

Action Plan

1. Organisational Information

STAFF & STUDENTS	FTE
Total researchers = staff, fellowship holders, bursary holders, PhD students either full-time or part-time involved in research *	2992,3
Of whom are international (i.e. foreign nationality) *	See note ¹
Of whom are externally funded (i.e. for whom the organisation is host organisation) *	See note ²
Of whom are women *	1492,4
Of whom are R3 or R4 = established or leading researchers with a large degree of autonomy (e.g. holding the status of principal investigator or professor) *	1294,9
Of whom are R2 = recognised researcher (e.g. postdoctoral researcher, junior researcher) *	846,8
Of whom are R1 = first stage researcher (e.g. doctoral candidate, research apprentice) *	823,6
Total number of students (if relevant) *	32 627
Total number of staff (including management, administrative, teaching, and research staff) *	4 724,9

¹ No statistics are available on the nationality distribution of the entire staff at Stockholm University. However, there are data on the recruitment of researchers. In 2024 (the most recently compiled statistics), 19.8 per cent of newly recruited researchers were international, i.e. without Swedish citizenship. In the same year, internationally recruited doctoral students accounted for 50 per cent.

² Most researchers are externally funded to some extent. There is data on total external research funding per higher education institution and discipline. However, we are unable to extract this data on individual level.

RESEARCH FUNDING (figures for the most recent fiscal year)	€³
Total annual organisational budget	639 012 000
Annual organisational direct government funding (designated for research)	181 009 878
Annual competitive government-sourced funding (designated for research, obtained in competition with other organisations – including EU funding)	128 617 850
Annual funding from private, non-government sources, designated for research	38 184 304

ORGANISATIONAL PROFILE (a very brief description of your organisation, max. 100 words)
Stockholm University is a public authority governed by Swedish law, with the University Board as its highest decision-making body and the Vice-Chancellor as head of the University. Education and research are organised within two scientific domains: Human Science, comprising the Humanities, Social Sciences and Law faculties, and Science, which also functions as a faculty. The University applies a tiered leadership model in which departments hold operational responsibility, faculties oversee recruitment and strategic development within their disciplines, and the central management provides overarching strategic direction.

2. Strengths and weaknesses of the current practice

Ethics, integrity, gender, and open science

Strengths and Weaknesses (max. 800 words)

³ Converted from Swedish kronor at rate 1 SEK = 0.094 Euro.

Stockholm University operates within a robust policy framework that embeds the principles of ethics, integrity, gender equality and open science in everyday academic practice. The University's overarching strategy is complemented by dedicated regulations and policies, together providing clear standards, responsibilities and routines across the institution. These documents are further supported by established quality-assurance mechanisms and operational procedures, ensuring that principles translate into practice. In this respect, the policy landscape of the University is strongly aligned with the Charter and Code and provides a stable basis for continuous improvement.

Ethics and integrity. The consultation confirms a high baseline with 90% of consultation groups report sufficient knowledge of fundamental research-ethics principles relevant to their field, indicating both effective policy communication and a mature research culture around ethical reflection. However, there has been a broad national debate on research ethics and several regulatory changes have created uncertainty among researchers, particularly within the humanities and social sciences, which further underlines the need for clearer guidance and more accessible support.

Open science and research data. Policy ambitions in open science are clear and well-developed, with university-level commitments to open access, research-data management and FAIR-aligned practices, supported by the data-support functions and training. Nevertheless, the consultation reveals a mixed picture: while a majority (60%) consider their understanding of data-management and data-protection requirements adequate, 34% indicate gaps. The Action Plan therefore prioritises research data management and strengthened technical support for data handling.

Gender equality. The University's formal commitments set out in different policies provide a consistent frame for equal opportunities in hiring, progression and working conditions. However, available data indicate persistent imbalance at the most senior level (R4), underscoring the need to continue driving improvement in selection processes.

Transparency and communication. A recurring theme in the consultation is that, while policies exist and are generally well-formulated, researchers sometimes experience uneven visibility and navigability of the most practical, "how-to" elements in understanding the procedural side of recruitment and progression. The University has therefore committed to improving online information on recruitment processes, assessment criteria and academic career paths.

Researchers assessment, recruitment, and progression

Strengths and Weaknesses (max. 800 words)

Stockholm University has a long-established and well-functioning system for the recruitment and promotion of senior academic staff (R3–R4), with procedures that are widely recognised as transparent, rigorous and legally robust. This system is built on the principle that appointments must be based on an impartial assessment of qualifications, ensuring that the most meritorious candidates are selected. To safeguard fairness, external expert reviewers are systematically involved in the assessment of applicants, which strengthens both the independence and the credibility of the decisions. Complementing this external evaluation, the Academic Appointments Board plays a central role by conducting interviews and trial lectures with shortlisted candidates. The process is well-documented and highly transparent. Candidates receive reviewer reports, are informed of decisions at each stage, and have the right to appeal final outcomes through the Higher Education Appeals Board, an independent national body. This multilayered structure reflects academic traditions that, in several respects, exceed the minimum requirements of national legislation.

In contrast, the recruitment and progression of researchers in the earlier career stages (R1–R2) are less consistently regulated. Although the recruitment of doctoral candidates is governed by detailed national legislation and clear university-level procedures, the practical implementation takes place at department level, where documentation of assessment and decision-making varies in quality and completeness. Departments generally follow established norms, but the absence of standardised internal guidelines for selection and assessment means that transparency can differ between units, and applicants may not always receive sufficient information about how decisions are made. This pattern was also reflected in the consultation study, while 80 percent of groups expressed confidence in transparency for recruitment in general, concerns about clarity and accessibility of information were more commonly raised by early-career researchers.

These challenges are even more pronounced for postdoctoral researchers (R2). Although the advertising of vacancies follows national legal requirements, there are no formal, university-wide guidelines regulating how postdoctoral applications should be assessed, what constitutes relevant merits for selection, or how competing candidates should be comparatively evaluated. As a result, practices vary between departments, which can lead to uncertainty about criteria, expectations, and opportunities for progression. The consultation results reinforce this picture: R2 respondents reported the lowest clarity regarding career paths, assessment practices and employment conditions, with only 20 percent

expressing a positive view of career-path transparency. This indicates that gaps in documentation and communication have practical consequences for how early-career researchers perceive the fairness and predictability of the system.

Nevertheless, it is important to recognise that the legal framework still provides safeguards. Employment decisions for postdoctoral researchers can also be appealed to the Higher Education Appeals Board, ensuring that the underlying processes, whether formally documented at departmental level or not, must be defensible under external scrutiny. This is a significant protective mechanism, reinforcing the merit-based foundation of the recruitment system even where local routines require strengthening.

Taken together, Stockholm University's recruitment and assessment systems have clear strengths in the senior academic tiers and are grounded in strong legal and procedural foundations. The main weaknesses concern consistency and transparency for early-career stages, particularly in communicating expectations, documenting decisions and ensuring that criteria and processes are equally visible across all departments. The consultation results confirm that these issues are most acutely felt by R2 researchers, who face both the greatest uncertainty and the least formalised support. Addressing these gaps, through clearer guidelines, improved web-based information and strengthened communication about selection processes, will be essential for ensuring that all researchers, regardless of career stage, experience SU's recruitment and progression systems as transparent, fair and aligned with the principles of the Charter and Code.

Working conditions and practices

Strengths and Weaknesses (max. 800 words)

Stockholm University benefits from a strong regulatory foundation for working conditions, where Swedish labour legislation, collective agreements and established internal policies together provide secure, transparent and predictable employment terms for researchers. The University's model of public-sector employment ensures robust protections, favourable social benefits and structured processes for annual performance reviews, work-environment management and access to training. These strengths were reflected in the consultation study, particularly in relation to ethics and supervision. An overwhelming majority of consultation groups, 90 percent, state that researchers have sufficient knowledge of the fundamental ethical principles relevant to their field, indicating a well-established culture of responsible research

practice. Likewise, opportunities to develop supervisory skills are perceived positively, with 81 percent reporting that the university provides sufficient support in this area.

Despite these favourable conditions, several challenges emerged that point to areas where working practices and support structures need to be strengthened. One recurring theme concerns the visibility and accessibility of information about employment conditions. Although the regulatory framework is extensive, only half of the consultation groups consider the information clear and accessible, and nearly 40 percent express some level of disagreement. This pattern is largely consistent across career stages, with R3 researchers reporting the greatest uncertainty. While international staff may face the steepest learning curve, the findings suggest that even researchers familiar with Swedish academia would benefit from more consolidated, navigable and user-friendly information about rights, obligations and employment regulations. This need has become particularly evident in the context of the University's commitment to strengthening the onboarding of newly recruited staff.

A second and more structural challenge relates to career development, especially for early-career researchers. The consultation responses make clear that academic career paths are not perceived as transparent or easy to locate. Only 44 percent of groups express a positive view, and an equal proportion report negative perceptions. When broken down by career stage, the disparities become pronounced: only 20 percent of R2 groups provide positive assessments, compared to 42 percent of R3 groups and 84 percent of R4 groups. These findings underscore a need for better communication about progression criteria, clearer articulation of the academic career framework and stronger support for researchers navigating early career transitions. The annual performance review, while widely implemented, is often experienced as focusing on operational matters rather than long-term development. Here, there is clear scope to shift towards more structured, career-focused dialogue between researchers and their supervisor.

Mentorship is another area where improvements are needed. Two-thirds of consultation groups believe that SU should further develop mentoring support for early-career researchers. While existing programmes are appreciated, access appears uneven between faculties and disciplines, resulting in different levels of support and inconsistent experiences for researchers in similar positions.

The consultation study also highlights variation in collegial environments across the University. While 56 percent of groups view collegial collaboration positively, a combined 44 percent are either neutral or negative. This indicates that although many departments offer supportive and collaborative research cultures, these conditions are not uniformly experienced.

Finally, while ethical understanding is strong, the results show a more mixed picture in relation to data management and data protection. Sixty percent of groups express confidence in their understanding of relevant requirements, but more than a third indicate uncertainty or insufficient knowledge. Given the increasing complexity of data-handling regulations, this finding points to a need for clearer guidance, enhanced technical support and expanded training opportunities to ensure that researchers feel confident in navigating regulatory and technical demands.

Taken together, the results suggest that Stockholm University possesses solid and well-functioning foundations for working conditions, but that improvements are needed in how information is communicated, how career development is supported and how collegial and administrative practices are harmonised across the University. The weaknesses identified do not concern the fundamental structures, which are robust, but rather their visibility, coherence and accessibility—particularly from the perspective of early-career researchers and newly recruited staff. The actions in the updated Action Plan directly address these challenges and aim to strengthen consistency, transparency and support across all research environments.

Research careers and talent development

Strengths and Weaknesses (max. 800 words)

Stockholm University provides several established structures that support researcher development across career stages. For doctoral candidates (R1), the individual study plan (ISP) constitutes a central and mandatory tool for ensuring that each student receives structured supervision, clear milestones, and documented progress. The ISP also formalises the responsibilities of both the doctoral student and the university and is reviewed annually to ensure alignment between research goals, supervision, and training needs.

The university further offers comprehensive pedagogical and supervisory training. The Centre for the Advancement of University Teaching provides courses and workshops that enable teachers, supervisors and early-career academics to develop their pedagogical competence, reflect



on their supervisory practice and strengthen their leadership and communication skills. This contributes to a learning-oriented academic environment and supports the quality of supervision at all levels.

The university also provides Mentoring Programme aimed at junior researchers (R2–R3). Senior academic mentors guide mentees in navigating academic career paths, balancing research and teaching responsibilities, and developing their academic profiles. The presence of established mentoring structures demonstrates the university's commitment to supporting talent development, academic socialisation and community building.

A significant proportion of younger and internationally recruited researchers (R1, R2 and some share of R3) have expressed uncertainty about how to navigate academic career structures at the university, including expectations at each stage, the criteria for progression, and available support services. Although formal regulations exist for certain career, pathways for researchers within R2 are less visible. Information is dispersed across departments, faculties and intranet pages, making it difficult to obtain a coherent overview. This lack of clarity affects researchers' ability to plan their careers and assess their opportunities both within and beyond academia.

3. Actions

The Action Plan and HR Excellence in Research strategy must be published in an easily accessible location of the organisation's website.

Please provide the web link(s) to the organisation's action plan / strategy for the implementation of the principles of the European Charter for Researchers. Multiple links must be comma-separated.

URL: <https://www.su.se/english/about-the-university/work-at-su/hr-excellence-in-research-award>

Please fill in the list of all individual actions to be undertaken in your organisation's HR Excellence in Research strategy to address the weaknesses or strengths identified in the gap analysis. It is recommended that the listed actions are concise but detailed enough for the assessors to determine the level of ambition, engagement, and planning for the implementation process. Please ensure that you provide a detailed plan, with precise and quantifiable KPIs, not just an enumeration of the institution's action.

Note: Choose one or more of the principles automatically retrieved from the gap analysis with their ratings.

Proposed Actions				
Action	GAP Principle(s)	Indicator(s) / Target(s)	Timing (at least by year's quarter/semester)	Responsible Unit
1) Develop and implement a Research Integrity Promotion Plan (RIPP)	(+/-) 2. Ethical principles 4. Professional attitude	Target: The RIPP is formally adopted by the university's decision-making body and published on the institutional website. Indicators: 1) The RIPP is formally approved.	Q4 2028	Office for Research, Engagement and Innovation Services

		<p>2) The RIPP is published on the University website in both Swedish and English.</p> <p>3) Communication about the RIPP is sent to all departments.</p>		
<p>2) Develop and deliver a web course on research ethics for researchers</p>	<p>(+/-) 2. Ethical principles</p> <p>4. Professional attitude</p>	<p>Target: Strengthen researchers' ability to work in accordance with ethical principles by improving access to high-quality, easily available support.</p> <p>Indicators: 1) At least one course on research ethics is developed and delivered. 2) Information about the course published on the webpage. 3) First course started. 3) Number of participants per session. 4) Share of researchers that have attended the course is</p>	<p>Q4 2027</p>	<p>Office for Research, Engagement and Innovation Services</p>



		summarised and analysed every three months. 5) Share of researchers complete within 12 months of launch. 6) Evaluation of first course.		
3) Online course in research data management for research staff	7. Good practice in research 5. Contractual and legal obligations	Target: The final target is that all research staff understand how data should be stored, why and where and the consequences of incorrect handling of data. Indicators: 1) Minimum of five courses held. 2) Follow up and evaluate key indicators regarding the courses, such as attendances.	Q2 2027	Stockholm University Library
4) Strengthened technical support for data management for research staff	7. Good practice in research 5. Contractual and legal obligations	Target: To improve researchers' ability to handle research data correctly and efficiently by providing improved technical support	Q4 2028	Stockholm University Library



		<p>Indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) information on data storage and publication recommendations available on website.2) material on data storage summarised and circulated to all newly hired researchers.3) Introduce measurable indicators in for the university's development of improved technical support for data management and support.4) user needs/feedback analysis is compiled and analysed annually.		
5) Enhanced career-related questions for research staff in the employee survey	11. Evaluation/ appraisal systems	Target: To strengthen our ability to monitor researchers' career development needs by integrating clearer and more relevant career-related questions into existing employee survey instruments.	Q4 2028	The Human Resources Office



		Indicators: 1) Updated career-related questions incorporated into the employee survey. 2) Survey findings referenced in at least one annual monitoring or development report.		
6) Enhanced career-related questions for research staff in their personal development discussions	11. Evaluation/ appraisal systems 30. Access to career advice	Target: To strengthen the University's capacity to support researchers' career development by integrating clearer, more consistent and more meaningful career-related discussions into personal development talks for research and teaching staff. Indicators: 1) Updated guidance and templates for personal development discussions, including enhanced career-related prompts.	Q4 2028	The Human Resources Office



		<p>2) Published and communicated to head of departments.</p> <p>3) Documentation from quality dialogues confirming that career development is a recurring discussion point in performance reviews.</p> <p>Qualitative feedback from head of departments and researchers incorporated into the annual follow-up cycle.</p>		
<p>7) Improved online information on recruitment processes and assessment criteria</p>	<p>12. Recruitment 13. Recruitment (Code) 14. Selection (Code) 15. Transparency (Code) 21. Postdoctoral appointments (Code)</p>	<p>Target: To strengthen transparency and understanding of recruitment at Stockholm University by ensuring that research staff have clear, consistent and easily accessible online information on recruitment processes and assessment criteria across the different organisational levels.</p> <p>Indicators: 1) Development information on internal webpage</p>	<p>Q4 2026</p>	<p>Management Secretariat</p>



		regarding recruitment processes and assessment criteria. 2) Faculty specific documents approved. 3) Documents published on the webpage.		
8) Improved online information on academic career paths	12. Recruitment 13. Recruitment (Code) 14. Selection (Code) 15. Transparency (Code) 21. Postdoctoral appointments (Code) 28. Career development 30. Access to career advice 33. Teaching	Target: To improve researchers' ability to navigate academic career opportunities at Stockholm University by providing clear, consistent and easily accessible online information on career paths, relevant regulations, and progression criteria across all relevant organisational levels. Indicators: 1) Updated web content on academic career paths published on SU's English and Swedish websites. 2) Clear cross-linking established between central,	Q4 2026	Management Secretariat



		faculty and departmental pages. 3) A consolidated overview page on academic career paths. 4) One annual event on academic and non-academic career paths delivered (participation and feedback monitored).		
9) Develop introduction videos specifically tailored to research staff	12. Recruitment 13. Recruitment (Code) 28. Career development	Target: To improve the onboarding experience and strengthen early integration of research staff. Indicators: 1) Introduction videos tailored to research and teaching staff produced and published. 2) Structured feedback from new research staff collected via surveys or evaluations.	Q4 2028	The Human Resources Office
10) Improved information for internationally	12. Recruitment 13. Recruitment (Code) 15. Transparency (Code)	Target: To strengthen the integration and working conditions of	Q4 2026	Management Secretariat



recruited research and teaching staff	21. Postdoctoral appointments (Code) 28. Career development	internationally recruited research and teaching staff by improving the clarity, accessibility and coherence of practical, legal and cultural information provided throughout the onboarding process. Indicators: 1) A comprehensive set of onboarding materials (including practical, legal, administrative and cultural information) published on the website. 2) Materials available in English and Swedish, with annual updates to ensure accuracy and alignment with current regulations. 3) Annual feedback from international staff shows improved clarity.		
11) Strengthened focus on career development in the development plan section	28. Career development 30. Access to career advice	Target: To ensure that performance reviews systematically	Q4 2027	Office of Human Science, Office of



<p>of performance reviews for research and teaching staff and doctoral candidates</p>	<p>33. Teaching</p>	<p>support researchers' and doctoral candidates' career development</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Guidelines for performance reviews are updated and communicated to managers.2) Supporting materials and templates for performance reviews are updated and communicated to managers.3) An annual thematic analysis is conducted on how career and competence development issues for early-career researchers are addressed in the quality dialogues, based on the notes and outcomes of these dialogues.4) Explore the possibility of including a career development question in existing survey tools, such as the workplace environment		<p>Science, The Human Resources Office</p>
---	---------------------	---	--	--



		survey, or in a new targeted survey for research and teaching staff, to support monitoring of the implementation.		
12) Improve coordination between the University's existing mentorship programmes, including better dissemination of information and integration of programme information in the introduction for new researchers	28. Career development 30. Access to career advice 33. Teaching	<p>Target:</p> <p>To strengthen the conditions for career development and collegial support by ensuring that the University's mentorship programmes are coherently coordinated, clearly communicated and integrated into the onboarding of new research staff.</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p>1) Consolidated and updated information material on existing mentorship programmes is developed, published, and incorporated into the introduction process for new researchers.</p> <p>2) The number of participants in the University's existing</p>	Q2 2027	Office of Human Science, Office of Science, The Human Resources Office, Management Secretariat



		mentorship programmes is monitored and compiled annually.		
13) Improved information on career paths both within and beyond academia	28. Career development 30. Access to career advice 37. Supervision and managerial duties	Target: To enhance researchers' ability to make informed career decisions by providing clear, comprehensive and accessible information on career paths both within academia and in external sectors. Indicators: 1) Development of support and information on internal webpage regarding on career paths both within and beyond academia, including more pedagogical explanations. 2) One annual event on academic and non-academic career paths delivered (participation and feedback monitored).	Q4 2026	Management Secretariat
14) Gender equality to be considered in the	10. Non discrimination 27. Gender balance	Target:	Q2 2028	Management Secretariat

<p>recruitment of research and teaching staff</p>		<p>Achieve gender balance in new researcher appointments.</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p>1) Annual gender distribution report for the total population of researchers (R1–R4), based on Stockholm University’s annual report, including analysis of trends and deviations from the 40–60% target range.</p> <p>2) Annual follow-up of the proportion of women among newly recruited professors, with the target of achieving 49% women in line with the government’s appropriation directions for Stockholm University.</p>		<p>Office of Human Science, Office of Science</p>
---	--	--	--	---

The establishment of an open recruitment policy is a key element in the strategy for the implementation of the principles of the European Charter for Researchers. Please also indicate how your organisation will use the OTM-R toolkit and how you intend to implement / are implementing the principles of OTM-R. It is helpful to include a brief commentary demonstrating this implementation even if there is some overlap with the actions listed above. If this is the case, please link the OTM-R checklist with the overall action plan (max. 1000 words).*



The gap analysis shows that Stockholm University already adheres to an Open Recruitment Policy, supported both by comprehensive Swedish legislation and by the University's own internal policies and guidelines. The principles of OTM-R are applied to a high degree across the institution. At the same time, the analysis identifies areas where transparency can be further strengthened, particularly for positions in the R1 and R2 categories. What is missing is primarily clearer, upfront information for applicants about assessment and selection procedures, as well as more accessible guidance on career opportunities. These needs are addressed through the actions outlined above.

The OTM-R toolkit has proven valuable in this work. Its clarity and conciseness make it an effective instrument for internal self-assessment and quality assurance. While the content of the toolkit is not new to Stockholm University, its principles are largely embedded already in Swedish legislation and the University's regulatory framework, it nevertheless offers a practical structure for identifying where improvements are required and for supporting continuous development of recruitment practices.

If your organisation already has a recruitment strategy which implements the principles of OTM-R, please provide the web link where this strategy can be found on your organisation's website. Multiple links must be comma-separated.

URL: <https://www.su.se/english/about-the-university/work-at-su/the-recruitment-process-at-su>; <https://medarbetare.su.se/en/our-su/governance/rules--regulations/personnel/rules-of-employment-for-the-recruitment-and-promotion-of-teachers-at-stockholm-university-aosu>

4. Implementation

General overview of the expected overall implementation process of the action plan (max. 1000 words).

Stockholm University has revised and strengthened its organisational model for implementing the HR Excellence in Research Award in direct response to the initial assessment from 2025. The revised structure ensures a clearer division of responsibilities, broader representation, stronger faculty involvement, and a more systematic and evidence-based approach to follow-up and monitoring. The implementation of the Action Plan is fully embedded into the university's overarching governance and quality assurance processes.

The implementation of the Action Plan is overseen by the Steering Committee for the HR Excellence in Research Award, a newly composed body including representatives from all faculties with responsibility to represent all research staff R1-R4 career stages, as well as members of the university leadership. The Committee has strategic oversight over the entire HR Excellence in Research Award process and ensures that the work is aligned with the university's long-term priorities, quality-assurance system, and other organisational goals. The Vice-Chancellor has appointed the Deputy Vice-Chancellor as the responsible leader for the continued work with HR Excellence in Research Award. The Steering Committee meets regularly throughout the year, receives updates from the Working Group, and ensures succession in the different projects.

The Working Group is responsible for the operational coordination and day-to-day implementation of the Action Plan. It comprises two researchers (one from each scientific domain) and two administrative staff members from the University Management.

The HR Excellence in Research Award process is firmly grounded in researcher participation through the Reference Group, which consists of eight academic representatives (four from each scientific domain), spanning R2–R4, along with two representatives from the doctoral student community (R1). The Reference Group provides continuous input on implementation progress, feedback on documents, and new projects. The Reference Group may also advise the Steering Committee directly on matters requiring broader academic consultation. This structure ensures systematic and continuous involvement of researchers from all levels.

In addition to the groups above, SU will continue to use established collegial forums such as faculty boards, domain boards, and departmental leadership groups to further anchor the work. Researchers remain central actors in decision-making bodies at all levels of the university, a structural condition that naturally supports broad participation in the HR Excellence in Research Award process.

Each action in the Action Plan has a designated responsible unit. These units are responsible for executing the concrete steps described in the Action Plan. The Working Group supports and coordinates each responsible unit, to ensure that the project is working towards set goals. The Steering Committee reviews progress at defined intervals and ensures that the overall implementation is proceeding according to the established timeline. The Working Group is responsible for monitoring measurable indicators associated with each action. SU will employ both quantitative indicators, such as completion rates, participation numbers, availability of web-based resources, and survey data, and qualitative indicators, such as documented procedures, improved accessibility of information, researcher feedback, and results from internal quality dialogues. Results will be reported to the Steering Committee at regular basis.

To ensure long-term sustainability, activities within the HR Excellence in Research Award process will be integrated into institutional practice.

Make sure you also cover all the aspects highlighted in the checklist below, which you will need to describe in detail.

Note: Click on each question of the checklist to open the editor.

How will the implementation committee and/or steering group regularly oversee progress?

Detailed description and justification (max. 500 words)

Stockholm University will oversee implementation through the Steering Committee constituted via Rufus, the Vice-Chancellor's committee for research evaluation and quality assurance. The Committee will meet on a fixed quarterly cycle, with additional meetings as required, to review progress report. Decisions and follow-up will be documented, and matters requiring wider institutional anchoring will be moved forward in line with established governance procedures. To ensure alignment, the Committee may request focused input from relevant advisory and support functions. The Working Group will provide the Steering Committee with regular updates and supporting material in a standardised format, covering progress against milestones and KPIs for each action. The President has appointed the Deputy President to lead the strategic work with HR Excellence in Research Award and to receive more frequent operational updates from the Working Group, which in turn

coordinates the University Administration and the implementation of all assigned actions across the institution. In addition, the Reference Group will supply the Steering Committee with researcher-informed input on how progress should be interpreted, any emerging issues, and priorities for subsequent measures. In addition to this ongoing reporting structure, the Steering Committee will be supported by the University's established annual cycles of quality assurance and evaluation, the results of which will be made available to inform oversight, contextualise progress and guide adjustments to the implementation process.

How do you intend to involve the research community, your main stakeholders, in the implementation process?

Detailed description and justification (max. 500 words)

Stockholm University will involve the research community through the traditional model of collegiality. The Steering Committee includes representatives from all faculties alongside university leadership. In the context of HR Excellence in Research Award-context it serves as the steering body, ensuring that perspectives across the R1–R4 career spectrum are formally present in decision-making.

To secure continuous researcher involvement between Committee meetings, the Deputy President (appointed by the President to lead the work) is supported by a Working Group that includes two academic members, one from each scientific domain, together with administrative secretariat support. The Working Group coordinates implementation across the University Administration and departments, and will provide regular, structured updates to the Steering Committee while also seeking targeted input from relevant forums as actions progress. Where appropriate, the Working Group will conduct additional referencing with other groupings in the University, such as faculty committees, section boards, specialised advisory bodies, or other stakeholders, to ensure that proposals are in line with current needs.

The Reference Group reinforces researcher participation by supplying practitioner-level perspectives from across the career stages. Comprising academic members from both scientific domains (with representation from R2–R4) and doctoral student representatives (R1), the Reference Group will advise on how progress should be interpreted, highlight disciplinary perspectives, practical constraints, and propose next steps where additional measures are warranted. Its input will be channelled to the Steering Committee through the Working Group's reporting cycle and, when needed, directly to the Committee for matters that require strengthened researcher focus.

However, we are also very aware that the administrative burden on researchers should be kept to a minimum, in line with university policy. Members of the Working Group will be expected to obtain feedback from their colleagues on various aspects of ongoing implementation and further activities required in the future.

How do you proceed with the alignment of organisational policies with the HR Excellence in Research award process? Make sure it is recognised in the organisation's research strategy as the overarching HR policy.

Detailed description and justification (max. 500 words)

The principles of the European Charter and Code are fully consistent with Stockholm University's existing ambitions for high-quality research environments, and as demonstrated in the gap analysis, already largely embedded in the University's regulatory and strategic framework. The HR Excellence in Research Award-process has therefore served as a valuable and systematic instrument for reviewing and strengthening policies, guidelines and routines linked to researcher recruitment, career development, ethics, and working conditions.

Going forward, alignment will be ensured by incorporating the HR Excellence in Research Award principles into ordinary policy development routines. When guidelines, procedures or steering documents are updated, the Working Group and the Steering Committee will oversee that revisions remain consistent with the Charter and Code.

The strategy for HR Excellence in Research Award will also be embedded in the University's ongoing quality work. As quality-assurance and evaluation cycles are conducted annually in research and education, the principles of the Charter and Code will be taken into account in monitoring, follow-up and policy adjustments.

How will you ensure that the proposed actions are implemented?

Detailed description and justification (max. 500 words)

The action plan for the HR Excellence in Research Award will be formally decided by the President. Its implementation will be secured through the Steering Committee, the Working Group and the wider implementation structure, ensuring coordinated follow-through across the organisation.

How will you monitor progress (timeline)?*

Detailed description and justification (max. 500 words)

Progress will be monitored against the targets and the timeline in the action plan. It is the respective project leader's task to ensure progress and that status is reported to the coordinator on a regular basis. It is the coordinator's task to report to the steering group and the implementation committee and support project leaders when necessary.

How will you measure progress (indicators) in view of the next assessment?*

Detailed description and justification (max. 500 words)

The indicators have been designed to allow systematic and measurable follow-up, with targets expressed wherever possible in quantifiable terms and linked to specific quarterly timelines. Where greater specificity is required for monitoring, the Steering Committee will refine these indicators further. Implementation of each action in the Action Plan will be integrated into the University's established annual cycle for planning, monitoring and reviewing operations. Progress will be assessed in relation to the defined targets, and each action will be examined to determine whether the underlying gap has been fully addressed or whether additional measures are required. For actions involving surveys, the resulting analyses will inform the formulation of new targets and follow-up actions for the next review period. For actions with numerical targets, developments over time will guide the evaluation and adjustment of objectives in preparation for subsequent assessments.

Additional remarks/comments about the proposed implementation process (max. 1000 words)

Notes on Organisational Information



*Of whom are international (i.e. foreign nationality) **

No statistics are available on the nationality distribution of the entire staff at Stockholm University. However, there are data on the recruitment of researchers. In 2024 (the most recently compiled statistics), 19.8 per cent of newly recruited researchers were international, i.e. without Swedish citizenship. In the same year, internationally recruited doctoral students accounted for 50 per cent.

*Of whom are international (i.e. foreign nationality) **

Most researchers are externally funded to some extent. There is data on total external research funding per higher education institution and discipline. However, we are unable to extract this data on individual level.

RESEARCH FUNDING (figures for the most recent fiscal year)

Converted from Swedish kronor at rate 1 SEK = 0.094 Euro.