

This is a draft chapter. The final version is available in *Research Handbook on Academic Careers and Managing Academics*, edited by Cláudia S. Sarrico, Maria J. Rosa, and Teresa Carvalho, published in 2022, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

<https://doi.org/10.4337/9781839102639.00029>

The material cannot be used for any other purpose without further permission of the publisher and is for private use only.

The impact of human resource management policies on higher education in Europe

Attila Pausits, Jussi Kivistö, Elias Pekkola, Florian Reisky and Henry Mugabi

INTRODUCTION

According to the European Commission's Modernisation Agenda, higher education's role as a driver of social and economic progress means that higher education institutions are crucial partners in delivering the European Union's (EU) strategies to drive forward and maintain growth. Higher education institutions are considered important for Europe, particularly for enhancing individual potential and equipping graduates with the knowledge and core transferable competences they need to succeed in high-skill occupations. Moreover, higher education institutions are expected to serve as centres of innovation, job creation and employability, with active and effective engagement through research and societal interaction. Furthermore, the massification of higher education has put considerable pressure on existing capacities, such that, if they do not devote sufficient attention to changing staffing needs, operative mechanisms of higher education systems run the risk of becoming increasingly inefficient. Though human resource management (HRM) plays a key role in determining higher education institutions' performance, there is little research on the interplay between European and national policies and HRM.

EU-level policies and key documents aimed at developing European higher education do not explicitly address the role and importance of HRM. For instance, the European Commission's 'Mobilising the brainpower of Europe: Enabling universities to make their full contribution to the Lisbon Strategy' simply states that '[u]niversities should be responsible for managing and developing their human resources' (European Commission, 2005a, pp. 7–8) and identifies 'factors to strengthen human resources' (p. 6). The same applies to the Commission's communication to the European Parliament: 'Supporting growth and jobs – An agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems' (European Commission, 2011a). This document explains the principles of the EU's Modernisation Agenda for higher education, but it does not explicitly reference HRM, beyond a suggestion to '[en]courage institutions to modernise their human resource management and obtain the HR Excellence in Research and to implement the recommendations of the Helsinki Group on Women in Science' (European Commission, 2011a, p. 9). However, it includes several recommendations on aspects within the sphere of HRM, such as 'transparent and fair recruitment procedures, better initial and continuing professional development, and better recognition and reward of teaching and research excellence' (European Commission, 2011a, p. 5). This should trigger higher education institutions to 'invest in continuous professional development for their staff, recruit sufficient staff to develop emerging disciplines and reward excellence in teaching' (European Commission, 2011a, p. 6).

Another example, priority 3 ('An Open Labour Market for Researchers') of the 'ERAC Opinion on the ERA Roadmap 2015–2020' (European Union, 2015, p. 12), stressed the need for 'Intersectoral Mobility' as a strategic future target. Measures should be taken to support researchers in moving from the public to the private sector, from companies to higher education institutions and between institutions. This may also influence the recruitment of researchers.

Human resources are at the centre of EU higher education policies since they combine the management of academic workers with the principle of free movement of people and knowledge. In the knowledge society era, research and innovation workers are closely connected to the free movement of goods, services and capital. So far, however, EU documents have failed to consider human resources (HR) from a managerial perspective. Consequently, in this chapter, we conduct a systematic analysis of the policy papers and recommendations relevant to HRM in higher education and identify the most fully explored areas of HR. First, we present a conceptual framework to frame HR functions adapted to higher education institutions. This framework supports an understanding of the different HR dimensions and provides a structure to link policies with HRM practices. Next, key policy papers and documents are discussed, and the contents of HR are highlighted. These are used to link policy priorities and recommendations with HR functions. This analysis identifies the key HR areas from policy perspectives, but also those dimensions that are not addressed or not linked to the formation of European higher education policy.

A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO THE FUNCTIONS OF HRM

Although the literature does not adequately discuss the history of HRM in higher education – except in England, where government supported the development of certain HRM practices in higher education institutions at the beginning of the twenty-first century (Guest & Clinton, 2007; Waring, 2013) – it does reveal that, until the early 1990s, HRM was not a widely used concept in higher education (Crosthwaite & Warner, 1995; Huxley & Hall, 1996). Since most higher education institutions devote around 60–75 per cent of their annual budget to HR, it is unsurprising that they are increasingly using HRM practices and related 'professional' language (Guest & Clinton, 2007; Huxley & Hall, 1996; Waring, 2013). The contributions of HRM to the general management of higher education institutions are widely recognized and discussed (Evans & Chun, 2012; HEFCE, 2010b; Julius, 2000; Kekäle, 2015; OECD 2020). The literature (e.g., Evans & Chun, 2012) reveals that higher education institutions face numerous challenges globally and that their ability to attract, develop, utilize, reward and retain the most talented HR will determine their success (Archer, 2005; Guest & Clinton, 2007). Böckelmann and colleagues (Böckelmann, Reif, & Fröhlich, 2010, p. 159), for example, succinctly noted that, because higher education institutions depend on the expertise and ambition of their HR:

[They] cannot afford to neglect questions of HRM; which competence is important for new appointments to the institutions, which category of personnel should be assigned to which tasks, which conditions increase performances and how individual development of employees is linked to the strategic objectives of the organisation.

There is currently no comprehensive framework for analysing the different dimensions of HRM in HE. To fill this gap, the EU-funded project 'Modernisation of Higher Education Institutions through enhancement of Human Resources Management function (HRMinHEI)' (<https://als.fractas.biz/>) developed and piloted such a framework between 2016 and 2019. The framework consists of nine functions: (a) HR strategy and planning; (b) job demands; (c) recruitment and selection; (d) performance evaluation; (e) training and development; (f) career progression, (g) pay and benefits; (h) HR analyses and reporting; and (i) information systems and personnel

administration. The framework is built around the functions of HRM; that is, it provides an analytical tool to operationalize and scrutinize complex issues related to academic careers (see Pausits, 2017). Of these functions, the present chapter excludes '(i) information systems and personnel administration' because these are often more country-specific, focusing primarily on national context.

Aligning Staffing and Institutional Vision: Human Resource Strategy and Planning

An HR strategy is an instrument for developing policies that not only cohere and align with overall strategies, address employee needs, promote equality and diversity and improve staff well-being and involvement, but also, importantly, create a working environment that supports the recruitment and retention of the best candidates and performers (Holbeche, 2012). At a minimum, HR strategies should:

- Align with overall institutional strategy and goals (Evans & Chun, 2012; Hall, 2009; Lanchbery, 1995);
- Support other key strategies and policies, such as research, teaching and learning strategies (Hall, 2009), and related programmes, goals and purposes to the priorities of the university (Evans & Chun, 2012);
- Promote coherent practices and avoid creating conflicting demands (Metcalf, Rolfe, Stevens, & Weale, 2005);
- Be devised in collaboration with key stakeholders (Holbeche, 2012) and have the full support of the governing body and senior management (Hall, 2009); and
- Be reviewed, updated continuously, and be flexible enough to adjust to external pressures and changes (Lanchbery, 1995).

Defining the Post, Tasks and Division of Labour: Job Demands

Job demands, as Schaufeli and Bakker (2004, p. 296) observed, are 'those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or psychological (i.e., cognitive or emotional) effort and are therefore associated with certain physiological and/or psychological costs. Accordingly, at the beginning of employment, higher education institutions should clarify the expectations for the job, accompanying performance-based benefits and required output to motivate and prepare employees (Kekäle, 2015).

Choosing the Right Person to Carry Out Tasks: Recruitment and Selection

According to Gold (2003, p. 221):

[R]ecruitment is the process of generating a pool of capable people to apply for employment to an organization. Selection is the process by which managers and others use specific instruments to choose from a pool of applicants a person or persons most likely to succeed in the job(s), given management goals and legal requirements.

Recruitment and selection, therefore, help higher education institutions not only identify and attract competent candidates (Julius, 2000; Oladipo & Abdulkadir, 2011), but also ensure that they have 'an adequate supply of HR at all levels and in all positions at the right time and in the right place' (Shobha, 2015, p. 13). Recruitment and selection also link institutional management to the (international) academic profession, since professorial recruitments are typically done utilizing (international) external experts (see e.g. Siekkinen, Pekkola, & Kivistö, 2016).

Defining What Should Be Done by the Faculty: Performance Evaluation

Performance evaluation is a process and practice of assessing, reviewing, and monitoring an employee's job performance within a defined period and then agreeing on a plan for the future (Bright & Williamson, 1995; Shobha, 2015). Although higher education institutions adopt different performance evaluation systems, most performance evaluation processes involve planning and defining expectations, implementation and action and monitoring and reviewing performance (Hall, 2009) and are associated with such indicators as productivity, peer review and internationally reviewed publications (Van den Brink, Fruytier, & Thunnissen, 2013). Furthermore, although performance evaluations are useful tools in monitoring the performance of academic staff, they should be used not only for monitoring and measuring the achievement of objectives, but also providing positive and constructive feedback to the staff (academic, administrative and technical) on how to improve their work (Dubosc & Kelo, 2012). Thus, each higher education institution should create its own performance evaluation system that matches its unique situation and promotes its goals (Shobha, 2015).

Updating Skills and Competences: Training and Development

HR training is one major approach work organizations use to maintain and improve the competence of their workforces and increase their adaptability to changing organizational needs. It attempts to develop a combination of physical, social and cognitive skills to achieve new and effective ways of behaving (Taylor & O'Driscoll, 1998). This may involve changing what employees know, how they work, their attitudes towards their work or their interactions with co-workers and/or supervisors. On the other hand, as DeCenzo and colleagues (DeCenzo, Robbins, & Verhulst, 2010; DeCenzo & Robbins, 1988) noted, employee development focuses on future organizational positions, for which employees require additional competencies. The purpose of development, therefore, is to help the organization ensure that it has the necessary talent internally to meet future human resource needs (DeCenzo et al., 2020, p. 36). HR-related training and development in HE, therefore, is considered an investment (Hall, 2009). It enables higher education institutions to enhance and maintain the quality of their workforces (HEFCE, 2010a; Oladipo & Abdulkadir, 2011) and helps staff reach their optimal potential (Shobha, 2015) and carry out their responsibilities successfully, efficiently and confidently (Böckelmann et al., 2010).

Providing a Horizon: Career Progression

According to HEFCE (2010b, p. 75), career progression involves 'creating career pathways where these do not exist, and better clarity and visibility where they already do'. Some higher education institutions have programmes and/or systems – for example, tailored support and development programmes for postdoctoral staff (Holbeche, 2012), career development fellowships and mentoring and coaching programmes (Archer, 2005) and promotion systems and criteria (Dubosc & Kelo, 2012; Kekäle, 2015) that explicitly support the career progression of their staff (including tenure tracks). Career progression and career systems are also important functions for employer brand and the fairness of employer practices in relation to different personnel categories, especially junior staff (Aarnikoivu, Nokkala, Siekkinen, Kuoppala, & Pekkola, 2019). National and institutional career systems reflect the civil service and labour law traditions of their respective countries (Kivistö, Pekkola, & Pausits, 2019). In addition, career models are primary policy instruments to implement national HR policies (Kuoppakangas et al., 2021), and academic careers and positions are increasingly hybrid and practical, integrating managerial, scientific and innovation policies (Pekkola et al., 2021; Siekkinen, 2019).

Rewarding Good Work: Pay and Benefits

Pay and benefits comprise all the monetary, non-monetary and psychological payments an organization provides its employees in exchange for the work they perform (Bratton, 2003, p. 278). Higher education institutions use various pay and benefits systems to recognize and reward staff achievements and performance (Bright & Williamson, 1995). Popular forms of pay and financial benefits in higher education include basic salaries and performance-related pay, such as market loadings, individualized salaries for senior academic and administrative personnel and performance-based bonuses (e.g., accelerated promotions and funding for further research and conference attendance; Bright & Williamson, 1995; Böckelmann et al., 2010; Nguyen, 2016).

Going beyond Individual Experiences: HR Analysis and Reporting

HR analysis can be defined as 'the use of data, statistical analysis, and explanatory and predictive models to gain insights and act on complex issues' (Bichsel, 2012, p. 6). HR analysis and reporting, therefore, is the process of analysing 'human resource data and metrics to inform organization decisions and influence the strategic planning process' (Aon Hewitt, 2012, p. 6). It also involves reporting the findings of analyses in clear ways to facilitate strategic planning and decision-making regarding not only HRM, but also other organizational issues. In higher education, for example, Julius (2000, p. 48) noted that HR systems 'should provide usable data and analysis to support strategic planning and decision-making regarding not only HRM, but also other organizational activities, such as curriculum development, financial management, teaching, learning and research. Table 18.1 lists the literature used in this review and the relevant EU policies and policy instruments.

Table 18.1 HR functional areas and main findings from the literature review

HRM functional area

HRM functional area	Key literature	EU policy	EU instrument
HR strategy and planning	Archer, 2005; Böckelmann et al., 2010; Dubosc & Kelo, 2012; Evans & Chun, 2012; Guest & Clinton, 2007; Hall, 2009; Lanchbery, 1995	European Charter for Researchers (EC, 2005b); CCRR, Renewed EU Agenda (EC, 2017b)	HRS4R (EU, 2015); Peer Learning and Peer Counselling
Job demands	Kekäle, 2015; Rothmann & Joubert, 2007	CCRR (EC, 2005b); European Framework for Research Careers (EC, 2011b)	HRS4R (EU, 2015)
Recruitment and selection	Archer, 2005; Arnhold, Pekkola, Püttmann, & Sursock, 2018; Kivistö et al., 2019; Crothall, Callan, & Härtel, 1997; Dubosc & Kelo, 2012; Metcalf et al., 2005; Nestor, 1995; Siekkinen et al., 2016; Van den Brink et al., 2013	CCRR (EC, 2005b)	HRS4R (EU, 2015); EURAXESS (EURAXESS, 2016)
Performance evaluation	Archer, 2005; Bright & Williamson, 1995; Dubosc & Kelo, 2012; Evans & Chun, 2012; Kekäle, 2015; Kivistö et al., 2019; Shobha, 2015	European Charter for Researchers (EC, 2005b)	–
Training and development	Archer, 2005; Böckelmann et al., 2010; Dubosc & Kelo, 2012; Hall, 2009; HEFCE, 2010a; Nguyen, 2016; Oladipo & Abdulkadir, 2011; Shobha, 2015	European Charter for Researchers (EC, 2005b); Renewed EU Agenda (EC, 2017b)	Information/Erasmus+ Initiatives, European Social Fund (ESF)
Career progression	Aarnikoivu et al., 2019; Archer, 2005; Dubosc & Kelo, 2012; HEFCE, 2010b; Kekäle, 2015; Kuoppakangas et al., 2021; Pekkola et al., 2021; Siekkinen, 2019	European Framework for Research Careers (EC, 2011b); Renewed EU Agenda (EC, 2017b)	ERC Funding Schemes; Horizon 2020; EURAXESS (EURAXESS, 2016)
Pay and benefits	Bright & Williamson, 1995; Böckelmann et al., 2010; Julius, 2000; Nguyen, 2016; Shobha, 2015	CCRR (EC 2005b); Renewed EU Agenda (EC, 2017b)	–
HR analyses and reporting	Aon Hewitt, 2012; Bichsel, 2012	–	–

In subsequent sections, these will be analysed by functional area. The presented eight dimensions cover the main HR functions in higher education and define not only the functional areas of the respective HR departments, but also the structures, procedures, tasks, and related processes of higher education institutions. These dimensions are similar to the HR objectives of other organizations (e.g. businesses). Related tasks must be adapted to the organizational context and implemented into higher education institutions' three main missions: research, education and the third mission. Research performance measures (e.g. publication outputs) are often prominent relative to those of education (e.g. number of offered classes or credits), or activities in community engagement, volunteer work or technology and knowledge transfer. This institutional complexity and diverse set of activities must be built into the HR dimensions, and linked across units (academic and administrative), and faculties. HR is an important prerequisite for transforming higher education institutions from loosely coupled organizations (Weick, 1976) to integrated ones (Maassen & Olsen, 2007). As higher education institutions become more and more autonomous organizations HR functions have been shifted from the ministries responsible for higher education to the institutions. Such a shift requires an adaptive HR in general and specific to the needs of the institutions regarding HR functions in detail. According to the specificities of higher education institutions, there are a number of implications for HR as well:

Ownership and legal status: A large variety of different institutional types (e.g. public, private, and public-private) and sectors (e.g. universities, universities of applied sciences) leads to different implementations regarding HR functions at single institutions. Therefore, there is not one concept of

HRM for higher education institutions. Instead, there is a variety of institutionalized HRM within one higher education system and across institutions. In some cases, even within the higher education institution (e.g. non-integrated universities in Croatia where faculties act as independent bodies).

Influence of legislation and regulatory bodies over HRM policies: A large variety of legal frameworks for and in higher education (e.g. one law for all or different frameworks at sectoral level) requires very specific and different regulatory structures at system and institutional level. The influence of policies may differ from sector to sector or from institution to institution.

Balanced against a high level of autonomy: Higher autonomy of institutions leads to more freedom to implement HRM policies and practices. However, a large set of similar attitudes and attributes, including the mission and overall outcomes, tend to be similar. This 'cohesive power' of the organismal type 'higher education institution' calls for a harmonization of HR practices (the same tasks everywhere), and at the very same time requires institutionalized HRM to achieve institutional goals and strategies.

Collective bargaining and collective agreements: In order to find a balance between institutional freedom and the nature of a public organization, higher education systems introduced a number of instruments and use specific mechanisms to manage the shift from 'government to governance'. One of the most common and highly important instruments for HR is the so-called collective agreement. This is a structural framework for different staff categories, influential for defined career progression and salary systems.

The unique characteristics of the academic profession: The core power of higher institutions are the professors. They are the main group for knowledge creation and transfer. Professors are very specific in comparison to other organizations in terms of promotion (e.g. tenure track) or working conditions (e.g. level of freedom) just to mention some. These characteristics of the core and most important staff group were the driving forces for HR in the past. However, in the meantime due to the enlarged functions of higher education institutions (e.g. third mission), and driven by concepts such as new public management, additional (supportive) functions, and new staff groups (e.g. new higher education professionals) need to be reflected in HRM too. The unique characteristics of the institutions are highly influenced by the recent development of the profession(s), but the vital focus is still on the 'professorship' as the core source of the institutions.

EU POLICIES AND THEIR RELEVANCE FOR HRM FUNCTIONS

The EU lacks competencies within the fields of higher education and public staffing. Thus, EU policies are usually implemented through open coordination and financial incentives. However, the EU has great interest in the academic workforce because it is a key instrument in developing a knowledge-intensive economy and promoting the free movement of knowledge as a means of production in internal European markets. One example is the European Commission's (2005a) communication 'Mobilising the brainpower of Europe: Enabling universities to make their full contribution to the Lisbon Strategy'. It acknowledges that 'universities should be responsible for [...] managing and developing their human resources' (p. 7f) and mentions, in a broad sense, the following '[f]actors to strengthen human resources':

- Excellence can only emerge from a favourable professional environment based on open, transparent and competitive procedures;
- Vacancies, at least for rectors, deans, professors and researchers, should be advertised publicly and, where possible, internationally;

- Researchers should be treated as professionals from the early stages of their career;
- Physical and virtual mobility (whether across boundaries or between university and industry) and innovation leading to, for example, university spin-offs should be encouraged and rewarded; and
- Compensation should reward quality and achievement in the performance of all tasks, including a share of income from research contracts, consultancies, patents, etc. (p. 6; bullet point listing introduced by the authors).

The Commission's (2011a) communication to the European Parliament entitled 'Supporting growth and jobs – An agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems' mentions as 'key policy issues for Member states and higher education institutions': '[I]ncentives for higher education institutions to invest in continuous professional development for their staff, recruit sufficient staff to develop emerging disciplines and reward excellence in teaching' (p. 6) and:

[Encouragement for] institutions to modernise their human resource management and obtain the HR Excellence in Research logo and to implement the recommendations of the Helsinki Group on Women in Science. (p. 9)

Further, the communication emphasizes the need for higher education institutions to engage in 'transparent and fair recruitment procedures, better initial and continuing professional development, and better recognition and reward of teaching and research excellence' (p. 5) to attract and retain excellent staff.

The European Policy Cooperation (also called ET 2020) is a strategic framework for education and training designed to help EU Member States exchange best practices and learn from one another. ET 2020 focuses on lifelong learning and the mobility, quality and efficiency of education and training. It further promotes equity, social cohesion and active citizenship, and it strives to enhance creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship at all levels of education and training, including higher education. To achieve this aim, the European Commission publishes a yearly report called the Education and Training Monitor. However, neither the framework nor the associated monitoring of the defined policy targets (cf. European Commission, 2019) relates to the issues of HRM in higher education.

To develop a more inclusive, cohesive, and competitive Europe, at the 2017 Gothenburg Social Summit, the European Commission presented a new vision of a European Education Area 2025 guaranteeing the free movement of learners by 2025. To implement this vision in higher education, the European Commission (2017a) defined three key priorities: a network of European universities, the automatic mutual recognition of diplomas, and a European student card. Through its Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020 programmes, the EU has developed a strong focus on the international exchange of students, academic staff, and researchers.

Further, structured cooperation between higher education institutions and public authorities in different countries should improve higher education in Europe. The objective to learn from one another across national borders and to work together on joint projects to develop good learning and teaching, undertake excellent research and promote innovation has a strong HR relevance. In relation to human resource management, we can assert that such peer learning activities and joint projects are instruments for staff development.

The Renewed EU Agenda (EC, 2017b) for higher education also underlines the importance of adequate and efficiently deployed human and financial resources, as well as the use of incentives and reward systems. This policy document relies on the efforts and competences of the scientific staff at higher

education institutions and stresses the significance of good working conditions, better initial training and continued professional development. Greater recognition of teaching and research excellence is fundamental to developing, attracting, and retaining high-quality academic staff in Europe.

As the demands on higher education are increasing, HRM is central to develop the capacities to achieve the defined new targets. Yet it is neglected in higher education policy and institutional practices (OECD, 2020). However, recent policy initiatives highlight the relevance of key policy aspects in higher education. The European Commission's (2018) study 'Promoting the relevance of higher education' argues that higher education remains relevant if it promotes sustainable employment, fosters personal development, and encourages active citizenship. Although the study primarily refers to the institutions' core missions, these cannot be achieved without further investment in HR.

The publication 'European Research Area (ERA) Roadmap 2015–2020' (European Commission, 2015) offers suggestions that may affect the recruitment of researchers. For example, it suggests '[u]sing open, transparent and merit-based recruitment practices with regard to research positions' (European Commission, 2015, p. 12) and directly refers to 'The Researcher's Charter and the Code of Conduct for Recruitment of Researchers' (Charter & Code) as another important policy document (see below).

The document 'Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area —ESG' (2015) provides guidance for quality assurance in European higher education and indirectly refers to HRM issues. With respect to teaching staff, it notes that '[i]nstitutions should assure themselves of the competence of their teachers. They should apply fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the staff' (Standards and Guidelines, 2015, p. 13). The document further explains the importance of a 'supportive environment' for teachers in higher education and emphasizes 'transparent and fair processes for staff recruitment' and 'professional development of teaching staff' (Standards and Guidelines, 2015, p. 13). The so-called Yerevan Communiqué (2015) indirectly promotes HRM in higher education by referring to the human resource potential in general. Similarly, the 2018 Paris Communiqué strongly emphasizes the importance of development and career aspects for teachers by recognizing that 'high quality teaching is essential in fostering high quality education'. For this reason, the Communiqué urged supporting 'institutional, national and European initiatives for pedagogical training, continuous professional development of higher education teachers and explore ways for better recognition of high quality and innovative teaching in their career' (Paris Communiqué, 2018, p. 4).

Since its establishment in 2015, the ESG has become, for almost all European quality assurance agencies, the guiding principles for accreditation and quality enhancement initiatives. The two key HR dimensions – recruitment and HR development – are not only key to national quality assurance models, but also important drivers of national policy initiatives, including several governments' reforms (e.g. amendments to higher education acts). Alongside academic career progress and pathways, these two dimensions have not only been fundamental, but also influential for higher education development in recent years. Unsurprisingly, the most relevant EU policy document with respect to HRM in higher education focuses on researchers and research careers. Specifically, the European Commission's (2005b) Charter & Code publication aims to promote goals for the European Research Area.

The Charter ('The European Charter for Researchers'; European Commission, 2005b) consists of two sets of principles: one for researchers and one for employers and funders. The principles include issues relevant to HRM, such as reminding researchers of the importance of continuing professional development (European Commission, 2005b, p. 15) and of 'keeping records of all work progress' (European Commission, 2005b, p. 14), which can be used for performance evaluation. With respect to

principles for employers, the European Commission's (2005b) Charter stresses the importance of 'stability of employment conditions' (p. 17), warning of the disadvantages of fixed-term contracts, and advises employers to:

- 'draw up, preferably within the framework of their human resources management, a specific career development strategy for researchers at all stages of their career' (p. 18);
- offer possibilities for (research) training and professional development (p. 19);
- offer their researchers 'career advice and job placement assistance' (p. 20); and
- utilize systems of staff evaluation and appraisal (p. 21).

The Charter is more precise with respect to the HRM topic of 'funding and salaries': 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 (European Commission, 2005b, p. 18).

The Code ('Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers'; European Commission, 2005b) focuses only on the recruitment and selection of researchers, suggesting that '[e]mployers and/or funders should establish recruitment procedures which are open, efficient, transparent, supportive and internationally comparable, as well as tailored to the type of positions advertised' (p. 24). To promote the Charter & Code, the European Commission has developed the Human Resources Strategy for Researchers (HRS4R) process (EURAXESS, 2016). Higher education institutions that commit to adopting the principles of the Charter & Code are granted the right to use the HRS4R logo, which may increase their attractiveness to researchers and, thus, offer a competitive advantage in staff recruitment. Together, the Charter & Code and the HRS4R process form additional measures of HRM in higher education at the European level.

POLICY INITIATIVES: DIRECT AND INDIRECT IMPLICATIONS FOR HRM FUNCTIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Human Resource Strategy and Planning

Interestingly, despite the overall trend of strong autonomy of higher education institutions in personnel issues, the EU also has ambitions in HR strategy and planning. Given the connection between the Charter & Code and the HRS4R, the EU (2015, p. 8) supports:

Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) and Research Funding Organisations (RFOs), [...] in the implementation of the principles of the Charter for Researchers & the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers (the Charter and Code) in their policies and practices. The concrete implementation of the Charter and Code by RPOs and RFOs renders them more attractive to researchers looking for their first or new employer or for a host for their research project. Research Funding Organisations implementing the Charter and Code principles will contribute to the attractiveness of their national research systems and to the attractiveness of the European Research Area. The HRS4R award identifies organisations as providers and supporters of a stimulating and

favourable working environment.

Job Demands

European policy documents refer to the HRM functional area of job demands only for academic staff (i.e., researchers). The European framework for research careers defines and describes 'four broad profiles for researchers' (European Commission, 2011b, p. 6). The Charter further suggests clearly specifying 'entry and admission standards for researchers' (European Commission, 2005b, p. 23), hinting at the specification of academic and other qualifications related to the assigned tasks and performance expected of new employees. However, it seems that the policy focuses mainly on researchers and pays little attention to other employees in different categories. These are management and administrative staff or those who have a teaching only contracts (e.g. lecturers). Higher education institutions have enlarged their staff functions and introduced also new categories. These led to a further diversification of the employment (e.g. different staff categories in collective agreements) and new types (e.g. third space worker) at higher education institutions.

Recruitment and Selection

The EU has a concrete interest in influencing recruitment practices to create a common European labour market. The portal EURAXESS supports this aim by facilitating international (European) recruitment and promoting the HRS4R process (<https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/hrs4r>). The HRM functional area of recruitment and selection is the one most often addressed in policy documents on the European level; however, quantity and quality differ considerably. While the Code (European Commission, 2015a) is solely dedicated to recruitment, other documents only briefly mention it (European Commission, 2005a, 2011a, 2015; Standards and Guidelines, 2015), most often using the wording 'transparent and fair recruitment'.

Performance Evaluation

On the level of EU policy, only the Charter & Code (European Commission, 2005b) refers to performance evaluation by recommending staff evaluation and appraisal. No further details are given.

Training and Development

A number of EU policy documents address training and development in a general way (e.g., by calling on higher education institutions to care for the professional development of their staff; European Commission, 2005b, 2011a; Standards and Guidelines, 2015). No further details are given.

Career Progression

The EU is also interested in harmonizing career structures. This objective is best seen in the so-called 'policy spin impact', where policy objectives are legitimized through policy interaction between national and European actors. Many European arenas, such as the European Science Foundation, have discussed the Finnish universities' four-stage career model, and higher education institutions impact of this can be seen in the European career framework (European Commission, 2011b). This model has been supplemented with career criteria and introduced into the European funding schemes.

Pay and Benefits

On the EU level, policy offers concise information on the issue of pay and benefits. The Charter & Code suggests that 'compensation should reward quality and achievement in the performance of all tasks, including a share of income from research contracts, consultancies, patents, etc.' (European

Commission, 2005a, p. 6). The Charter & Code also suggest that salaries be fair, attractive, and connected to performance and explicitly mentions 'social security provisions' as an important aspect of pay and benefits (European Commission, 2005b, p. 18).

HR Analysis and Reporting

From the national point of view, HR analysis and reporting is gaining prominence as an HRM function. While staffing autonomy is increasing, the role of information and 'soft law type' steering is becoming increasingly important. European policy documents do not reference the HRM functional area of HR analysis and reporting. This functional area is likely regarded as technical, strategically unimportant, and sufficiently steered at the national level.

Table 18.2 summarizes the dimensions of HRM, recommendations based on the literature and EU policy documentation.

Table 18.2 Summary of the dimensions of HRM and recommendations from the literature and EU policy documentation

HR strategy and planning	Align staffing and institutional vision	Align personnel policies with institutional strategy. Ensure top management commitment for personnel planning.	Higher education institutions shall acquire the HRS4R award to increase their attractiveness as employers.
<i>Job demands</i>	Define the post, tasks, and division of labor	Provide transparent descriptions of tasks and expected responsibilities.	Higher education institutions shall clearly specify entry and admission standards for researchers.
<i>Recruitment and selection</i>	Choose the right person(s) for the right tasks	Consider recruitment to be the most important investment of the institution.	Higher education institutions shall employ transparent and fair recruiting processes and use the EURAXESS portal to support international recruitment.
<i>Performance evaluation</i>	Define what is important	Measure all relevant aspects of academic work in a balanced manner. Focus particularly on research, teaching and administrative tasks.	Higher education institutions shall make use of staff evaluation and appraisal.
<i>Training and development</i>	Ensure organizational competences	Ensure academic work is all about learning. Motivate personnel to participate in job-related trainings. Connect well-organized training to academic career development.	Higher education institutions shall care for professional development of their staff.
<i>Career progression</i>	Motivate and support	Ensure that academic managers have the competence and time to plan and discuss academic careers. Provide individual support to plan and discuss careers.	Higher education institutions shall design career stages with transparent career criteria to meet the requirements of European funding schemes and to compete for staff.
<i>Pay and benefits</i>	Reward work performance	Ensure that fair and transparent pay and benefits are aligned with institutional strategies and job descriptions.	Higher education institutions shall offer attractive and fair pay and benefits (e.g., salaries), including social security provisions, and reward quality and achievement in all tasks, including by offering a share of income from research contracts, consultancies, patents, etc.
<i>HR analysis and reporting</i>	Benchmark for individual needs and desires	Ensure that academic managers have aggregated information on their staff and performance.	—

EU policy initiatives are translated in a relatively small number of governance instruments. Due to universities' autonomy, shared governance models concentrate on a small number of key instruments. However, system-wide government development plans set overall goals and define, at a minimum, mid-term perspectives regarding focus and targets. Hence, while EU (higher education) policies lack a significant focus on HR, national (higher education) policies offer strong and detailed policy formation objectives and determined conceptualizations of HR goals. As a result, institutional HR implementation is defined primarily by national policy goals, rather than generic EU policies.

HRM in higher education is rarely addressed explicitly in European-level policies. Nevertheless, some other issues are clearly identified as priorities in European higher education. For instance, the EU focuses heavily on improving working conditions, pay and benefits, and career progression paths to increase the attractiveness of academic careers to young talents. In addition, personnel training and development have received attention due to the need to enhance teaching and research, since professionalizing teaching activities leads to an improvement in the quality of education.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Higher education institutions have specific characteristics that significantly differentiate them from companies and other institutions. These characteristics are important for HRM and, therefore, should be considered in the process of designing and implementing HRM in higher education institutions. They include: ownership structure and legal status; influence of legislation and regulatory bodies over HRM policies, balanced against a high level of autonomy; collective bargaining and collective agreements; the unique characteristics of the academic profession. These factors significantly determine (and often restrict) the development and implementation of HRM practices in higher education institutions. Processes related to recruiting, selecting, training, developing, and evaluating staff are major priorities, as is securing convincing prospects for career progression and competitive payments and benefits for employees. In other words, today, more than ever, HRM in higher education institutions must be strategically planned at all operational levels to ensure the success of the organization and its contribution to the objectives of the Europe 2020 Strategy. HRM and the organizational performance of higher education institutions must be interlinked, since HRM practices impact academic and administrative staff. Specifically, HR practices directly and indirectly affect staff competences, motivation, opportunities to contribute and commitment (Guest & Clinton, 2007).

Based on the reviewed higher education literature, we find that, although all discussed functional areas of HRM support the effective utilization and management of HR in any higher education institution, not all functional areas are given the same emphasis. The most discussed functional areas are recruitment and selection, performance evaluation, training and development and pay and benefits. Other functions, such as HR strategy and planning, career progression, and employee relations, are discussed in some publications, but not most. The least studied and discussed functional area is job demands, despite the crucial role of job demands in the success of other functional areas, such as performance evaluations, pay and benefits, training and development and career progression. However, the defined framework and related functions as well as some higher education specific aspects provides a good overview for policy makers to connect and reflect their intended goals and implications for or through HRM. Those functions, which are less or not sufficiently discussed in the literature nor connected to recent research, need specific attention in higher education research. As in the past, functions relying on scientific evidence or data informed developments have a higher potential to be used and applied in higher education. This may be one of the specificities of HRM in higher education relative to other sectors, such as the business sector.

Our starting point was to look at the connections between HRM and poly formation in Europe. Based on the given empirical work, we can say that HRM issues represent an emerging policy field within the scope of European higher education policies. EU-level actors are particularly interested in harmonizing career practices across Europe to develop European academic labour markets. Against this background, EU-level policy documents address issues of HRM in higher education by connecting them to 'larger' topics, such as employment and innovation. Only rarely do these policies offer detail or provide higher education institutions accurate advice on how to address specific issues. We assume that HR in general and the management of HR at higher education in particular need more dedicated attention in future educational as well as other policies. Even though HRM is one of the enablers to meet the defined targets and expectations in those policies, policies should be more precise when referring to HR and indicating the importance of HR. First, if the HR relevant aspects are well described, then the implication of the policies is more precise. The implementation procedures could then reflect better the intended goals by paying attention to the HR dimensions. Second, in higher education HR are a costly element in any change or development process. It is worthwhile to address them carefully and precisely in policies by taking advantage of HR functions and services. Third, as not all HR functions are well developed nor improved at higher education institutions it is crucial that higher education

research pays more attention to all HR functions in higher education.

We can further note that the eight HRM functional areas receive different levels of attention in EU-level policy. The functional area most often mentioned – and, in some policy documents, described in detail, including recommendations for first steps in higher education institutions – is that of recruitment and selection. However, several functional areas are referenced only brief and/or broad terms, preventing higher education institutions from drawing from EU-level policy and reverting instead to national policy.

REFERENCES

Aarnikoivu, M., Nokkala, T., Siekkinen, T., Kuoppala, K., & Pekkola, E. (2019). Working outside academia? Perceptions of early-career, fixed-term researchers on changing careers. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 9(2), 172–189.

Aon Hewitt (2012). Higher Education Survey: The State of HR Effectiveness. <https://2012/6/ers1207.pdf?la=en&hash=B6E84D1B3A1A0921609BF64F298D741297DA3006>.

Böckelmann, C., Reif, L., & Fröhlich, M. (2010). Human resources management. In J. Huisman & A. Pausits (Eds.), *Higher Education Management and Development: Compendium for Managers* (pp. 159–173). Münster: Waxmann.

Bratton, J. (2003). Reward management. In J. Bratton & J. Gold (Eds.), *Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice* (3rd edition) (pp. 276–315). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bright, D., & Williamson, B. (1995). Managing and rewarding performance. In D. Warner & E.

Crosthwaite (Eds.), *Human Resource Management in Higher and Further Education* (pp. 70–85). London: Society for Research into Higher Education.

Crosthwaite, E., & Warner, D. (1995). Setting the scene. In D. Warner & E. Crosthwaite (Eds.), *Human Resource Management in Higher and Further Education* (pp. 1–6). London: Society for Research into Higher Education.

Crothall, J., Callan, V., & Härtel, C. E. J. (1997). Recruitment and selection of academic staff: Perceptions of department heads and job applicants. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 19(2), 99–110.

DeCenzo, D. A., & Robbins, S. P. (1988). *Personnel/Human Resource Management* (3rd edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

DeCenzo, D. A., Robbins, S. P., & Verhulst, S. L. (2010). *Human Resource Management: International Student Version* (10th edition). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Dubosc, F., & Kelo, M. (2012). *Human Resource Management in Public Higher Education in the Tempus Partner Countries*. Brussels: European Commission.

EURAXESS (2016). Draft Guidelines to the Implementation of the ‘Strengthened’ Human Resources Strategy for Researchers. <https://cdn4.euraxess.org/sites/default/>

52011DC0567&from=en.

European Commission (2011b). Towards a European Framework for Researchers. https://era.gv.at/object/et2020-framework_en.

European Commission (2017b). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on a Renewed EU Agenda for Higher Education. <https://59d3a999-84b9-11e8-ac6a-01aa75ed71a1>.

European Commission (2019). Education and Training Monitor 2019. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Evans, A., & Chun, E. (2012). Creating a tipping point: Strategic human resources in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 38(1), 1–143.

Gold, J. (2003). Recruitment and selection. In J. Bratton & J. Gold (Eds.), *Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice* (3rd edition) (pp. 221–248). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Guest, D. E., & Clinton, M. (2007). *Human Resource Management and University Performance*. Report in the Research and Development series. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Hall, A. (2009). *Getting to Grips with Human Resource Management: Resources for Governors of UK Universities and HE Colleges*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) (2010a). *The Higher Education Workforce Framework 2010: Overview Report*. Bristol: HEFCE. <http://www.theeuropeanlibrary.in%20UK%20universities%20%28print%20version%29.pdf>.

Huxley, L., & Hall, V. (1996). Human resource management in higher education: Idiom and incidence. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 1(1), 77–85.

Julius, D. J. (2000). Human resources. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2000(111), 45–54.

Kekäle, J. (2015). A human resources model supporting academic excellence. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 21(2), 160–171.

Kivistö, J., Pekkola, E., & Pausits, A. (2019). Academic careers and promotions in Finland and Austria: System and institutional perspectives. In M. Teoksessa Mahat & J. Tatebe (Eds.), *Achieving Academic Promotion* (pp. 105–125). Bingley: Emerald.

Kuoppakangas, P., Suomi, K., Pekkola, E., Kivistö, J., Kallio, T., & Stenvall, J. (2021). Theoretical, practical and hybrid ex-academics: Career transfer stories. *European Educational Research Journal*, 20(1), 14–41.

Lanchbery, E. (1995). Developing a human resource strategy. In D. Warner & E. Crosthwaite (Eds.), *Human Resource Management in Higher and Further Education* (pp. 20–31). London: Society for Research into Higher Education.

Maassen, P., & Olsen, J. P. (Eds.) (2007). *University Dynamics and European Integration*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Metcalf, H., Rolfe, H., Stevens, P., & Weale, M. (2005). Recruitment and Retention of Academic Staff in Higher Education. Research Report No. 658. National Institute of Economic and Social Research. <http://.azvo.hr/results>.

Pekkola, E., Pinheiro, R., Geschwind, L., Siekkinen, T., Carvalho, T., & Pulkkinen, K. (2021). Nested hybridity and value definition in public higher education. In J. Vakkuri and J. Johanson (Eds.), *Hybrid Governance, Organisations and Society: Value Creation Perspectives* (pp. 59–80). Abingdon: Routledge.

Rothmann, S., & Joubert, J. H. M. (2007). Job demands, job resources, burnout and work engagement of managers at a platinum mine in the North West Province. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 38(3), 49–61.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. R. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 258, 293–315.

Shobha, A. M. (2015). HRM in higher education: The need of the hour. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 5 (6 Version 2), 12–14.

Siekkinen, T. (2019). The changing relationship between the academic profession and universities in Finnish higher education. *Studies 35*, Academic dissertation, Finnish Institute for Educational Research.

Taylor, P. J., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (1998). A new integrated framework for training needs analysis. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 8(2), 29–50.

Van den Brink, M. C. L., Fruytier, B. G. M., & Thunnissen, M. (2013). Talent management in academia: Performance systems and HRM policies. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 23(2), 180–195.

Waring, M. (2013). All in this together? HRM and the individualisation of the academic worker. *Higher Education Policy*, 26(3), 397–419.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(1), 1–19.

Yerevan Communiqué (2015). http://www.ehea.info/media.ehea.info/file/2015_Yerevan/70/7/YerevanCommuniqueFinal_613707.pdf