

Temat: EURAXESS - HRS4R Renewal Phase External Assessment EC Consensus Outcome

Nadawca: EURAXESS <noreply@euraxess.org>

Data: 2023-08-11, 15:09

Adresat: pkra@igr.poznan.pl

EURAXESS - HRS4R Renewal Phase External Assessment EC Consensus Outcome

Dear Madam, Sir, After consultation with our assessors' team, we can now get back to you regarding your application to enter the renewal phase of the HRS4R process. We are pleased to say that the assessors welcomed the care taken in aligning your institution's HR practices with those of the Charter and Code principles. Your institution's comprehensive analysis and action plan meet all the requirements of progress and quality of your institution's HR policies. Please check your HRS4R dashboard of the e-tool where you can find the consensus report form including comments and suggestions from the assessors to be considered within the next period. Your institution can continue to use the 'HR Excellence in Research' award to help promote itself as a provider of a stimulating and favourable work environment for researchers. Please visit your [HRS4R Dashboard](#) to download the HR award icon in different formats together with the graphic guidelines. Please keep in mind that all relevant information you might need is available on the EURAXESS website: <https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/hrs4r> **As your organisation successfully passed into the Award Renewal phase, the Award will be renewed on a three-year cycle, subject to a process of internal institutional review accompanied by desk-based assessment and (possible) site visit.** Therefore, within three years from now, your organisation is deemed to undertake a further Internal Review of the HR policies (action plan /still existing gaps), and show evidence of embedding the HRS4R strategy and the OTM-R in the institution's policies. **We wish you every success in continuing to implement the Human Resources Strategy for Researchers at your institution and look forward to learning about your achievements and further proposed quality actions in 36 months from now.** HRS4R case workflow can be viewed [here](#). Best regards, The EURAXESS Rights team RTD-CHARTER@ec.europa.eu

The European Commission is committed to personal data protection. Any personal data is processed in line with the Regulation (EC)45/2001. All personal information processed by the Directorate-General for Research and Innovation is treated accordingly.

EURAXESS

Renewal Phase Assessment Without Site Visit - EC Consensus Report

Case number

2019PL368249

Name Organisation under assessment

Institute of Plant Genetics PAS

Organisation's contact details

34 Strzeszynska street, Poznan, 60-479, Poland

Submission date of the Internal Review

16/03/2023

Submission date to the European Commission

11/08/2023

Quality assessment

The quality assessment evaluates the level of ambition and the quality of progress intended by the organisation.

If any statements have prompted a "no" or "partly" in the evaluation, please provide recommendations:

	YES / NO / PARTLY	Recommendations
Has the organisational information been sufficiently updated to understand the context in which the HR Strategy is implemented?	Yes	The HRS4R progress phases and subsequent updates are clearly documented in the dedicated section of the website, including strategic documents and respective Directors' orders. A nice overview of the current status and timeline is also included in the Implementation section, together with relevant links to the HRS4R award and the institute's job announcements.
Does the narrative provided list goals and objectives which clearly indicate the organisation's priorities in HR-management for researchers?	Yes	The organisation is very clear about their objectives under HRS4R
Has the organisation published an updated HR Strategy and Action Plan been updated with the actions' current status, additions and/or modifications?	Yes	The Institute has updated a number of Actions, including the onset of three new actions on Equality, professional accountability, and internal communication, which had been set for extension in prior assessments. However, more detail on the timeline and links to corresponding indicators would be useful
Is the implementation of the HR strategy and Action Plan sufficiently embedded within the organisation's management structure (e.g. steering committee, operational responsibilities) so as to guarantee a solid implementation?	Yes	HRS4R seems to be sufficiently embedded, as the new Director is committed to interviewing research processes and publishing orders relative to HRS4R implementation, and also several Deputy Directors and Chiefs of departments are involved

	YES / NO / PARTLY	Recommendations
Is the OTM-R policy in place and publicly available?	Yes	The OTM-R policy is now published and accessible among other strategic documents of the HRS4R process

During the transition period special conditions apply:

Institutions having started the HRS4R implementation prior to the publication of the OTM-R toolkit and recommendations by the European Commission (2015) may not have prioritised actions implementing the OTM-R principles yet. In this case, they should not be penalised but strong recommendations should be made to address these principles appropriately.

Strengths and weaknesses

On the basis of the information submitted and taking into account the organisation's national research context, how would you as an assessor judge the HR Strategy's **strengths and weaknesses?** (maximum 1000 words)

What this organisation has done (considering the starting place) is remarkable. The organisation has incorporated OTMR, put in place mentoring programmes and is working on gender plans and inclusivity for all. The organisation was badly effected by the pandemic. Probably due to its size and the critical issue of funding yet, they have put a robust application in place.

A lot of effort has been done towards guaranteeing ethical and professional aspects, being integrity, inclusiveness and equality transversal and present in several initiatives. Recruitment and selection are also well addressed, strengthening transparency and a healthy feedback culture, which works towards a nurturing professional environment.

A significant increase in the presence of young researchers in different steering bodies is relevant. Still, external funding remains the only source to support research.

There has also been development in the area of internal communication, with the adoption of both an electronic document management system, and a Virtual grant office to provide support and training.

On the other hand the AP 2022/2024 could have been more ambitious, as it contains 11 actions, out of which three are new, while the other ones are extension of the previous ones. This is due to a conservative approach that was adopted as consequence of two external factors, such as the economic crisis deriving from the COVID pandemic and the ongoing war in Ukraine. Moreover funds at national level have been decreased making it difficult to implement some actions, such as creating an access to the institution for disabled people. IPG PAS will reapply for national funds but it is worth saying that in the meantime a plan B was realized, putting at disposal of disabled people offices on the groundfloor.

If relevant, please provide suggestions for modifications or revisions to the (updated) HR strategy: (maximum 2000 words)

Even though the OTMR policy is published it would be good to see this expanded a little more with links (perhaps) to where the roles are advertised or any other recruitment policies.

Some more detail on indicators and key achievements, especially regarding updated and extended actions would be advisable. Links to means of verification would be helpful.

Thanks to the obtaining of additional funds at a national and international level and the desirable end of the emergencies and the consequent instability that has characterized the last period for Europe, it is hoped that the Institute of Plant Genetics Polish Academy of Sciences will be able to elaborate an Action Plan with the inclusion of more new actions aimed at continuing to increase international collaborations, becoming a point of reference for the European research area and a competitive and supportive employer for its researchers.

General Assessment

Which of the below situations describes the organisation's progress most accurately? Tick the right situation regarding the award renewal application:.

Accepted



Pending **minor** modifications



Pending **major revisions**



Explanation

- **Accepted:** The organisation is progressing with appropriate and quality actions as described in its Action Plan. **There is evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded. The next assessment will take place in 36 months.**
- Pending **minor** modifications: The organisation is, for the most part, progressing with

appropriate and quality actions as described in its Action Plan, but could benefit from alterations as advised through the Assessment process. **There is some evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded.**

The institution is requested to submit within 2 months a revised file taking into account the recommendations of the assessors.

- Pending **major revisions**: The organisation is not deemed to be implementing appropriate and quality actions and this raises some concern for the future efforts to implement actions closely aligned to the Charter and Code. **There is a lack of evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded.**
The institution is requested to submit within 12 months a revised file taking into account the recommendations of the assessors.
Until then, the HR Award will be put as "pending".

General Recommendations

If any of the above statements have prompted a "no" in the evaluation, please provide suggestions of modifications in the form below.

- If the general assessment is "pending minor modifications" the recommendations are split into:
 - Immediate mandatory recommendations (to be implemented for award renewal, resubmission within 2 months)
 - Other recommendations (to be carried out during the award renewal phase).
- If the general assessment is "pending major revisions" the recommendations are split into:
 - Mandatory recommendations (to be implemented for award renewal, resubmission within 12 months)
 - Other recommendations

Recommendations *

As consequence of the site visit a new webpage and a intranet access for the staff were created. The webpage is easy to find and consult, but it is recommended to keep it updated. The implementation process, for example, is described until 2019.

The conservative approach as consequence of the lack of funds is understandable, but the Action Plan could have been a little bolder by inserting a few more actions, which do not require external fundings. Given the recent creation of a grant office, for example, they could try to encourage the submission of projects or to promote the attraction of foreign researchers considering the creation of an international doctoral school.

Include some links to means of evidence and indicators of achievement in the action plan.

Include job postings in a IPG PAS Euraxess profile to increase mobility and attract international talent.

However, keep doing what you can as an organisation. Every step no matter how small is part of the whole process. I am impressed with the dedication shown considering the lack of funding and the pandemic.

If the organisation deserves to be commended on their ambition, their actions, evidence of good practice and/or their implementation process, please provide a commentary supporting this. (max. 2000 words)

The following good practices have been detected:

The interest in Gender equality and the adoption of the GEP despite the fact that no critical issues have been identified in this sense by the researchers shows the attention of IPG PAS for gender equality and inclusiveness

- the involvement of the scientific community in the HR process (Participation of R1-R2 representatives in the meetings of Senior Researchers Board, Creation of focus groups to discuss about C&C principles and new AP)
- the attempt to find creative solutions to carry out the proposed actions, even when difficulties arise, e.f due to the lack of Ministerial funds
- the commitment to offer competitive working conditions and a good working environment for tis researchers
- more than half of the annual budget is results from competitive government-sourced funding (designated for research, obtained in competition with other organisations – including EU funding)
- the establishment of an International Doctoral School.

Well done on the submission and congratulations on an excellent result.