

Important message to institutions:

Due to exceptional circumstances linked to COVID19, processing of HRS4R applications might suffer additional delays. Moreover, in the context of extraordinary measures taken at national level (e.g. universities or other institutions closed), all self-assessment deadlines between 15 March and 30 May can be extended by one or two months, depending on your needs. You only need to apply for an extension electronically in your dashboard or, if you need more than one month extension, send an email to the functional mailbox: RTD-CHARTER@ec.europa.eu.

Site Visits: All in house audits planned for April through June (and possibly July and August - depending on how the pandemic situation evolves) are cancelled. HRS4R experts and/or EC will contact you in due course to arrange additional dates. No site visits dates will be set before the situation both at EU and national level stabilises. Meanwhile, you can continue using the HR Excellence in research award.

Remote assessments: We will continue processing remote evaluations within the limits of HRS4R experts' availability and the special circumstances of EC staff being on mandatory teleworking. Please note that evaluation and communication of outcome might incur further delays.

Implementation Phase Interim Assessment - EC Consensus Report

Case number: 2019PL381593

Name Organisation under assessment: Cracow University of Technology

Submission date of the Interim Assessment Internal Review: 12/03/2020

Submission date: 29/04/2020

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	
Does the narrative provided list goals and objectives which clearly indicate the organisation's priorities in HR-management for researchers?	Yes	
Has the organisation published an updated HR Strategy and Action Plan been updated with the actions' current status, additions and/or modifications?	Yes	
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	CUT need to ensure that the Research Community (R1 - R4) are involved in the steering and working groups.
Has the organisation developed an OTM-R policy?	No	The organisation has not developed an OTM-R policy but it has developed "Guidelines for the recruitment of academic teachers at Cracow University of Technology". CUT plans to develop an OTM-R policy and should prioritise this and implement it at the earliest possible opportunity.

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)

Strengths

The new regulations for the support of doctoral students.

Code of Ethics in place for researchers.

Staff information system in place: Information Service for Employees (SIP).

Training in place for the research community with 40 training programmes run each year which includes training for IP protection and research commercialisation.

The new statute that will allow for the implementation of an evaluation/appraisal system and processes.

It is obligatory to post research jobs in English on Euraxess.

Clearly defined selection criteria for research vacancies.

Guidelines for the recruitment of academic teachers at CUT.

Parental privileges in place for staff and support is also in place for researchers returning to work after a break in their service.

The regulations for the remuneration of researchers.

Support in place for staff and students from the careers office.

A review of the action plan demonstrates that actions are completed, some extended, some in progress and importantly new actions identified.

The Rector and the senior management team demonstrate support for the HRS4R process.

There is a clear commitment to gender equality through the workings of the 'Gender Equality in Engineering through Communication and Commitment' (GEECCO) group and the informal group of women-scientists: WIEmy.

Weaknesses

CUT has a very low number of international researchers (13).

Women only make up 36% of the research community.

CUT does not have an Equality and Diversity Policy.

No mentoring system in place although there is support from the Careers Office.

The position of a Mediator for the resolution of conflict between staff is not in place.

There does not appear to be a flexible working / shorter working hours policy in place.

It does not appear that members of the research community (R1-R4) are represented on the HRS4R team.

Mobility and visibility of CUT researchers on the international stage is an issue.

The HRS4R logo is not on the home page of CUT which means individuals have to search for the HRS4R webpage.

Most of the policies that apply to the research community are only in Polish which is a possible deterrent in attracting international researchers.

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

CUT should develop clear strategies and policies to grow the number of international researchers.

It is important to develop strategies that ensure Women are equally represented across all grades in CUT including management and senior leadership positions.

CUT needs to develop and implement an Equality and Diversity Policy that addresses equality, gender equality and all aspects of diversity.

Consideration should be given to the development and implementation of a formal mentoring system and coaching scheme.

CUT should prioritise the filling of the position of a Mediator for the resolution of conflict between staff.

Consideration should be given to the development and implementation of a formal flexible working & shorter working hours policy.

CUT should ensure that members of the research community (R1-R4) are represented in the development and implementation of the HRS4R strategy. Models that work well tend to have an HRS4R Steering Group and HRS4R Working Group with members of R1, R2, R3 and R4 represented on both groups.

CUT needs to identify clear mechanisms and methods to increase the participation of its research community in international collaborations and projects. This should assist with increased mobility and visibility of CUT researchers on the international stage is an issue.

The HRS4R logo should be placed on the CUT website home page with a link to the HRS4R web page.

CUT should prioritise the translation of the policies that apply to the research community into English and make them available on the CUT website.

CUT should continue to review its action plan and develop new actions where appropriate.

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.

At this point of the 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).

Recommendations

Which of the below situations describes the organisation's progress most accurately? Tick the right situation and add comments/general recommendations accordingly.

HRS4R embedded



HRS4R embedded, corrective actions needed



HRS4R embedded, strong corrective actions needed



Additional comments *

CUT has done considerable work on the implementation of the HRS4R process and should be commended for this. The interim report is quite clear and clearly identifies weaknesses that need to be addressed. The institution has identified new actions that will help to address identified weaknesses within the institution. It seems clear that CUT understands that the HRS4R process is about continual improvement and has identified new issues that demonstrate this.

Explanation

- **HRS4R embedded:** The organisation is progressing with appropriate and quality actions as described in its Action Plan. **There is evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded.**

- **HRS4R embedded, corrective actions needed:** 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.**

- **HRS4R embedded, strong corrective actions needed:** 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.**