



‘Sharing experience to better implement  
the Human Resources Strategy for Researchers’

**Consensus Report**  
(to be filled by the lead assessor)



## IMPLEMENTATION PHASE<sup>1</sup> – interim assessment

Name Organisation under assessment: Institute of Geophysics, Polish Academy of Sciences

This assessment is composed in **CONSENSUS** by the assessors on: **16-01-2019**

### DETAILED ASSESSMENT

#### 1. QUALITY ASSESSMENT

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

	YES	NO
Has the <b>organisational information</b> been sufficiently updated to understand the context in which the HR Strategy is implemented?	X	
Does the <b>narrative</b> provided list goals and objectives which clearly indicate the organisation’s priorities in HR-management for researchers?	X	
Has the organisation's published <b>HR Strategy and Action Plan been updated</b> with the actions’ current status, additions and/or alterations?		X
Is the implementation of the <b>HR Strategy and Action Plan sufficiently embedded</b> within the organisation’s management structure (e.g. steering committee, operational responsibilities) so as to guarantee a solid implementation?		X
Has the organisation developed an <b>OTM-R policy</b> <sup>2</sup> ?		X

#### 2. STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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**?

##### Strengths:

Almost all the actions envisaged in the initial action plan have been carried out successfully.

<sup>1</sup> Last update 2.2.2018

<sup>2</sup> 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.*

In the initial HRS4R phase, stakeholder involvement was good followed by a detailed analysis of the survey findings which resulted in the initial action plan which was approved by the Director, Institute of Geophysics, Polish Academy of Sciences.

**Weaknesses:**

1. A revised HR Excellence in Research action plan has been published, but no new actions and related indicators have been established for the following years. The Draft Guidelines to the Implementation of the Strengthened Human Resource Strategy for Researchers (HRS4R) suggests that the internal review is an *“opportunity to create new actions for the next 3 years”*. It appears that the Institute of Geophysics, Polish Academy of Sciences (IG PAS) did not take this opportunity. In the IG PAS internal review submission, there are 19 main actions/objectives and most of these are marked achieved. A small number of actions/objectives are ongoing or pending but the details on these actions are too vague e.g.

(a) *“Organisation of training sessions, for instance with respect to issues raised in the questionnaire.”* This action is marked *“achieved”* with a note to state *“additional trainings are foreseen in the forthcoming period”*. This action is too vague and is not quantifiable or measurable in anyway. Consider revising the action so it is measurable within designated timeframes.

(b) IG PAS have purchased an integrated system including digital circulation of documents. The update states *“Ongoing (implementation foreseen in forthcoming period)”*. Specific, measurable targets with milestones should be set for this project. The current action is too vague.

(c) *“Promotion of Good Practice”*. This action is marked *“achieved”* with a note to state *“ongoing for the forthcoming period”*. It would be good to get details of the type of good practice and what the specific objectives will be for the forthcoming period including measures.

2. The responsibility for the monitoring and implementation of IG PAS Action Plan is mainly in charge of the HR Department. The two-year internal review has involved consultation with Head of HR Department, Head of Project Management Department and Deputy Research Director, but the involvement of the research community is not mentioned at all. Therefore, it appears that there are no members of the research community involved in the Implementation Committee or Steering Group.

3. Progress has been monitored on an on-going basis by the HR Head of Department and Head of Project Management Department through various meetings. IG PAS should note that evidence of the feedback may be sought during the site visits. What issues or new objectives arose from the surveys and consultations with the research community? Did these not give rise to some new objectives or actions? The HRS4R implementation and continuous improvement initiatives need to be owned by the Research Community as well as HR and the Deputy Research Director.

4. In the report, it is mentioned that the research community has been involved in the implementation process by various surveys, consultations and meetings with Deputy Research Director, and that the institution also encouraged feedback from their research staff following events. Consider including the outcome of the surveys, consultations and meetings e.g. new objectives and initiatives for the next 3 years as a result of the research community engagement.

5. OTM-R does not provide clear and measurable indicators.

If relevant, please **provide suggestions for alterations or revisions** to the (updated) HR strategy:

<p><b>Recommendations (see weaknesses)</b></p> <p>1. In line with the draft HRS4R guidelines and the fact that the HRS4R is a continuous improvement process: IG PAS need to create new actions and related indicators for the next 3 years based on the surveys, feedback and consultations with the Research Community.</p> <p>2. Some of the actions/objectives are too vague and impossible to measure. Review actions and objectives using something like the S.M.A.R.T. criteria: <i>“SMART goal setting creates verifiable trajectories towards a certain objective, with clear milestones and an estimation of the goal's attainability. Every goal or objective, from intermediary step to overarching objective, can be made S.M.A.R.T. and as such, brought closer to reality.”</i> S.M.A.R.T.: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timely.</p> <p>3. Since the subject of the HRS4R is the research community, its involvement in the monitoring process (and in the establishment of new actions) is crucial. Consideration should be given to co-opting representatives of the Research Community onto the Implementation Committee and Steering Group.</p> <p>4. During the monitoring process, the HR Head of Department and Head of Project Management Department should involve representatives of the research community. IG PAS should note that evidence of the feedback may be sought during the site visits.</p> <p>6. OTM-R: clear and measurable indicators must be provided. In addition to including new objectives/tasks in the revised action plan, include those identified in the OTM-R checklist.</p>
--

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Which describes the organisation’s progress most accurately?	Additional comments	TICK the right option
1. The organisation is progressing with appropriate and quality actions as described in its Action Plan. <b>There is evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded.</b>		
2. 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. <b>There is some evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded.</b>		X
3. 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. <b>There is a lack of evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded.</b>		

*At this point of INTERIM assessment, the **institution does not jeopardise maintaining the HR award.** Nevertheless, the institution is advised to take into account the comments and recommendations of the assessors to meet all assessment criteria at the next assessment (in 36 months)*