

HR Excellence in Research

Initial Assessment & Granting: EC Consensus Report

Initial Assessment - EC Consensus Report

Case number

2022RO853007

Name Organisation under assessment

Institutul de Chimie Macromoleculara Petru Poni

Organisation's contact details

Aleea Gr. Ghica Voda nr. 41 A, Iasi, 700487, Romania

Submission date of initial GAP-Analysis, HR Strategy and Action Plan

29/11/2024

Submission date to the European Commission

28/02/2025

Eligibility assessment

Please rate the state of achievement ("yes", "no" or "partly"). If any statements have prompted a "no" or "partly" in the evaluation, please provide recommendations:

	YES / NO / PARTLY	Recommendations
Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published on the organisation's website?	Yes	The organization published the Strategy and Action Plan on the organization's website
Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published in English?	Yes	An English version is available
Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published in a visible place?	Yes	The HRS4R page is under public information page, but there is also a direct link from the main page
Have the following elements of the templates for the Gap Analysis and the HR Strategy and Action Plan been completed with sufficient details and quality? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gap Analysis HR Strategy and Action plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisational information Strengths and weaknesses of the current practice Actions Implementation 	Yes	The average scores for the GAP analysis have been appropriately adjusted to reflect the institution's reality. References to actual practices, current applicable legislation, internal regulations, and proposed improvements have been provided. The survey report delivered offers a sufficient degree of detail. The degree of implementation in the GAP analysis has also been adapted, such as in Action 1 regarding 'Research Freedom', which is now labeled as 'almost, but not fully implemented,' along with improvement proposals like drafting a System Procedure or disseminating information on this issue through the website. The indicators have been considerably refined by integrating quantitative data, thereby enabling more precise methods for assessing improvements.

Quality assessment

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

Rate the state of achievement ("yes", "no" or "partly"). If any statements have prompted a "no" or "partly" in the evaluation, please provide recommendations:

	YES / NO / PARTLY	Recommendations
Is the organisational information provided sufficient to understand the context in which the HR Strategy is designed?	Yes	The GAP analysis has been completed with an adequate level of detail, encompassing the state of the art for each principle. The analysis has been finalized with the inclusion of additional information. The information presented offers a clear understanding of the organization's context.
Is the Action Plan coherent with the Gap Analysis?	Yes	Coherence between the GAP analysis and the Action Plan has been enhanced. For example, the methodology for recruiting research personnel has been addressed in the Action Plan, with certain measures included for an upcoming revision, along with additional measures outlined in actions 25 and 28.
Have a steering committee and working group been established to guarantee the implementation of the HRS4R-process?	Yes	Both steering committee and working group are established and are operational
Has the research community been sufficiently involved in the process, with a representation of all levels of a research career?	Yes	Researchers from all career levels are involved
Are the relevant management departments sufficiently involved in the process so as to guarantee a solid implementation?	Yes	All the necessary relevant departments are involved
Have adequate targets and indicators been provided in order to demonstrate when/how an action will be/has been completed?	Yes	Most of the actions are related to document preparation or training. However, when reading the Action Plan, one has the impression that some of the actions have used the copy paste function under Indicator/Target, i.e. there is a lot of duplication of indicators, which raises a reasonable doubt that the Institute has really taken a careful and responsible look at its objectives.
Is the organisation establishing an OTM-R policy?	No	There is no OTM-R policy yet, but in Action 26 the organization stated that they will prepare it
Are the goals and ambitions sufficiently ambitious considering the context of the organization?	Yes	There is a plethora of actions for major improvement of university operation. The Institute has developed more than 50 actions for the first phase, but some of them are related to the preparation of documents or actions such as "Regular use of https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu ". While the number of actions is certainly quite ambitious, especially considering that the aim is to make a difference in all C&C, on the other hand it shows that the Institute has no set priorities.

General Assessment

Accepted

Pending modifications

Pending modifications - extended deadline



Explanation

- Accepted: This application meets the criteria and the HR award is granted.

The assessors might have commented on your file asking for future focus on a particular aspect/criterion, so please refer to the comments given above.

- Pending modifications: This application **broadly meets the criteria**, but the assessors have some concerns/questions about specific areas/criteria. Please reflect about the feedback given above and update your file before **re-submitting within 2 months**.
- Pending modifications - **extended deadline**: This application does not meet the criteria; please make the appropriate changes taking into account the comments of the assessors before **re-submitting within 12 months**.

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 modifications" the recommendations are split into:
 - Immediate mandatory modifications (to be implemented in order to obtain the award, resubmission within 2 months)
 - Other modifications (to be carried out during the interim phase).
- "pending modifications - extended deadline" the recommendations are split into:
 - Mandatory modifications (in order to obtain the award, resubmission within 12 months)
 - Other modifications.

Recommendations *

- There is lack of internal communication, e.g. the existence of excellent tools which are not used by personnel due to lack of information.
- There is no collective labor contract for organizations employees. There are only individual contracts of defined period either part time or full time.
- There a significant percentage (19%) from researchers claiming that they have met a form of discrimination.
- Some improvement for the recruitment procedures are needed, all vacancies should be published to the EURAXESS portal.
- Institution should encourage young researchers' mobility.
- More intensive training for research equipment is needed.
- Few improvements for more flexible working conditions could be adapted by laboratory heads.
- There is a complete lack of permanent mentoring mechanism. The proposed eventually training sessions for young researchers are not so satisfactory to solve researchers career guidance issues since there a need to implement individual career development plans.
- No existence of bilingual informative documents that could facilitate the attraction of foreign researchers.
- For Action 27 an indicator is needed for example how many vacancies are published per year.
- There is no OTM-R policy yet, but in Action 26 the organization stated that they will prepare it.
- Consider translations in English for the Guidelines / templates for all advertising positions.
- Indicator/Target, i.e. there is a lot of duplication of indicators, which raises a reasonable doubt that the Institute has really taken a careful and responsible look at its objectives. Revise the indicator/target and adapt them to the quantitative action.

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)