

**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](mailto: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:** 2019PL377529

**Name Organisation under assessment:** Centre of Molecular and Macromolecular Studies Polish Academy of Sciences

**Submission date of the Interim Assessment Internal Review:** 02/09/2019

**Submission date:** 06/08/2020

**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	
Has the organisation developed an OTM-R policy?	Yes	

**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**

Centre of Molecular and Macromolecular Studies Polish Academy of Sciences appear to have taken a large and comprehensive review. They showed examination of existing actions to further strengthen and expand on the work on behalf of researchers within CMMS PAS. New actions were also added which showed a willingness to take on new view points for researchers within the organisation.

The organisation is undergoing change from a national / governmental way and this has its own effects on any institute but it would appear positive for researchers within the institute. However, no doubt this also comes with challenges.

Some of the actions outlined may be challenging and it is positive to see that the Institute is willing to progress on behalf of their researchers to increase the rights and access for their research staff for a better working environment.

**Weaknesses**

The Institute has a lot of ongoing and existing actions which would have been stronger to see a more specific deadline or KPI which also would keep momentum in the Institute to keep up the good work underway.

The deadline again is very generic of Q4 2019 to early 2020

The Institute have outlined the last of integration of the HRS4R into Institute policies and strategies however this would appear a national issue.



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

I would encourage rather than the over emphasis on extended deadlines to use more supportive and encouraging mechanism to achieve set out actions such as KPI that are tangible to both the organisation and resachers to measure and to realise

Overall I would say the Institute has done a very good job on the interim assesment.

#### 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 \*

The Institute appear to have taken a more organisational review of the HRS4R which will bode well in the implementation of actions.

The Institute appear to have a stong understanding for the need for the OTM-R and policy and its benefits to the organisation

An Institute survey was very positive to have implemented and is a very good step to have taken and brings in the engagement of researchers.

#### 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.**