“HR excellence in research” award

What to know about?

• Visegrad 4 Liaison offices for Research
  KoWI, Brussels, 6th Dec. 2018
The ERA objectives

« The ultimate political goal is to contribute to the development of an attractive, open and sustainable European labour market for researchers, where the framework conditions allow for recruiting and retaining high quality researchers in environments conducive of effective performance and productivity »

« ... Europe must dramatically improve its attractiveness to researchers and strengthen the participation of women researchers by helping to create the necessary conditions for more sustainable and appealing careers for them in R&D »

« Member states should endeavour to offer researchers sustainable career development systems at all career stage, regardless of their contractual situation and of the chosen R&D career path, and they should endeavour to ensure that researchers are treated as professional and as an integral part of the institution in which they work »
Operationalisation

ARTICLE 32 AMGA

- Obligation to take measures to implement the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers
- Consequences of non-compliance
Good reasons for entering the process?

- We are aware that performance and well-being are correlated, and that we are all working on the improvement of the researchers working condition.
- We agree to do it efficiently and officially and we agree to integrate the HRS4R into our institutional strategy.
- We accept to involve researchers in the process and to take into account their opinion.
- We would like to provide an institutional tool to the researchers for answering the requirements of Article 32 of MGA-H2020 and to apply for MSCA and ERC grants.
- We would like to better recruit and to let know about...
HRS4R – The essentials

- Gap Analysis
- Action Plan
- Publication

- Process
- Involvement
- Implementation
- Coherence
- Evidence
- Ambition
• Involvement of all levels of researchers is MANDATORY
• The description of the process has to be clear and documented
• Each C&C principle has to be analysed regarding the actual gap and initiatives undertaken + suggestions for improvement
  • Focus on some principles: gender, ethics, OTM-R, OS
  • Narrative of the Action Plan will give a summary by groups)
• (Gap Analysis is kept confidential)
Different schemes exist:
- Steering committee
- Focus groups
- Stakeholders should be included during the whole process: listing the gaps, the actual initiatives, ideas for improvement
- Researchers are supposed to validate the gap analysis
It is important to do it adequately:

- Question all researchers & pertinent stakeholders
- Pertinence of question is crucial
- Response rate has to be described regarding classes, gender, pertinent groups, ...
- Results are to be discussed
- Interpretation has to make sense
Main weaknesses

Weaknesses in gap analysis are often related to:

• Top down input
• Involvement of researchers
• Quality, reporting and interpretation of surveys
• Balance between what is done and what has to be done
• Readability of the text for externals
Content

- Organisational information for a good understanding of priorities
- Narrative regarding the 4 groups of principles
- Actions to be implemented within 2 years / 5 years
  - Action title – Timing – Responsible Unit – Indicator(s) / Target(s).
- Implementation process involving researchers
Weaknesses in AP are often related to:

- The description of the organisation (autonomy of faculties or not, multisite, ...)
- The process is cycling so that not all the gaps are to be filled within 2 years! Priorities given are not explained. A 5y-perspective is also important
- The actions are not fully coherent with the gaps (+ institutional problems if any)
Weaknesses in AP are often related to:

- The agenda is not realistic (duration, start-end, eavyness)
- Progress evaluation is not clear (targets, indicators)
- Communication and dissemination is not considered
- Implementation doesn’t involve researchers
- Researchers did not commit with the Action Plan
When?  **Before** submission
Where? Has to be visible
What?  **HR & AP** + related docs

Not acceptable if...

... Not published
... pdf on invisible page
... Not in English
... **HR & AP** are not « Template 2 »
... Related docs are in local language

... GA Process not described
... No explanation on HRS4R
... Divergence with submission
... Award still used
Search engines

Web: useful and well documented

Publication
HRS4R E-tool

Mandatory since May 15th, 2018

- Easy for the management and the follow-up
- Integrates all the documents
- Visible track of the process
- Clear and well documented procedure
What about evaluation?

**assessment**

*is to*

**INCREASE**

**quality.**

**evaluation**

*is to*

**JUDGE**

**quality.**
The assessors are experts ...

- Who know about the assessment and about HRS4R from the inside
- Who are trained and works with 3 colleagues
- Who know about the ERA objectives
- Who commit with their « contract » (role, confidentiality, COI, agenda)
They are requested to...

- Put themselves in the flower pot
- Give advices for growing in quality
- Discriminate between what must be done and what would be done
- Use short and clear sentences

And also:
- Not to imagine what is not written
- Be as precise as possible
- Respect the agenda
Individual Form is a working document used by the assessors for their personal analysis.

- Give strengths and weaknesses
- Discriminate between what is major or what is minor
- Provide recommendation for improvement
- Be clear on what is mandatory, optional but of added value, just a comment or just a typing error
- Try to estimate how many time it will take to correct
- Mention what is questionable and would be discussed with peers
This is the feedback document sent to the EU
The lead assessor is responsible for aggregating the IFs into the CF
Clarification and discussion is often necessary
A good skype can sometimes help
If a consensus cannot be reached, the lead interacts with the EU
Possible decisions

• Accepted
• Accepted pending (minor)
• Declined

MINOR (2 months)

MAJOR (12 months)
And then?

More grows in the garden than the gardener knows he has sown...

Spanish Proverb
Useful links

Awarded institutions’ websites are inspiring

On the website of the Commission:

• https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/charter
• https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/hrs4r
• https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/useful-information/policy-library#document-collapsible-research-careers-strengthened-hrs4r-process
• https://cdn4.euraxess.org/sites/default/files/technical_guidelines_hrs4r_-initial_phase.pdf