



*The European Charter for Researchers and  
the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers*

**Self-assessment and update of Human Resources Strategy for Researchers for Reykjavik University**

**November 2012**

**I. Introduction**

Reykjavik University (RU) is a private university-level institution dedicated to higher education and research, with good connections to industry and society. The Icelandic Ministry of Education, Science and Culture accredits RU with the authority to award degrees. RU is the second largest university in Iceland and the largest private institute of higher education. RU consists of four academic Schools: the School of Law (SL), the School of Business (SB), the School of Computer Science (SCS), and the School of Science and Engineering (SSE); the Open University (OU) is RU's continuing education unit, and in addition RU offers also preliminary study course as a preparation for university education. RU has a community of 3200 students (thereof only around 30 Ph.D. students), 230 full-time employees and over 250 part-time employees.

In June 2009 RU accepted an invitation by the European Commission (EC) to join the HRS4R program to incorporate the *Charter* and the *Code* into its human resources strategy. In September 2009 a working group, consisting of key players in research at all levels within RU, was established to conduct an internal analysis of RU vis-a-vis the principles underlying the *Charter* and the *Code*. The current infrastructure at RU was analysed and to support the analysis, a special section of an employee survey conducted in November and December 2009 was designed to evaluate the environment at RU vis-a-vis these principles. In February 2010 the internal analysis was completed and in May same year RU received a formal acknowledgement by the EC and the «HR excellence in research» logo. The logo has been on the RU web page (on the research page) since then. The result of the internal gap analysis can be seen at [http://en.ru.is/media/hr/skjol/RU\\_Internal\\_analysis.pdf](http://en.ru.is/media/hr/skjol/RU_Internal_analysis.pdf). A summary of suggested actions based on the internal analysis can be seen at [http://en.ru.is/media/hr/skjol/CC\\_summary\\_of\\_suggested\\_actions.pdf](http://en.ru.is/media/hr/skjol/CC_summary_of_suggested_actions.pdf).

In May 2012 a new working group was established to conduct a self-assessment and review the HRS4R at RU. The working group consisted of researchers at all levels within RU, including one dean (Guðrún Arnbjörg Sævarsdóttir), two professors (Magnús Már Halldórsson and Vlad Vaiman), one associate professor (Þórdís Ingadóttir), one assistant professor (Ásrún Matthíasdóttir), one postdoctoral researcher (Ute Schiffl), two doctoral students (Milosz Marek Hodun and Már Mixa), as well as the Senior Executive Director at RU (Þóranna Jónsdóttir) and the Director of RU Research Services (Kristján Kristjánsson), who administered the group work.

The working group had four meetings in the period from June through October 2012, reviewing the gap analysis from 2010 and recent developments at RU in relation to the *Charter* and the *Code*. The working group went through the gap analysis step by step and the results can be seen in Appendix 1 - *Review of the gap analysis submitted in 2010*. Furthermore, the working group produced a new summary of suggested actions, based on the summary from 2010, plus an overview of new actions and recent developments within RU, which support the implementing of the *Charter* and the *Code* into its human resources strategy (see below).



## II. Self-assessment: Summary of suggested actions and recent developments

**Black text** = Action done  
**Green text** = Action on going  
**Red text** = Action still required

Summary of suggestions from 2010	Review and update of actions, new actions and recent developments
<b>Recruitment</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Job advertisements should be more specific about working conditions, opportunities, funds, the selection process etc. (link to website at least).</li> <li>Invite applicants (all who reached the final phase) to inquire about their strengths and weaknesses at the conclusion of the selection process.</li> <li>Lobby the government to create immigration “fast-track” for incoming non-EU researchers.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>and 2. <b>Advertisements and feedback to applicants have been substantially improved.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The University is still putting pressure on the government regarding immigration “fast-track” for incoming non-EU researchers.</b></li> </ol>
<b>Selection and promotion work</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide training in selection and promotion work for all committee members (at least an information packet).</li> <li>More emphasis on international representation in evaluation committees (academic promotion).</li> <li>Gender balance on selection committees.</li> <li>Need to update anti-discrimination statement in HR strategy.</li> <li>Update HR strategy to speak to variations in chronological order of careers, to encourage mobility and that levels of qualifications should be in line with needs of position.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Training and information packet regarding selection and promotion work need to be created.</b></li> <li>Rules on evaluation committees now stipulate international representation.</li> <li>and 4. <b>A new strategy for Reykjavik University has been approved by the Board of Trustees and the Executive Committee in November 2011 (<a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/</a>), in where gender balance on selection committees is clearly stipulated. Furthermore the anti-discrimination issue has been strengthened.</b></li> <li>Encouragement on mobility and possibilities for mobility is in now the official HR strategy of RU. Mobility is encouraged in new guidelines on hiring of post-doctoral researchers and Ph.D. students.</li> </ol>
<b>Postdocs and doctoral students</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidelines on hiring post-doctoral staff and doctoral students (open recruitment, duration, importance of mobility, right to performance evaluation, development etc.).</li> <li>Also need template contracts.</li> <li>Clarify categories of students/staff when doctoral and masters students are on payroll.</li> <li>Clarify when they should receive stipend (grantee) and when they should be put on payroll (employee).</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>General guidelines on hiring post-doctoral staff and Ph.D. students need to be created.</b></li> <li>Template contracts are now used at RU.</li> <li>and 4. <b>There is still need to clarify more clearly the categories of staff when students are on the payroll (employed) or receiving a stipend (e.g. contractor agreements). Common rules on rights and position of Ph.D. students and postdocs within RU can be made clearer and also more accessible.</b></li> </ol>
<b>Young researchers</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide researchers with more support regarding their employment relationship and working conditions, e.g. an ombudsman.</li> <li>Look into developing mentoring program for</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RU Code of Ethics have been reviewed and approved by Rector and the RU Executive Committee in September 2011. (<a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/ru-code-of-ethics/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/ru-code-of-ethics/</a>).</li> </ol>

<p>young researchers (inside RU or outside RU), or find other ways to provide career advice and training in transferable skills.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Create rules about when faculty members wish to engage in doctoral studies at RU.</li> <li>4. Look into alternative career ladders, i.e. a research ladder</li> <li>5. Need guidelines on when contractor agreements can be used in lieu of employment contracts.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The issue of mentoring is now a part of the Faculty Contribution Records (FCR). <b>However, mentoring program has not been formally established.</b></li> <li>3. Rules for faculty members wishing to engage in doctoral studies at RU have been created.</li> <li>4. <b>There is still a need to look into the development of alternative career ladders for researchers, where their possibilities for career development would be specified.</b></li> <li>5. <b>Guidelines on this issue not yet created.</b></li> </ol>
<b>Faculty working conditions</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop course analysis system further, to measure teaching load more accurately.</li> <li>2. Look into system where faculty have discretionary funds (e.g. for travel or books).</li> <li>3. Look into offering a longer termination period for all faculty.</li> <li>4. Create application forms and final report forms for sabbaticals.</li> <li>5. Repeat survey with research environment questions in fall of 2011.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>The course-analysis system is under development.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The Executive Committee (EC) is looking into this matter and suggesting new rules.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The RU Research Council has suggested rules on this matter. Still on the agenda in the EC.</b></li> <li>4. <b>These forms already exist.</b></li> <li>5. <b>A survey with research environment questions has been carried out in 2009, 2011 and 2012.</b></li> </ol>
<b>Evaluation and feedback</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need database for recording (and, ideally, presentation) of all research output.</li> <li>2. Implement the annual reviews in a more consistent way (100% each year).</li> <li>3. Finish Universal Promotion Criteria.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Work is still on going with the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, The Icelandic Centre for Research (RANNIS) and other research institutes in Iceland to create a common database for all researchers in Iceland.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The Annual Research Assessment is now done in a very consistent way and the Deans annual staff interviews.</b></li> <li>3. <b>RU's Universal Promotion Criteria have been completed.</b></li> </ol>
<b>Principal investigators</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Write guidelines on the responsibilities of Principal Investigators. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– e. g. finances, hiring, mentoring, performance feedback, informational responsibility, accountability etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Need training or an information packet for PI's.</li> <li>3. Finish CLIP's rules.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>General guidelines for Principal Investigators still need to be written.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Training or an information packet still needs to be created.</b></li> <li>3. <b>New CLIP rules have been approved by the Executive Committee (Rules for Establishing Groups, Centers, and Institutes at Reykjavik University).</b></li> </ol>
<b>Intellectual property</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create templates for contracts with industry and other outside parties (may be part of start-ups project).</li> <li>2. Create an information packet for researchers on IP issues and personal privacy issues in research.</li> <li>3. Guidelines on joint data ownership (students, companies).</li> <li>4. Update Intellectual Property policy.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Templates for contracts with industry have been made, in collaboration with the Icelandic Confederation of Icelandic Employers.</b></li> <li>2. <b>An information packet for researcher on IP issues is under construction (the Executive Committee).</b></li> <li>3. <b>Guidelines on joint data ownership not yet created but are under consideration.</b></li> <li>4. <b>The IP policy has not yet been updated but is in</b></li> </ol>

5. Need to strengthen access to legal advice on Intellectual Property issues.	<b>progress.</b> <b>5. There is still need to strengthen access to legal advice on IP issues.</b>
<b>Safety and security</b>	
1. Need university-wide health and safety guidelines, plus training in first-aid. 2. Need a safety representative and a safety committee. 3. Need IT policy to ensure data security, e.g. regarding backups and access to data.	<b>1. University-wide health and safety guidelines are under construction, and first aid training for support staff has been conducted.</b> <b>2. A safety representative and a safety committee have been established.</b> <b>3. New IT policy has been approved and addresses this issue.</b>
<b>Other</b>	
1. Research strategy should stipulate more clearly public dissemination.	<b>1. Public dissemination is stipulated in many ways – research strategy, annual research assessment, public events within the university on research, etc.</b>
<b>Recent events and developments in where the C&amp;C principles are addressed</b>	
1. RU Institution-Wide Review of the Icelandic Quality Enhancement Framework (QEF) - <a href="http://rannis.is/news/2012/09/institution-wide-review-reykjavik-university/">http://rannis.is/news/2012/09/institution-wide-review-reykjavik-university/</a> 2. New Strategy in (2011) - <a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/</a> 3. New policy on staff education and development (2012) 4. New Policy on equal rights (2012) 5. New rules on Ph.D. studies (2012) 6. New HR policy approved by the executive committee in Oct 2012	

Based on the summary above and what has been actually done until now (November 2012) and/or are under development, these are the main issues for RU to address:

- **Training and information packet regarding selection and promotion work**
- **Guidelines on hiring post-doctoral staff and Ph.D. students**
- **Guidelines for Principal Investigators + training or an information packet**
- **Update the IP policy and the policy on joint data ownership**
- **Policy for start-up companies**
- **Health and safety guidelines**



## Appendix 1:

## Review of the gap analysis submitted in 2010

The text below contains the review of the working group of the status of RU vis a vis each principle outlined in the Charter and the Code. The numbered headings (in bold) refer to the relevant paragraphs in the Charter and the Code, and the numbers correspond to numbers used in the template internal analysis document used.

Headings in the text below that stem from the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers are identified especially (by „Code of Conduct.....“ in parentheses), but other headings refer to content stemming from the European Charter for Researchers.

### Principles of the Charter and Code regarding **RESEARCHERS RESPONSIBILITIES** (Principles 1-12)

Principles of the Charter and Code	RU internal analysis results 2010	RU Self-assessment 2012
<p><b>1. Research freedom</b>            Researchers should focus their research for the good of mankind and for expanding the frontiers of scientific knowledge, while enjoying the freedom of thought and expression, and the freedom to identify methods by which problems are solved, according to recognised ethical principles and practices. Researchers should, however, recognise the limitations to this freedom that could arise as a result of particular research circumstances (including supervision/guidance/management) or operational constraints, e.g. for budgetary or infrastructural reasons or, especially in the industrial sector, for reasons of intellectual property protection. Such limitations should not, however,</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> Act no. 63/2006 on Universities in Iceland (article 1) specifies the independence of universities. The Icelandic constitution also ensures freedom of speech in the community. These laws thus support this principle and no laws impede its implementation.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The RU Code of Ethics, item 7, speaks to academic freedom. So does the RU Research Strategy, items B3 and C1.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> None.</p>	<p><b>The RU Code of Ethics have been reviewed and approved by Rector and the RU Executive Committee in September 2011 (<a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/ru-code-of-ethics/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/ru-code-of-ethics/</a>).</b>  <b>Staff surveys shows that researchers are generally confident regarding the research freedom issue.</b></p>

<p>contravene recognised ethical principles and practices, to which researchers have to adhere.</p>		
<p><b>2. Ethical Principles</b>          Researchers should adhere to the recognised ethical practices and fundamental ethical principles appropriate to their discipline(s) as well as to ethical standards as documented in the different national, sectoral or institutional Codes of Ethics.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> According to Icelandic law the government operates two institutions supporting this issue, The National Bioethics Committee (Vísindasiðanefnd) and Data Protection Authority (Persónuvernd). No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The RU Code of Ethics.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> None.</p>	<p><b>The RU Code of Ethics have been reviewed and approved by Rector and the RU Executive Committee in September 2011 (<a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/ru-code-of-ethics/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/ru-code-of-ethics/</a>).</b>  <b>Guidelines and forms from the Data Protection Authority and the National Bioethics Committee are used regarding ethical approvals.</b></p>
<p><b>3. Professional responsibility</b>          Researchers should make every effort to ensure that their research is relevant to society and does not duplicate research previously carried out elsewhere. They must avoid plagiarism of any kind and abide by the principle of intellectual property and joint data ownership in the case of research carried out in collaboration with a supervisor(s) and/or other researchers. The need to validate new observations by showing that experiments are reproducible should not be interpreted as plagiarism, provided that the data to be confirmed are explicitly quoted. Researchers should ensure, if any aspect of their work is delegated, that the person to whom it is delegated has the competence to carry it out.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> Art. 1 of Act no. 63/2006 on Universities in Iceland supports this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Code of Ethics, par. 8, the RU Research strategy and the RU Intellectual Property Policy all speak to this issue.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Guidelines on the responsibilities of Principal Investigators (including hiring and delegating) are needed.</p>	<p><b>The RU Code of Ethics have been reviewed and approved by Rector and the Executive Committee in September 2011 (<a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/ru-code-of-ethics/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/ru-code-of-ethics/</a>).</b>  <b>A new strategy for Reykjavik University has been approved by the Board of Trustees and the RU Executive Committee in November 2011 (<a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/</a>).</b>  <b>A new RU Human Resource Strategy has been completed and approved by the Executive Committee in October 2012.</b>  <b>IP policy and guidelines on the responsibilities of Principal Investigators (including hiring and delegating) are still needed.</b></p>
<p><b>4. Professional attitude</b>          Researchers should be familiar with the strategic goals governing their research environment and funding mechanisms, and should seek all necessary</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Deans of schools must sign</p>	<p><b>New rules on Centres, labs and institutes have been approved by the RU Executive Committee on 9<sup>th</sup> of October 2012 - <i>Policy for Establishing Groups, Centers,</i></b></p>

<p>approvals before starting their research or accessing the resources provided. They should inform their employers, funders or supervisor when their research project is delayed, redefined or completed, or give notice if it is to be terminated earlier or suspended for whatever reason.</p>	<p>grant applications for national or international grants. For internal grants, they must be made aware of the application. Annual reviews, conducted by the Deans of each school (based on Faculty Contribution Records), ensure that Deans are informed about the status of all research projects.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Need guidelines on the responsibilities of Principal Investigators, including approvals and informational responsibility. These guidelines also need to specify the responsibilities of the University and the Dean when starting a research project or accepting a research grant. (2) Need to finish the work on rules regarding centres, labs, institutes and programs (CLIP's). (3) Regularly remind RU's staff and faculty of RU's strategy.</p>	<p><b>and Institutes within Reykjavik University.</b></p> <p><b>Guidelines on the responsibilities of Principal Investigators, including approvals and informational responsibility, are still needed. These guidelines also need to specify the responsibilities of the University and the Dean when starting a research project or accepting a research grant.</b></p>
<p><b>5. Contractual and legal obligations</b>          Researchers at all levels must be familiar with the national, sectoral or institutional regulations governing training and/or working conditions. This includes Intellectual Property Rights regulations, and the requirements and conditions of any sponsor or funders, independently of the nature of their contract. Researchers should adhere to such regulations by delivering the required results (e.g. thesis, publications, patents, reports, new products development, etc) as set out in the terms and conditions of the contract or equivalent document.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle. It is supported by, inter alia, the Act on intellectual property no. 73/1972.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Employment contracts specify relevant issues and IP regulations.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Need a document on the responsibilities of PI's (including the responsibility to deliver according to contracts). (2) Need templates and guidelines for making contracts when collaborating with industry, including clear guidelines regarding conflict of interest. (3) Need to create an information package for researchers on IP rights and related issues.</p>	<p><b>A template for making contracts when collaborating with industry (including guidelines regarding individual IP rights and conflict of interest) is now available for all researchers.</b></p> <p><b>A document on the responsibilities of PI's (including the responsibility to deliver according to contracts) is still needed.</b></p> <p><b>A special information package has not yet been created on IP rights and related issues.</b></p>
<p><b>6. Accountability</b>          Researchers need to be aware that they are accountable towards their employers, funders or other related public or private bodies as well as, on more ethical grounds, towards society as a whole. In</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Faculty Contribution Record, the RU Dashboard.</p>	<p><b>Faculty Contribution Record has been reviewed and improved in March 2011. In addition to the RU Dashboard, research activities at Reykjavik University are now published annually –</b></p>

<p>particular, researchers funded by public funds are also accountable for the efficient use of taxpayers' money. Consequently, they should adhere to the principles of sound, transparent and efficient financial management and cooperate with any authorised audits of their research, whether undertaken by their employers/funders or by ethics committees.</p> <p>Methods of collection and analysis, the outputs and, where applicable, details of the data should be open to internal and external scrutiny, whenever necessary and as requested by the appropriate authorities.</p>	<p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Need guidelines on data ownership and access when new data is collected jointly by university and students or company. This can be part of guidelines for contracts for collaboration with industry and others (KK). (2) Also need policy on start-up companies. (3) Currently we are working on a policy on centres, labs institutes and programs (CLIP's). (4) Need a document on the responsibilities of Principal investigators, for example regarding their accountability.</p>	<p><b>Academic Strength of Reykjavik University</b>  <a href="http://en.ru.is/media/almennt/The-Academic-Strength-of-Reykjavik_University2011.pdf">http://en.ru.is/media/almennt/The-Academic-Strength-of-Reykjavik_University2011.pdf</a>.</p> <p><b>New rules on Centres, labs and institutes have been approved by the RU Executive Committee on 9<sup>th</sup> of October 2012 - Policy for Establishing Groups, Centers, and Institutes within Reykjavik University.</b></p> <p><b>Guidelines on data ownership and data access are not yet created, but are imbedded in the template for making contracts when collaborating with industry.</b></p> <p><b>Guidelines on the responsibilities of Principal Investigators are yet to be created.</b></p> <p><b>Policy on start-up companies not yet established.</b></p> <p><b>A guideline for managing research grants is under construction.</b></p>
<p><b>7. Good practice in research</b></p> <p>Researchers should at all times adopt safe working practices, in line with national legislation, including taking the necessary precautions for health and safety and for recovery from information technology disasters, e.g. by preparing proper back-up strategies. They should also be familiar with the current national legal requirements regarding data protection and confidentiality protection requirements, and undertake the necessary steps to</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> Laws on working conditions and safety, and Act no. 77/2000 on the Protection of Privacy as regards the Processing of Personal Data, support this principle</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The Code of Ethics addresses this issue. A back-up system is in place for all RU data systems.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Need university-wide health and safety guidelines. (2) Need to finish IT strategy, with special emphasis on ensuring the security of research data and serving the needs</p>	<p><b>The RU Code of Ethics have been reviewed and approved by Rector and the RU Executive Committee in September 2011 (<a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/ru-code-of-ethics/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/ru-code-of-ethics/</a>).</b></p> <p><b>A new IT-strategy for Reykjavik University has been approved by the RU Executive Committee in June 2012.</b></p> <p><b>University-wide health and safety guidelines are under construction.</b></p>

fulfil them at all times.	of research groups. This strategy must be made public to all staff. (3) Need university wide training in first-aid.	<b>University-wide training in first-aid not yet established.</b>
<p><b>8. Dissemination, exploitation of results</b> All researchers should ensure, in compliance with their contractual arrangements, that the results of their research are disseminated and exploited, e.g. communicated, transferred into other research settings or, if appropriate, commercialised. Senior researchers, in particular, are expected to take a lead in ensuring that research is fruitful and that results are either exploited commercially or made accessible to the public (or both) whenever the opportunity arises.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The RU intellectual property policy (see also in item 31).</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Need to add to our Research strategy the importance of researchers making the results of research available for public use when possible. (2) Also need a centralized database where all research output is recorded, with links to actual publications whenever possible (as stipulated by RU's Research strategy).</p>	<p>The importance of researchers making results available for the public use is stipulated in many ways, e.g. via the annual research assessment, in the Faculty Contribution Record and in the Research Strategy. Furthermore all research activities at Reykjavik University are now published annually – <i>Academic Strength of Reykjavik University</i> (<a href="http://en.ru.is/media/almennt/The-Academic-Strength-of-Reykjavik_University2011.pdf">http://en.ru.is/media/almennt/The-Academic-Strength-of-Reykjavik_University2011.pdf</a>). Work is still on going with the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, The Icelandic Centre for Research (RANNIS) and other research institutes in Iceland to create a common database for all researchers in Iceland.</p>
<p><b>9. Public engagement</b> Researchers should ensure that their research activities are made known to society at large in such a way that they can be understood by non-specialists, thereby improving the public's understanding of science. Direct engagement with the public will help researchers to better understand public interest in priorities for science and technology and also the public's concerns.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The Faculty Contribution Record provides a method to track public engagement of researchers.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Need to update research strategy; must refer more clearly to the importance of public engagement to the overall RU strategy. (2) Need a research information system that makes RU research more visible on the web (see above).</p>	<p>The importance of researchers making results available for the public use is stipulated in many ways, e.g. via the annual research assessment, in the Faculty Contribution Record and in the Research Strategy. Furthermore all research activities at Reykjavik University are now published annually – <i>Academic Strength of Reykjavik University</i> (<a href="http://en.ru.is/media/almennt/The-">http://en.ru.is/media/almennt/The-</a></p>

		<p><a href="#">Academic-Strength-of-Reykjavik_University2011.pdf</a>).</p> <p>As soon as the common database has been established, research will be made more visible and accessible. The web site of RU has been reviewed and improved in June 2012, including the research site (<a href="http://en.ru.is/research/">http://en.ru.is/research/</a>).</p>
<p><b>10. Non-discrimination</b> Employers and/or funders of researchers will not discriminate against researchers in any way on the basis of gender, age, ethnic, national or social origin, religion or belief, sexual orientation, language, disability, political opinion, social or economic condition.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> National Relevant legislation supports this principle, including notably Act no. 10/2008 on the equal status and equal rights of men and women and art. 65 of the Icelandic Constitution. No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i></p> <p><i>Actions required: Need to add social or economic condition to the RU anti-discrimination statement (in the RU HR strategy).</i></p>	<p>A new strategy for Reykjavik University has been approved by the Board of Trustees and the Executive Committee in November 2011 (<a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/</a>) addressing the issue of non-discrimination.</p>
<p><b>11. Evaluation/appraisal systems</b> Employers and/or funders should introduce for all researchers, including senior researchers, evaluation/appraisal systems for assessing their professional performance on a regular basis and in a transparent manner by an independent (and, in the case of senior researchers, preferably international) committee.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> The Act on Universities in Iceland supports this, by requiring universities to monitor the quality of teaching and research. See Act. no. 63/2006. No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The Annual Research Evaluation, as specified in the RU Quality Assurance System, is conducted by independent and international academics. Also, we have the Faculty Contribution Record, followed by an annual review by the Dean (or Director). Finally, evaluation committees are always appointed for academic promotions. In-house rules on academic promotions stipulate that when evaluating for assistant or associate professorships at least one member should have a higher level of qualification and that if possible,</p>	<p>Academic staff interviews are now conducted by the Deans annually. The interviews are largely based on the Faculty Contribution Record, the outcome of the Annual Research Assessment and a special interview form, i.e. every faculty member needs to complete two forms; The Faculty Contribution Record and the interview form annually.</p>

	<p>at least one member of these committees should have international recognition.</p> <p><i>Actions required: (1) We need to implement the annual reviews by Deans in a more consistent manner, so that all research staff and faculty undergo review once a year. (2) Also, more stringent requirements for international involvement in promotion committees may be needed.</i></p>	
<p><b>12. Recruitment</b> Employers and/or funders should ensure that the entry and admission standards for researchers, particularly at the beginning at their careers, are clearly specified and should also facilitate access for disadvantaged groups or for researchers returning to a research career, including teachers (of any level) returning to a research career. Employers and/or funders of researchers should adhere to the principles set out in the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers when appointing or recruiting researchers.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> Act no. 63/2006 on Universities in Iceland supports this by requiring selection committees when professors, associate professors and assistant professors are recruited. No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Since 2009 a process for recruitment and hiring of academic staff has been in place.</p> <p><i>Actions required: (1) Need guidelines on hiring post-doctoral staff and PhD students. (2) Need to finish University-wide Universal Promotion Criteria. (3) Need to present rules on recruitment and hiring of academic staff regularly to all faculty and staff.</i></p>	<p><b>Reykjavik University Universal Promotion Criteria were approved by the RU Executive Committee on April 20<sup>th</sup> 2010.</b></p> <p><b><i>Guidelines on hiring post-doctoral staff and Ph.D. students have not yet been created.</i></b></p>

## Principles of the Charter and Code regarding **RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF RESEARCHERS**

(Principles 13-21)

Principles of the Charter and Code	RU internal analysis results 2010	RU Self-assessment 2012
<p><b>13. Recruitment (Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers)</b> Employers and/or funders should establish</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The process for recruitment</p>	<p><b>No clear policy on recruitment procedures exist.</b></p>

<p>recruitment procedures which are open, efficient, transparent, supportive and internationally comparable, as well as tailored to the type of positions advertised. Advertisements should give a broad description of knowledge and competencies required, and should not be so specialised as to discourage suitable applicants. Employers should include a description of the working conditions and entitlements, including career development prospects. Moreover, the time allowed between the advertisement of the vacancy or the call for applications and the deadline for reply should be realistic.</p>	<p>and hiring of academic staff specifies open recruitment and international advertisements.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> Need to improve advertisements in terms of describing working conditions and career development prospects, such as stipulating duration of contract and type of track. Advertisements should also specify arrangements for travel and whether any start-up funds are available.</p>	
<p><b>14. Selection (Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers)</b>          Selection committees should bring together diverse expertise and competences and should have an adequate gender balance and, where appropriate and feasible, include members from different sectors (public and private) and disciplines, including from other countries and with relevant experience to assess the candidate. Whenever possible, a wide range of selection practices should be used, such as external expert assessment and face-to-face interviews. Members of selection panels should be adequately trained.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> Chapter 6 in the Act on universities no. 63/2006, and article 3.2 of the RU Regulation support this principle. No laws impede its implementation.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Process for recruitment and hiring of academic staff specifies the existence of selection committees. Selection committees generally come from within the school, although for higher positions (e.g. professorial, Dean) they generally include independent and/or international academics as well. It also specifies interviews and on-campus visits including an open talk by the candidate. Candidates are also requested to provide names of persons who can provide references.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Need to provide our staff with training (or at least an information package) in selection and promotion work (e.g. a course for permanent Assistant professor committees). (2) Also need to clearly aim for gender balance on selection committees.</p>	<p><b>A new strategy for Reykjavik University has been approved by the Board of Trustees and the Executive Committee in November 2011 (<a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/</a>), in where gender balance on selection committees is clearly stipulated.</b></p> <p><b>Training and information package regarding selection and promotion work has not yet been established.</b></p>
<p><b>15. Transparency (Code of Conduct for the</b></p>		<p><b>Advertisements and feedback to</b></p>

<p><b>Recruitment of Researchers)</b> Candidates should be informed, prior to the selection, about the recruitment process and the selection criteria, the number of available positions and the career development prospects. They should also be informed after the selection process about the strengths and weaknesses of their applications.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Advertisements generally include selection criteria and the number of available positions. Candidates receive automated acknowledgement letters, and letters are written to all candidates who are not hired.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Need to provide more information in advertisements, or acknowledgement letters (e.g. put a link to an information site on the RU web). (2) Candidates who have entered the final phase of the selection process need to be invited to inquire about the strengths and weaknesses of their applications. Due to open international recruitment, the number of applicants prohibits feedback to each one.</p>	<p><b>applicants have been improved in this regard.</b></p>
<p><b>16. Judging merit (Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers)</b> The selection process should take into consideration the whole range of experience of the candidates. While focusing on their overall potential as researchers, their creativity and level of independence should also be considered. This means that merit should be judged qualitatively as well as quantitatively, focusing on outstanding results within a diversified career path and not only on the number of publications. Consequently, the importance of bibliometric indices should be properly balanced within a wider range of evaluation criteria, such as teaching, supervision, teamwork, knowledge transfer, management of research and innovation and public awareness activities. For candidates from an industrial</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> the RU Regulation supports this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> We have implemented an annual review process using the Faculty Contribution Record. This helps faculty and managers at RU to balance the items mentioned in the principle.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Need to finalize the Universal Promotion Criteria as, this will provide a very clear message regarding the expectations of candidates at various levels. (2) Need to provide selection and promotion committees with guidelines on this when they are advised about the task at hand.</p>	<p><b>Reykjavik University Universal Promotion Criteria were approved by the RU Executive Committee on April 20<sup>th</sup> 2010.</b> <b>Selection and Promotion Committees do get guidelines in this direction, but can be improved further.</b> <b>The Faculty Contribution Record underlines the importance of variety of evaluation criteria – i.e. judging merit qualitatively as well as quantitatively. The Annual Research Assessment also takes this into consideration.</b> <b>Selection and Promotion Committees are advised on this issue.</b></p>

background, particular attention should be paid to any contributions to patents, development or inventions.		
<p><b>17. Variations in the chronological order of CV's (Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers)</b></p> <p>Career breaks or variations in the chronological order of CVs should not be penalised, but regarded as an evolution of a career, and consequently, as a potentially valuable contribution to the professional development of researchers towards a multidimensional career track. Candidates should therefore be allowed to submit evidence-based CVs, reflecting a representative array of achievements and qualifications appropriate to the post for which application is being made.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> Icelandic law no. 10/2008 the equal status and equal rights of men and women, article 26 supports or mandates this principle. No laws impede its implementation.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Candidates can submit CV's in whatever format they choose.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i>  (1) Encouragement in this direction will be put into the official HR strategy of RU.  (2) Need to put this into the guidelines for selection and promotion committees.</p>	<p><b>The Annual Research Assessment takes this into consideration and Selection and Promotion Committees are advised on the issue.</b></p> <p><b>Encouragement in this direction not yet in HR strategy of RU.</b></p>
<p><b>18. Recognition of mobility experience (Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers)</b></p> <p>Any mobility experience, e.g. a stay in another country/region or in another research setting (public or private) or a change from one discipline or sector to another, whether as part of the initial research training or at a later stage of the research career, or virtual mobility experience, should be considered as a valuable contribution to the professional development of a researcher.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws or rules impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> PhD students at RU are generally required to go abroad for some time during their studies. In general mobility experience is viewed very positively at RU.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Encouragement on mobility will be put into the official HR strategy of RU. (2) Put mobility into guidelines on hiring of post-doctoral researchers.</p>	<p><b>Encouragement on mobility not yet in the official HR strategy of RU. Mobility will be put into guidelines on hiring of post-doctoral researchers.</b></p>
<p><b>19. Recognition of qualifications (Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers)</b></p> <p>Employers and/or funders should provide for appropriate assessment and evaluation of the academic and professional qualifications, including</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> The Act on Universities in Iceland and the RU regulation support this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> RU strategy (international university). Faculty Contribution Records ensures an overview of all qualifications of the individual.</p>	<p><b>Reykjavik University Universal Promotion Criteria were approved by the RU Executive Committee on April 20<sup>th</sup> 2010.</b></p> <p><b>Alternative carrier ladders are still on the agenda.</b></p>

<p>non-formal qualifications, of all researchers, in particular within the context of international and professional mobility. They should inform themselves and gain a full understanding of rules, procedures and standards governing the recognition of such qualifications and, consequently, explore existing national law, conventions and specific rules on the recognition of these qualifications through all available channels.</p>	<p><i>Actions required: (1) Need to finish Universal Promotion Criteria. (2) Will be looking into alternative career ladders in 2010-2011.</i></p>	
<p><b>20. Seniority (Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers)</b> The levels of qualifications required should be in line with the needs of the position and not be set as a barrier to entry. Recognition and evaluation of qualifications should focus on judging the achievements of the person rather than his/her circumstances or the reputation of the institution where the qualifications were gained. As professional qualifications may be gained at an early stage of a long career, the pattern of lifelong professional development should also be recognised.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i></p> <p><i>Actions required: (1) Encouragement in this direction can be put into the official HR strategy of RU. (2) Put it into guidelines for selection and promotion committees.</i></p>	<p><b>A new strategy for Reykjavik University has been approved by the Board of Trustees and the Executive Committee in November 2011 (<a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/</a>).</b> <b>Selection and Promotion Committees are advised on this issue.</b></p>
<p><b>21. Postdoctoral appointments (Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers)</b> Clear rules and explicit guidelines for the recruitment and appointment of postdoctoral researchers, including the maximum duration and the objectives of such appointments, should be established by the institutions appointing postdoctoral researchers. Such guidelines should take into account time spent in prior postdoctoral appointments at other institutions and take into consideration that the postdoctoral status should be</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> In general those who have funds are allowed to advertise for a post-doc.</p> <p><i>Actions required: (1) Need guidelines on the hiring of post-doctoral researchers (the duration of the contract, their role, their development, their evaluation, maximum duration of contracts etc.). Also need a template contract for post-docs.</i></p>	<p><b>Template contract does exist in all RU Schools.</b> <b>General guidelines on hiring post-doctoral researchers and Ph.D. students have not yet been created.</b></p>

transitional, with the primary purpose of providing additional professional development opportunities for a research career in the context of long-term career prospects.		
---	--	--

## Principles of the Charter and Code regarding **RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT**

### (Principles 22-40)

Principles of the Charter and Code	RU internal analysis results 2010	RU Self-assessment 2012
<p><b>22. Recognition of the profession</b> All researchers engaged in a research career should be recognized as professionals and be treated accordingly. This should commence at the beginning of their careers, namely at postgraduate level, and should include all levels, regardless of their classification at national level (e.g. employee, postgraduate student, doctoral candidate, postdoctoral fellow, civil servants).</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> According to the Code of Ethics, all staff and students are respected as individuals. Post-graduate students who are hired to work on projects are generally treated the same as staff (for example regarding insurance, benefits etc.), although in instances where their appointment is limited to their final project research they are hired as contractors, and in those cases do not have the same rights.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Need to clarify the categories of staff when students are on the payroll or receiving a stipend. (2) Also need rules on when faculty wish to enrol in doctoral studies at RU.</p>	<p><b>Rules on when faculty wish to enrol in doctoral studies at RU have been proposed to the RU Executive Committee by the RU Research Council. The general RU Ph.D. rules are under revision in the RU Research Council (<a href="http://en.ru.is/research/rules-on-doctoral-studies/">http://en.ru.is/research/rules-on-doctoral-studies/</a>).</b></p> <p><b>There is still need to clarify more clearly the categories of staff when students are on the payroll (employed) or receiving a stipend (e.g. contractor agreements). Common rules on rights and position of Ph.D. students and postdocs within RU can be made clearer and also more accessible.</b></p>
<p><b>23. Research environment</b> Employers and/or funders of researchers should ensure that the most stimulating research or research training environment is created which offers appropriate equipment, facilities and</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> Icelandic laws on occupational safety support this principle. No laws or rules impede its implementation.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> RU generally provides good IT</p>	<p><b>A new IT-strategy for Reykjavik University has been approved by the RU Executive Committee in June 2012. Due to several factors (e.g. the economic recession in Iceland), current working</b></p>

<p>opportunities, including for remote collaboration over research networks, and that the national or sectoral regulations concerning health and safety in research are observed. Funders should ensure that adequate resources are provided in support of the agreed work programme.</p>	<p>equipment and facilities for teaching and administration, but research-related IT support needs improvement.</p> <p><i>Actions required: (1) Need health and safety rules for all labs, plus courses for lab staff. (2) Need to appoint a representative for security (öryggistrúnaðarmann). (3) A comprehensive IT strategy is needed at RU, couple with more information flow on IT support issues to academic staff.</i></p>	<p><b>facilities for academic employees at RU are not optimal. The University has already put forward its main objectives and priorities, which address this issue, i.e. by midyear 2015 the University, will have created “suitable” working space for all faculty.</b></p> <p><b>Health and safety rules for labs, plus courses for lab staff and a security representative (öryggistrúnaðarmann) not yet in place.</b></p>
<p><b>24. Working conditions</b> Employers and/or funders should ensure that the working conditions for researchers, including for disabled researchers, provide where appropriate the flexibility deemed essential for successful research performance in accordance with existing national legislation and with national or sectoral collective-bargaining agreements. They should aim to provide working conditions which allow both women and men researchers to combine family and work, children and career. Particular attention should be paid, <i>inter alia</i>, to flexible working hours, part-time working, tele-working and sabbatical leave, as well as to the necessary financial and administrative provisions governing such arrangements.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> This is permitted/mandatory under article 21 of the Act on the equal status and equal rights of men and women no 10/2008, see also law on rights of the disabled (59/1992). No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The RU HR Strategy speaks to this issue. The new building at Nautholsvik is very accessible for the disabled. RU is flexible regarding family-related leave, tele-working and other flexible work arrangements. Rules on sabbatical leaves are in effect.</p> <p><i>Actions required: None.</i></p>	<p><b>A new strategy for Reykjavik University has been approved by the Board of Trustees and the Executive Committee in November 2011 (<a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/</a>) and the new HR strategy addresses this issue as well as a new RU policy on work development, education and training of staff.</b></p>
<p><b>25. Stability and permanence of employment</b> Employers and/or funders should ensure that the performance of researchers is not undermined by instability of employment contracts, and should therefore commit themselves as far as possible to improving the stability of employment conditions</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Post-doctoral researchers and doctoral students generally have temporary contracts, but faculty generally have permanent contracts. The general rule on</p>	<p><b>A proposal from the RU Joint Academic Council – Job Security Measures for Core Academic Staff – has been sent to the RU Executive Committee. The proposal addresses longer minimum termination period off faculties.</b></p> <p><b>Guidelines on hiring post-doctoral staff</b></p>

<p>for researchers, thus implementing and abiding by the principles and terms laid down in the <i>EU Directive on Fixed-Term Work</i>.</p>	<p>the Icelandic labour market is that a permanent contract has a three-month termination period. However, Deans and Directors at RU are free to offer longer termination periods (generally 6 months or in exceptional cases 12 months). In exceptional cases, faculty have temporary contracts, of three or five years duration. These contracts also have a three-month termination period.</p> <p><i>Actions required: (1) Guidelines for hiring doctoral students and post-doctoral researchers. (2) Should look into the possibility of offering a longer minimum termination period for all faculties.</i></p>	<p><b>and Ph.D. students have not yet been created. Education and mentoring of post-doctoral researcher needs to be improved.</b></p>
<p><b>26. Funding and salaries</b> Employers and/or funders of researchers should ensure that researchers enjoy fair and attractive conditions of funding and/or salaries with adequate and equitable social security provisions (including sickness and parental benefits, pension rights and unemployment benefits) in accordance with existing national legislation and with national or sectoral collective bargaining agreements. This must include researchers at all career stages including early-stage researchers, commensurate with their legal status, performance and level of qualifications and/or responsibilities.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> This is generally mandatory under social security legislation (i.e. equal rights to sick-leave benefits, parental-leave benefits, pension rights and unemployment benefits regardless of the level of employee or the type of contract). No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The RU Research Strategy, section C.3. speaks to the importance of linking performance and pay. The RU sick-leave fund ensures that those who do not belong to a union-based sick leave fund enjoy equivalent benefits in case of long-term illness. All employment contracts at RU refer to a union contract with reference to vacation days and sick-leave rights, and thus the employee enjoys the same rights, whether or not he or she belongs to the union or not.</p> <p><i>Actions required: (1) Need to clarify the rights of independent contractors with regards to the items specified, and when RU will use contractor agreements and when not. Put in guidelines on hiring doctoral students and post-doctoral researchers.</i></p>	<p><b>Need to clarify the rights of independent contractors with regards to the items specified, and when RU will use contractor agreements and when not. Put in the guidelines on hiring doctoral students and post-doctoral researchers. There is also a need to look into the transfer of vacation rights between institutions.</b></p>
<p><b>27. Gender balance</b> Employers and/or funders should aim for a</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> The law on the equal status and equal</p>	<p><b>A new strategy for Reykjavik University has been approved by the Board of</b></p>

<p>representative gender balance at all levels of staff, including at supervisory and managerial level. This should be achieved on the basis of an equal opportunity policy at recruitment and at the subsequent career stages without, however, taking precedence over quality and competence criteria. To ensure equal treatment, selection and evaluation committees should have an adequate gender balance.</p>	<p>rights of men and women supports this clause (no. 10/2008). No laws impede its implementation.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The RU HR strategy has a special section on equality, with special emphasis on gender equality. Salaries are analyzed regularly to ascertain that there is not gender bias in pay levels for any given position type.</p> <p><i>Actions required: (1) Selection and evaluation committees need to have a gender balance if possible.</i></p>	<p><b>Trusties and the RU Executive Committee in November 2011</b> (<a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/the-strategy-of-reykjavik-university/</a>) has a section on equality and the new HR strategy as well, in where the issue regarding the gender balance in selection and evaluation committees is stipulated.</p>
<p><b>28. Career development</b> Employers and/or funders of researchers should draw up, preferably within the framework of their human resources management, a specific career development strategy for researchers at all stages of their career, regardless of their contractual situation, including for researchers on fixed-term contracts. It should include the availability of mentors involved in providing support and guidance for the personal and professional development of researchers, thus motivating them and contributing to reducing any insecurity in their professional future. All researchers should be made familiar with such provisions and arrangements.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Doctoral students and post-doctoral researchers always have mentors or advisors, as to researchers who are hired into existing research groups. Due to the skewed age distribution at RU, with many junior faculty members and a lack of senior ones, there is a lack of mentors for young faculty members.</p> <p><i>Actions required: (1) Need to look into the development of a career ladder for researchers, where their possibilities for career development would be specified. (2) RU should look into supporting young faculty members in obtaining mentors outside RU.</i></p>	<p>The issue on mentoring has been added to the Faculty Contribution Record. The new HR strategy addresses this issue as well as a new RU policy on work development, education and training of staff.</p>
<p><b>29. Value of mobility</b> Employers and/or funders must recognize the value of geographical, intersectorial, inter- and trans-disciplinary and virtual mobility as well as mobility between the public and private sector as an important means of enhancing scientific knowledge and professional development at any stage of a</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle. However, the immigration law in Iceland permits the development of a „fast-track“ route for highly specialized individuals, and this route has not been developed yet, with the result that the immigration process takes a long time.</p>	<p>Reykjavik University Universal Promotion Criteria were approved by the RU Executive Committee on April 20<sup>th</sup> 2010. The new HR strategy addresses the issue of mobility as well as a new RU policy on work development, education and</p>

<p>researcher's career. Consequently, they should build such options into the specific career development strategy and fully value and acknowledge any mobility experience within their career progression/appraisal system. This also requires that the necessary administrative instruments be put in place to allow the portability of both grants and social security provisions, in accordance with national legislation.</p>	<p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The RU Strategy on becoming an international university and an international workplace supports this. Also the emphasis in the RU Research Strategy on international recognition as a way to evaluate researchers. The International Office at RU supports mobility by helping researchers take advantage of various opportunities. Nothing in RU regulations or practices prevents the portability of grants, either from RU or to RU.</p> <p>The new Faculty Contribution Record, now being implemented, has increased the visibility of international experience when performance is evaluated.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) The Universal Promotion Criteria, now under development, will also make this importance very clear. (2) The importance of mobility needs to be written into the RU HR strategy and made clear to selection and evaluation committees. (3) RU needs to continue to put pressure on the government to implement the „fast-track“ route.</p>	<p><b>training of staff.</b>  <b>Still a need to put pressure on the government to implement “fast-track” route.</b></p>
<p><b>30. Access to career advice</b>  Employers and/or funders should ensure that career advice and job placement assistance, either in the institutions concerned, or through collaboration with other structures, is offered to researchers at all stages of their careers, regardless of their contractual situation.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No rules impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The establishment in 2007 of the post of an Executive Director responsible for human resources within the university supports this principle. RU also has a Career Services office for students in place since 2006.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Support in this area must be strengthened, with courses, seminars, help in using local or international job portals and with resources for seeking new opportunities, career advice or mentoring outside RU.</p>	<p><b>The carrier service (for students) at RU has been strengthened.</b>  <b>There is still a need to strengthen support this area. Not all Ph.D.-students end up as academic employees. Career coaching is needed.</b></p>
<p><b>31. Intellectual property rights</b>  Employers and/or funders should ensure that researchers at all career stages reap the benefits of</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> Icelandic law on intellectual property makes this mandatory, see act no. 73/1972. Supporting this is act no. 77/2000 on the Protection of Privacy as regards the</p>	<p><b>Prototype of contracts does exist, when collaborating with students or parties outside RU.</b></p>

<p>the exploitation (if any) of their R&amp;D results through legal protection and, in particular, through appropriate protection of Intellectual Property Rights, including copyrights. Policies and practices should specify what rights belong to researchers and/or, where applicable, to their employers or other parties, including external commercial or industrial organisations, as possibly provided for under specific collaboration agreements or other types of agreement.</p>	<p>Processing of Personal Data, and the Icelandic information law no. 50/1996. No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> RU developed a policy on intellectual property in 2007. All employment contracts since then have included a clause relevant to this, guaranteeing the right of the researcher to their intellectual property. Under development are policies regarding centres, labs and institutes (CLIP's), where the rights of all involved are clarified. The Director of Research Services at RU is on a committee with the Icelandic Confederation of Icelandic Employers to develop such contract templates, using Danish models.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Need to revise the policy on intellectual property to deal with cases where students and faculty members cooperate in collecting new data. (2) Need to establish a way to offer appropriate legal counsel to our students and staff on these matters. (3) Also need to develop prototypes of contracts that may be used when collaborating with students or parties outside RU, and train staff in using them. (4) Need to develop a policy on start-ups that originate within RU.</p>	<p><b>IP policy and guidelines on how to deal with cases where students and faculty members cooperate in collecting new data are needed.</b></p> <p><b>No formal legal counsel to students and staff on this matter exist within the University.</b></p> <p><b>Policy on start-up companies not yet established.</b></p>
<p><b>32. Co-authorship</b> Co-authorship should be viewed positively by institutions when evaluating staff, as evidence of a constructive approach to the conduct of research. Employers and/or funders should therefore develop strategies, practices and procedures to provide researchers, including those at the beginning of their research careers, with the necessary framework conditions so that they can enjoy the right to be recognised and listed and/or quoted, in</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Post-doctoral researchers and doctoral students are generally publishing their results with authorship based on their actual contribution, although this is not stipulated in any RU policies (?). Statistics collected at RU do not in any way discount publications with more than one author. See also paragraph 2 in article 3 of the RU Regulation.</p>	

<p>the context of their actual contribution, as co-authors of papers, patents, etc, or to publish their own research results independently from the supervisor(s).</p>	<p><i>Actions required:</i> None.</p>	
<p><b>33. Teaching</b> Teaching is an essential means for the structuring and dissemination of knowledge and should therefore be considered a valuable option within the researchers' career paths. However, teaching responsibilities should not be excessive and should not prevent researchers, particularly at the beginning of their careers, from carrying out their research activities. Employers and/or funders should ensure that teaching duties are adequately remunerated and taken into account in the evaluation/appraisal systems, and that time devoted by senior members of staff to the training of early stage researchers should be counted as part of their teaching commitment. Suitable training should be provided for teaching and coaching activities as part of the professional development of researchers.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The Regulation on RU and the standard employment contracts used for faculty both emphasise the importance of teaching and puts it on an equal footing with research. Attempts are made to limit the teaching load of researchers to enable them to focus on their research. Deans at RU have the right to increase the teaching load of individuals not producing research outputs, and this helps them limit the teaching load of research-active individuals. All teachers at RU have access to a teaching coach, and various courses and support materials (such as the RU Teaching Quality Handbook) are offered. Also, a Teaching Award is being introduced at RU in 2010. The new Faculty Contribution Record counts all teaching activities, also supervision of research-oriented students, and this support a balanced assessment of the overall workload. See also paragraph 2 in article 3 of the RU Regulation.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) A new course-analysis system is now being developed, which when completed will help Deans to evaluate and adjust the teaching load of their faculty. (2) The Universal Promotion Criteria, now under development, will also make it very clear that teaching has an equal status to research at RU. (3) A survey question asking researchers about their assessment of their teaching duties will be repeated in 2011.</p>	<p><b>Reykjavik University Universal Promotion Criteria were approved by the RU Executive Committee on April 20<sup>th</sup> 2010.</b></p> <p><b>The survey asking researchers about their assessment of their teaching duties is carried out annually.</b></p> <p><b>A course-analysis system is still under development. There is a need, due to the high percentage of academic employees of foreign origin to establish teaching training courses in English.</b></p>

<p><b>34. Complaints/appeals</b> Employers and/or funders of researchers should establish, in compliance with national rules and regulations, appropriate procedures, possibly in the form of an impartial (ombudsman-type) person to deal with complaints/appeals of researchers, including those concerning conflicts between supervisor(s) and early-stage researchers. Such procedures should provide all research staff with confidential and informal assistance in resolving work-related conflicts, disputes and grievances, with the aim of promoting fair and equitable treatment within the institution and improving the overall quality of the working environment.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> RU has an Executive Director of Human Resources and Quality, where disputes between supervisors and staff, including researchers, can be handled. RU also has an ethics policy and an ethics committee where serious complaints can be voiced. RU has two academic councils, Research Council and Curriculum Councils where concerns are often brought up.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> Should write up a document describing the possible avenues for complaints or inquiries regarding their working conditions or employment relationship with RU, where the role of the Councils in this regard is increased. Need to present information on the code of ethics and the ethics committee regularly to staff.</p>	<p>The RU Code of Ethics have been reviewed and approved by Rector and the RU Executive Committee in September 2011 (<a href="http://en.ru.is/the-university/ru-code-of-ethics/">http://en.ru.is/the-university/ru-code-of-ethics/</a>).</p>
<p><b>35. Participation in decision-making bodies</b> Employers and/or funders of researchers should recognize it as wholly legitimate, and indeed desirable, that researchers be represented in the relevant information, consultation and decision-making bodies of the institutions for which they work, so as to protect and promote their individual and collective interests as professionals and to actively contribute to the workings of the institution.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Since 2007 representative researchers from all schools at RU have formed the RU Research Council (originally labelled RU Science Council), based on section C.5. of the RU Research Strategy. The Chair of this council is a full member of the RU Executive Committee. Members of the RU Research Council are generally Heads of the Research Council at their School, and are as such full members of the School Councils of their Schools. Minutes of the RC meetings are posted on the RU intranet, for the information of all faculty and staff at RU. Researchers are always represented in working groups relevant to their domain, and they have a large role in Town hall meetings held regularly at RU.</p>	<p>It has been discussed whether postdocs and/or students (Ph.D. – students) should not be represented in the RU Research Council. Students are represented in the Curriculum Council and in the Ethic Committee. No decision taken yet on this issue.</p>

	<p><i>Actions required:</i> None, although care must be taken to consistently consult with faculty and staff, whether via meetings, e-mail or other means. The Executive Committee should make this a routine approach when dealing with important policies affecting staff.</p>	
<p><b>36. Relation with supervisors</b></p> <p>Researchers in their training phase should establish a structured and regular relationship with their supervisor(s) and faculty/departmental representative(s) so as to take full advantage of their relationship with them. This includes keeping records of all work progress and research findings, obtaining feedback by means of reports and seminars, applying such feedback and working in accordance with agreed schedules, milestones, deliverables and/or research outputs.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> The Act on Universities in Iceland and regulation no. 37/2007, which sets out criteria that universities must meet, in order to offer doctoral training, support this principle. No laws impede its implementation.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Doctoral students or post-doctoral researchers who are paid by RU or from grants received by RU have a contract specifying their roles and responsibilities, including who they report to. Rules on doctoral studies (both the Icelandic National Qualification Framework and RU specific rules) also specify the parties' rights and responsibilities to some degree.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) Employment contracts made when doctoral students, masters students and post-doctoral researchers participate in research projects at RU could be more thorough, so as to clarify rights with regard to supervision, reporting relationships and feedback. It should also be clarified when the individual should be an employee and when he or she should be an independent contractor. (2) Also need guidelines about the responsibilities of PI's (and doctoral and post-doctoral advisors)</p>	<p><b>The general Ph.D. rules are currently under revision in the RU Research Council.</b></p> <p><b>General guidelines on hiring post-doctoral researchers and Ph.D. students have not yet been created.</b></p> <p><b>Guidelines on the responsibilities of Principal Investigators are yet to be created.</b></p>
<p><b>37. Supervision and managerial duties</b></p> <p>Senior researchers should devote particular attention to their multi-faceted role as supervisors, mentors, career advisors, leaders, project coordinators, managers or science communicators. They should perform these tasks to the highest</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i></p> <p><i>Actions required:</i></p>	<p><b>The issue on mentoring has been added to the Faculty Contribution Record.</b></p> <p><b>Supervisory training and guidelines for senior researchers responsible for the work of junior researchers not established. Must state this clearly in RU</b></p>

<p>professional standards. With regard to their role as supervisors or mentors of researchers, senior researchers should build up a constructive and positive relationship with the early-stage researchers, in order to set the conditions for efficient transfer of knowledge and for the further successful development of the researchers' careers.</p>	<p>(1) Need to provide supervisory training and guidelines for senior researchers responsible for the work of junior researchers. Must state this clearly in RU HR strategy and put into guidelines for principal investigators. (2) The Research Council has started a discussion of how mentoring can be implemented at RU.</p>	<p><b>HR strategy and put into guidelines for principal investigators. There is perhaps a need to set up courses in research ethics and general research methodologies.</b></p>
<p><b>38. Continuing professional development</b> Researchers at all career stages should seek to continually improve themselves by regularly updating and expanding their skills and competencies. This may be achieved by a variety of means including, but not restricted to, formal training, workshops, conferences and e-learning.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p> <p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> The RU HR strategy stipulates the availability of professional development, and various policies such as the policy on sabbaticals and free tuition within RU, support this. Also guidelines within schools in support for attending conferences, although these are always dependent on the funding situation each year. This is not dependent on contractual situation, with the exception that sabbaticals are only for faculty. The size of the university and the relatively small number of doctoral students and post-docs makes it difficult to offer a large selection of training programs in-house. Annual reviews with the Faculty Contribution Record (or a similar tool for non-faculty researchers) will help this.</p> <p><i>Actions required:</i> (1) More training should be provided to early-stage researchers, for example on career development and transferable skills, or assistance in seeking such training elsewhere. (2) Need application forms and report forms for sabbaticals. (3) Need to look into developing a system where faculty members have discretionary funds to use e.g. for travel or books.</p>	<p><b>Application forms and report forms for sabbaticals does already exist. Developing a system where faculty members have discretionary funds to use is under discussion and on the agenda of RU Executive Committee. The new HR strategy for the University addresses this issue and encourages and supports continuing professional development in many ways. Special training for early-stage researchers has not been established.</b></p>
<p><b>39. Access to research training and continuous development</b></p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.</p>	<p><b>The new HR strategy for the University addresses this issue and encourages and supports continuing professional</b></p>

<p>Employers and/or funders should ensure that all researchers at any stage of their career, regardless of their contractual situation, are given the opportunity for professional development and for improving their employability through access to measures for the continuing development of skills and competencies. Such measures should be regularly assessed for their accessibility, take up and effectiveness in improving competencies, skills and employability.</p>	<p><i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Same as above (38).  <i>Actions required:</i> See above (no. 38).</p>	<p><b>development in many ways.</b></p>
<p><b>40. Supervision</b> Employers and/or funders should ensure that a person is clearly identified to whom early-stage researchers can refer for the performance of their professional duties, and should inform the researchers accordingly. Such arrangements should clearly define that the proposed supervisors are sufficiently expert in supervising research, have the time, knowledge, experience, expertise and commitment to be able to offer the research trainee appropriate support and provide for the necessary progress and review procedures, as well as the necessary feedback mechanisms.</p>	<p><i>Relevant legislation:</i> No laws impede the implementation of this principle.  <i>Existing rules of practices at RU:</i> Doctoral students and post-doctoral researchers always have advisors who they have good access to. Faculty members have good access to their Dean. The new Faculty Contribution Record will support this.  <i>Actions required:</i> Need to ensure that Doctoral students and post-doctoral researchers also participate in the new Faculty Contribution Record process, or a similar process for non-faculty researchers, to ensure that they receive enough feedback and mentoring. Need to state this in guidelines for Principal Investigators that have not yet been developed, and provide training for all PI's, as well as for Deans.</p>	<p><b>All postdoctoral students participate in the FCR and the Annual Research Assessment.</b>  <b>Guidelines on the responsibilities of Principal Investigators (including hiring and delegating) are still needed.</b></p>