on the basis of participation of citizens of all stakeholder groups. At UMA, LUISS and TiU individual scientists are interested in Citizen Science, but until now there are no comparable projects like at WU.

5 Funding

5.1 Sources of funding

As far as university funding is concerned, all the universities involved in the survey -both public and private- receive external funding (where external means funding outside the ordinary income set aside for funding).

External funds consist of grants from the private sector in amounts ranging from 4,7% of NHH to 47% of WU (TiU 5%; Luiss 31.4%; UMA 25%; UT1C 21%). The share of private funding for UNWE is negligible.

The proportion of European funds in the overall external funds has a very wide range, between Luiss's 36%, WU's 16%, UNWE's 14%, NHH's 12,8%, UT1C's 6% and UMA's 1.5%.

All universities have specific rules for managing external funds and provide for separate accounting of them.

5.2 Internal distribution of research funds

As regards the internal distribution of funds, most universities distribute research funds internally following an evaluation of the research activity (UT1C, WU, Luiss, NHH). UMA has no proportional distribution: it only provides for a flat-rate distribution to the various chairs. UNWE also implements a flat-rate funding but project based, i.e. provided

to research project teams. Finally, TIU bases the distribution of funds on the needs of the schools and the number of students, diplomas issued and PhD defenses.

All professors are allocated minimum internal research funds, regardless of research evaluations (UMA, Luiss, UT1C, TIU). At WU, NHH and UNWE, there is no automatic allocation without prior application.

Evaluations and bonuses are based on parameters that are specific for each department (UT1C, Luiss, WU, NHH). On the contrary, UNWE practices unified system of research evaluation and approval of bonuses. There are no research bonuses at TIU.

Concerning external funds, they are available to the researchers who win them. Withholding fees can be provided in favour of the administration/department.

5.3 Research incentives

As far as the research incentives, Luiss, UT1C, NHH stimulate research through the increasing proportional distribution of funds. All universities structurally provide some forms of bonuses. The exception to this trend are UMA, which does not provide for generalized bonus mechanisms although it provides for rewards, and TIU, where there are no specific incentives other than career progression opportunities (tenure track, promotion to full professor).

The evaluation of research is implemented differently between UT1C (at Research Unit level), Luiss and UNWE (at the level of individual researchers), TIU (at the Department level), or NHH and WU (mixed modalities). UMA does not have an official evaluation mechanism.

Gender equality, ethics and sustainability are promoted through internal policies in almost all universities.

None of the universities have special financial incentives to the creation of research centres. Nevertheless, WU, Luiss, UMA, and NHH have many research centres, mostly devoted to interdisciplinary research. Conversely, UT1C encourages clustering and centralisation.

5.4 Spending

The spending issue is characterised, like many other issues in this section, by both common and very different approaches. It is mandatory to report all expenses, either at individual or research unit. The only exception are TIU and WU, that requires technical reporting only for funds coming from third parties and for some of the internal funding schemes. However, also at WU all expenditures are processed in WU's ERP-System (SAP).

Almost all universities publish annual reports on the use of research funds (apart from UNWE).

Some universities have no regulations on the use of funds (although expenses for personal purposes are never allowed), some regulate the use of external funds and some the use of all funds.

For all universities, travel expenses constitute the main source of expenditures. Almost all universities tend to use funds for internationalization (except UNWE); the partial exception is UMA, that for internationalization permits the use of external funds only.

6 Hiring and Resource Management

6.1 Hiring of New Employees

Concerning the topic of Hiring and Resource Management, it is worth starting by stressing that major differences regarding hiring activities affect the way hiring activities are organized. At some universities recruiting is

largely decentralized whereas others make use of HR service centers to coordinate the hiring process. Furthermore, some partners describe considerable differences between the recruitment for academic and non-academic positions (NHH, UMA). For example, turnover with academic staff is at a higher level than with non-academic staff (UMA). WU and UMA state to pay special attention to employer-branding measures in order to tackle the task of being more visible as an attractive employer and to be competitive in the war for talents.

Most partners usually offer temporary employment for academic positions before potential permanent hiring, whereas for administrative staff there are often permanent positions. UNWE seems to be an exception: permanent hiring for scientific staff is stated as the standard employment mode.

When asked about a digital applicant system the picture is heterogeneous: three universities make use of such a tool whereas two do not and one of the partners is currently testing a digital applicant system.

Measures to ensure transparency within the hiring process focus mainly on gender neutral job descriptions, public announcement of open positions (except for LUISS being the only private university) and in most cases legal obligations on a national level that have to be fulfilled.

In order to foster equality and diversity some partners tackle the task strategically (TiU: Gender & Diversity Roadmap 2018-2021, trainings; UMA: Equal Opportunity Plan). WU and UMA explicitly encourage women to apply for open positions as well as people with special needs. As a specific measure towards equal opportunities NHH offers female Associate Professors to work

only half of the normal period to qualify for their two first years of sabbatical leave. WU additionally mentions networking activities. UNWE states to have a high share of female workforce due to gender bias concerning the clerical professions, being major education profiles at UNWE, that experienced lower pay levels in the past.

6.2 Onboarding Activities for New Hires

Almost all universities regard onboarding as being crucial for a successful recruitment strategy. UNWE states that currently there is no specific understanding and treatment of onboarding issues.

According to the majority of partners onboarding aims at professional, cultural and social integration, key information on general matters as well as organization. NHH follows a wholistic approach and includes the new hire's family in the onboarding process. At most universities onboarding formally starts with or close by the hiring date (NHH, TiU, LUISS, UMA) but NHH stresses the potential importance of the prospect of good onboarding practices for recruitment. Duration is heterogeneous to a large degree, ranging from two weeks (LUISS) to one year into the job (WU).

NHH, UMA, WU have formal processes for onboarding activities which partly consider different stages and levels. TiU states that there is an ongoing project aiming at using a digital tool in order to structure and align onboarding processes among all Schools and divisions. WU offers formal onboarding programs for different target groups whereas LUISS focuses on networking activities.

In most cases responsibility for the onboarding process rests with the university's executives with additional stakeholders offering support: HR department, working groups, IT department,

mentors, colleagues. UMA makes use of an optional mentoring system. NHH, WU and UNWE provide informal support by mentors and TiU has pilot programs among PhD's and HR staff. available to each employee. As means of support and of promoting the idea of onboarding as a crucial factor all universities (except UNWE) provide at least a minimum of documents on different topics that might be relevant to new hires. The extent of information varies widely, ranging from organization chart to workshops and trainings.

Given that new hire feedback is crucial to unlocking a better employee experience, improving performance and retention and boosting overall employee engagement some universities engage in a systematic approach to giving and receiving effective feedback. WU provides new employees with questionnaires/feedback tools and evaluate feedback systematically at the end of onboarding processes. LUISS collects employee feedback via a survey in order to identify possible areas for improvement. Other partners have informal feedback processes. UMA is planning to introduce annual review/appraisal interviews in 2022. TiU states that feedback processes will be part of its onboarding project.

6.3 Attractive Working Conditions

TiU, UMA, LUISS state that they pay special attention to flexible working conditions (place- and partly time-independent working). UMA is a certified family-friendly university. Health and safety issues play an important role for TiU. NHH emphasizes a good working environment and has a Working Environment Committee which meets several times a year and continuously follows up the work environment. LUISS highlights team building and a positive work environment.

All universities have a mission statement to give expression to their fundamental values. Propositions center around the following key words/key phrases: education, unity of research and teaching, support of interdisciplinary research projects in collaborative research centers, equality of women and men in research and society, business and society development, value creation, sustainable development, space for contemplation/creativity, economic capability, social prosperity, open-minded institution, global hub for global exchange, diversity, plurality, social responsibility, close-knit, open and inclusive, international community, elaboration/transmission of humanistic knowledge of social sciences, promotion/organization of research, cultural and professional preparation, transfer of innovation, inspiration of profound changes in society, focus on intellectual development, social duties, continuous learning.

All universities have a code of behavior/code of conduct/code of ethics and take measures to ensure that everyone follows these guidelines. Raising awareness is the main focus for all universities. WU and UMA explicitly mention the importance of executives acting as role models. TiU attaches great importance to integrity and has a number of positions in the organization for facilitation. UNWE organizes refreshment seminars to maintain awareness. To counteract possible violations all universities count on dialogue, leadership intervention and disciplinary actions if necessary and some have special structures/positions to support people who are affected. For example, WU has a working group for Equal Treatment/HR department/ Works Council. TiU uses roadmaps per target group/topic.

Regarding employment conditions there are significant differences between the partners

when it comes to fixed-term contracts for researchers. WU, UNWE and UMA offer fixed-term contracts aligning to the expected duration of the doctoral studies/respective qualification goal (tenure track system). This also holds true for several Schools at TiU. NHH ties permanent employment to the achievement of clear conditions set out in advance. Focus is mainly on research output in terms of publications. At TiU assessment criteria focus on research, education, impact, leadership and team spirit. Future regulations at TiU comprise that employees holding the position of professor for more than 0.2 FTE or the position of assistant professor or associate professor can be offered a temporary employment contract for a maximum term of twelve months. Upon proven suitability and continuation in the same position permanent employment follows this period. At LUISS researchers on fixed-term contracts are selected through public competition. Public competition for Ph. Ds or equivalent applications for senior researcher positions are restricted to certain groups.

6.4 Career Development

At most universities human resource development is affiliated to the HR department/team. At WU the team for human resource development is part of the Personnel Planning, Personnel Development & Organizational Development unit. UNWE emphasizes that personnel development lies in the hands of each department. NHH, WU and TiU explicitly mention the importance of human resource development as an integral, indispensable and permanent task. UMA is currently working on a comprehensive concept for human resource development in order to enhance recruiting and employee satisfaction aiming at building consistent

structures in both fields of non-academic and academic staff.

Main topics/issues/activities in the field of human resources development are onboarding programs, language trainings, career development programs for postdocs/predocs, advisory services for executives, coaching and counselling, sustainable employability, performance and talent development, and career advancement. Notable is the fact that some universities go to great lengths to actively promote human resource development by offering a large array of measures and activities in order to anticipate and prepare for future developments.

NHH, WU, TiU, LUISS and UNWE conduct staff appraisals/interviews on a regular basis but at different intervals. UMA is planning to introduce those in 2022.

NHH, UMA, WU and TiU offer special programs and Career Development Training for specific target groups. Other ways of promoting careers include project work, double affiliation to research institutes and taking on representative roles. UNWE points to the fact that its system might be prone to "inbreeding" practices" as a result of informal settings that distort the normal operation of the system with national legislation creating further complications.

Measures to ensure career development opportunities to be transparent and predictable differ. NHH, WU, TiU, UMA focus on communicational efforts using different channels while LUISS and UNWE discuss those topics mostly internally within the realm of each department/faculty.

Monitoring of individual careers happens exclusively on a decentralized level at all universities.

NHH's departments have placement officers who offer career counselling to PhDs and postdocs. WU states that career counselling is an integral part of its career development programs. At UMA career counselling is currently available for junior female scientists participating in the WOVEN career program. UMA is planning to expand career counselling to other target groups. TiU's policy stands out: each staff member at Tilburg University is entitled to three consultations that might be followed by extended career guidance course/coaching sessions. Besides, TiU offers job interview trainings, a redeployment program, a reintegration program and group career training guidance.

6.5 Academic/Non-academic Staff

Heterogeneity is again apparent when it comes to the different realms of academic and non-academic staff. The fact that employment for most of the scientific staff lasts only for a few years while non-academic employees are often employed permanently has to be taken into account as well as legal/formal procedures concerning recruitment. Apart from contract issues, differences concerning key tasks, development aims and structural settings have to be taken into account according to WU. In contrast, TiU states that there are no major differences between academic and support staff in terms of hiring, selection, working conditions or onboarding.

7 Ethics and IRB

7.1 Ethics concerns by discipline

Finally, some considerations can be made on the topic of Ethics and IRB.

First of all, when asked about the ethical concerns the answers could be fitted in three major sections the data collection, the methods, and the treatment of the test subjects. In terms of data the instrument found that the alliance (UMA and UT1C) has

concerns of how the data, in multiple cases confidential or private, is collected and compiled. After the process of collecting data is finished the next concern, as expressed by UMA, is in how the data is kept confidential or private also what are the established deletion periods. Some of other concerns expressed by UT1C, TiU and UMA are the need of having a pre-registration of the data to comply with the requirements set some journals and the possibility of multiple publications with the same data set, this practice, as stated by the school of management of UT1C, is not un-ethical by itself but is necessary to have a clear differentiation inside the data set.

In terms of treatment of the data or the methods, the ethical concerns are centered as shared by the school of economics and the school of management at UT1C, in the need of having a unique yet replicable methodology that allows other researcher to validate the information and the conclusion. Following this line of thought the school of economics at UT1C also shared the concern of having a transparent method and experimental protocols that allows other researchers to understand the different techniques the data set was treated with.

The ethical concerns raised by UT1C on the subject test is the necessity to be clear and honest about the topic, objective, and methodology of the project this is generally stated in an informed consent that all the participants will have to agree if they are looking to be part of the research, this informed consent is also stated by TiU and UNWE. Also, as stated by UMA, the need to avoid prejudgments for a specific or vulnerable group. When the conclusion process begins, some of the ethical concerns raised by, UT1C and UMA are the need to write in a way that the participant stays

anonymous also the need to avoid making harmful conclusion that can lead the public to a misconception or stigmatization of a special or vulnerable group.

In order to train the researchers into having an ethical behavior most of the partners like UT1C, NHH, WU Vienna and LUISS have either mandatory or optional ethical courses and lectures focused on scientific integrity and ethic best practices available. In the case of the school of management of UT1C there are mandatory courses for 1st and 2nd year PhD and in the Law school there is an integrity speech, in the case of NHH these courses are mandatory for the PhD students but voluntary for the junior faculty. In TiU has ethics courses for bachelors and master students, for the case of PhD students and junior faculty they are instructed in the ethics.

On the other hand, there are the ethical certifications, these are usually granted by IRB, this type of certifications are widely used in the natural and health sciences but their use is less in the social sciences reason why most of the partner institutions don't have an internal IRB board and the certification is only required when the project is seeking for governmental or international funding as stated by the schools of economics and management at UT1C, UMA, TiU and NHH. Also, in some cases as expressed by UT1C, TiU and NHH the IRB certification is mandatory for the publication process in specific journals, in addition in school of economics of NHH all the projects inside the FAIR (FAIR research center stands for Centre for Experimental Research on Fairness, Inequality and Rationality) research center it is mandatory to have an IRB approval.

7.2 Ethics and IRB

Since there is a real need of the ethical certification, all the universities have established some form of evaluator panel that can give approval of research project ethic wise, it was found that most of the universities have an inside body in the form of an ethical board, ethics office or scientific integrity officer. Inside UT1C, WU Vienna, UMA, TiU and NHH this bodies are accessible for all the professors, PhD's students, or researchers, for the case of LUISS the submission to the ethical senate can only be made by the researcher in charge of the project. In terms of the time of response, in UMA it could variate depending on the relevance of the project but usually takes between few weeks and a month for the other partners, also in TiU this procedure will take 11 working days, for the case of UNWE this process takes between 7 and 14 days depending on the complexity of the case.

This ethical board inside the WU Vienna the ethical board consist of six members including three full professors, two junior faculty and one PhD student. For the case of UMA is consisted of five members and two deputies, inside TiU there is one member from each department a chair and vice chair a secretary and a data representative.

Inside the UNWE the board has five members, one chairman four members including one representative of the students and one administrative staff, but more members can be invited in a case-by-case scenario. For the case of LUISS the board also consist of five members of which at least two members are external, these members are the rector and the delegate, the general manager and its delegate, an ethic expert, a research committee representative and the external experts.

For the case of UT1C, the school of economics rely on their own board on the other hand the school of management and the school of law rely on the UFTMiP board (Université Fédérale Toulouse Midi-Pyrénées consist of the aggrupation of three public universities, Toulouse I: Université Capitole (Social sciences), Toulouse II: Université Jean Jaurès (Humanities) and Toulouse III: Université Paul Sabatier (Hard sciences)), this board consist of two different colleges one consisting of eighteen members and the other one with four members.

There is a different approach within the partners in how the application to the ethical committee is done, it differs between having an online dedicated application platform like in WU Vienna or a web page in TiU and other type of application or channel. Once this application is done, revisions to the project are accepted in all the partners, these revisions can come from the reviewing panel asking for a change, similar to the editorial process of a peer reviewed journal, or from the researchers themselves that can update the project. For TiU there can be amendments inside the project and in these amendments take 5 working days to be implemented.

7.3 Ethics and IRB - Alternative solutions

In terms of alternatives to the IRB depending on the complexity or magnitude of the project NHH has the possibility to activate a standalone ethical committee or a different ethical senate, and when dealing with international project there is no need of multiple certifications only one of the authors should get ethical clear from their home university as stated by UT1C, UMA and NHH.

8 Outcome of the Study and Conclusions

As mentioned in the introduction, the process of identifying topics through which to explore research and innovation cultures and processes in the Engage consortium was a truly collaborative effort between the team members of the seven partner institutions. In the same way, the discussion of the questionnaires and their filling in, with the sharing of observations and comments, gave rise to a process of learning and comparison of the different policies.

The objectives of this first phase of Task 3.5 of the Engage Project were to explore the research and innovation cultures and processes within the ENGAGE.EU consortium and to obtain an overview of the structures, cultures, and processes for research and innovation.

From the outputs of the questionnaires and the Report, it is possible to make several overall observations: in general, on many issues, partner Universities have different approaches among themselves, rather than among their departments, although some exceptions exist. Many of these differences are related to organizational structures and national legislation. The report investigated the topics identified mainly in relation to the categories of teaching and research, but also with respect to aspects where university autonomy is more limited (such as recruitment policies). At the level of macro principles and goals, however, it is possible to find many commonalities in the approaches of the various partner Universities, which also makes it possible to imagine future forms of policy coordination and exchanges of best practices.

As far as the macro common elements are concerned, we can start from the monitoring of quantitative (number of publications)

and qualitative research, often linked to obtaining external (competitive) funding. The Universities of the Consortium appear to be committed to research evaluation, although the methods by which this is done may vary. In this context, it is worth noting that all partner Universities require faculties to carry out research activities to be combined with teaching: some Universities of the Consortium also set minimum parameters for research (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed). In all partner Universities research funds are also raised through external competitive calls: all the Universities of the Consortium are beneficiaries of external funds and European funds. Moreover, in many partner Universities research funds are partly linked to an evaluation of the research carried out and there are research award systems. Additionally, all partners encourage interdisciplinary cooperation and healthy internal competition. Specifically, the interdisciplinary approach to research (but also to teaching) is an important aspect of the mission for all the partner Universities, as pointed out in their Strategic/Development Plans and Annual Reports. Although the answers to the questionnaires were very heterogeneous, there seems to be an important trend towards the development of interdisciplinary research lines, which are expressed through various degrees of formalization (incentives or regulations). The main instrument with which interdisciplinary research is developed at organizational level appears to be that of research centers. On the contrary, there are no instruments aimed at (explicit) promoting the funding of interdisciplinary projects. A similar common trend is towards Open Science, with particular reference to Open Access. However, in this case, different national regulations seem to be driving the development of this practice, as well as private funders: this heteronomous

impulse leads to a divergence between the various partner Universities, even though unifying European structures. However, all the Universities of the Consortium are moving to plan and implement OS policies: this is an area where cooperation between partner Universities could be strengthened. Regarding the recruitment of academic staff there is a trend of high turnover of researchers with a predominantly temporary recruitment. There are significant differences in relation to staff recruitment and how it is done. However, onboarding policies reflect similar goals but they vary considerably, as well as all organizational aspects. A common commitment of all partner Universities is also that of creating good working conditions with non-discriminatory and inclusive environments through practices, procedures, codes of conduct and sensibilization campaigns. Another important topic is certainly ethics, which also relates to the working environment, but above all to research: especially through courses for researchers and IRB opinions. The way the IRB operates, however, is varied.

The overview in this Report shows that there are many common themes and often many evolving procedures and processes that draw similar trends: in these areas, the Consortium could work to promote cooperation, identify best practices and encourage the creation of common policies: while in many areas the impact of national legislation has to be taken into account, for the development of policies on OS, Onboarding, Ethics, and Interdisciplinarity there is probably room for action within university autonomy to develop common approaches based on identified best practices.

In conclusion, the research carried out has enabled us to collect and catalogue an important volume of data on the various

practices and cultures of the partner universities. The project on which this research is based has made it possible to assemble this large body of information through the sharing of ideas and comments between the teams of the partner universities and the development of questionnaires capable of bringing out the peculiarities of the individual universities but also the common traits. The data collected from this research will allow the next deliverable to highlight the best practices in each field and their applicability to partner universities, outlining a possible integrative development of the Engage Consortium.



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



This publication has been produced by ENGAGE.EU. It is funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them. ENGAGE.EU does not accept responsibility for loss caused to any person who acts, or refrains from acting, in reliance on the material in this publication, whether such loss is caused by negligence or otherwise.

First published March 2023
Copyright © 2023 by ENGAGE.EU.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the copyright holder.

Contact:

Coordinator University of Mannheim
Prof. Dr. Thomas Fetzer
engage@uni-mannheim.de



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



European University ENGAGE.EU

ENGAGE.EU is an alliance of leading European universities in business, economics, and the social sciences, which aims to provide European citizens the set of skills and competences needed to tackle major societal challenges. These existing and new challenges, such as digitalisation and artificial intelligence, climate change, ageing societies and migration, must be tackled successfully to ensure a sustainable and positive future. ENGAGE.EU will inspire active societal engagement in the current and future state of Europe – and beyond.



LUISS

