

Revision of Gap analysis and Action plan.

We thank reviver for his/her valuable comments and suggestions how to improve our Action plan and furthermore implementation process

This report was drafted by the Lead-Assessor in consensus with the members of the assessment team

Submission date: 16/08/2021

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?		<p>The institution has created a web page dedicated to HRS4R process (https://www.ibp.cz/en/about-ibp/hr-award), but there is no reference on the home page about HRS4R process yet, nor even using the search button for the keyword HRS4R process. The Action Plan, Gap analysis, OTM-R information are not included, only internal documents/ regulation are published.</p> <p>Answer: The action plan and gap analysis were inserted into the IBP web page, and also a new document related to the OTM-R policy of the IBP.</p>
Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published in English?		<p>See above.</p> <p>Answer: All relevant documents were translated into English, including OTM-R document, career document, communication plan, results of a gap analysis, salary rules, R1-R4 categorization, etc.</p>
Have the Strategy and Action Plan been published in a visible place?		<p>See above. My suggestion is to publish a link to the HR award in the navigation bar, under the Research section.</p> <p>Answer: A new navigation bar was created on the IBP web page, and Strategy Plan, Action Plan was published on this page after careful revision.</p>

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?

- Gap Analysis ○
- HR Strategy and Action plan
 - Organisational information
 - Strengths and weaknesses of the current practice
 - Actions
 - Implementation

Gap analysis was performed in a diligent, transparent manner. Many gaps have been properly identified and described. References to internal supporting documents were indicated. The Action Plan, however, is partially coherent with Gap Analysis. Implementation process is rather poorly described.

Answer: In the revised version, the inconsistency was eliminated, and Action Plan was corrected in accord with the Gap Analysis and results of the questionnaire. The implementation process was also improved to address better demands that arose from the Gap Analysis.

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?		Point 2 of the PA, Strengths and Weaknesses of the Current Practice Section was not clearly described. For example, to some extent, the explanations of the recruitment and selection part refer more to the working conditions part. The correspondence between the ranks/titles of the staff employed at the IBP Institute of Biophysics and the four career stages R1-R4, the European Commission research

YES / NO / PARTLY**Recommendations**

profiles descriptors, is not clearly presented. In the future, I recommend providing (perhaps between brackets) the equivalent of the scientific Czech titles with one of R1-R4 stage researchers in order to provide more evidence of the representation of all levels of researchers in the process, including WG and SC.

Answer: We revised a conception of the recruitment policy. All positions will be advertised on the EURAXESS portal. We established a new OTM-R document. And our aim is to translate all documents relevant to HR4R policy to English; many of them we placed on the IBP web page for HR4R. We establish equivalents between V1-V6 Czech categorization of the research positions by the Czech Academy of Sciences and linked them to EU categorization R1-R4.

This categorization is mentioned in a separate document published on the IBP web page.

After careful revision, all levels of R1-R4 are presented in WG and SC, not only employees working in higher management.

Is the Action Plan coherent with the Gap Analysis?

The action plan is partially in line with the Gap analysis (GA). There are "gaps" identified in GA, but not actions were addressed to them and

included in the Action plan. For example: a) in the case of principle 3 - Professional responsibility: it was stated that there is “a certain feeling of insecurity among researchers with respect to the duration of their employment contracts”, but no action was proposed for this issue. b) principle 5 - Contractual and legal obligations: the gap found is the need of “training regarding IP rights and project administration and funding” should be included in the Action 8, amongst other courses. In the same register, the IBP proposals from principle 7, courses on GDPR, should be included in Action 8. c) principle 7- Good practice in research - regarding specific measures for data management, data back-up and security, an action should be assigned; d) principle 9 - Public engagement: the proposal “creation of the Communication plan of the IBP” is missing from AP. e) In my opinion, action 7 - “The use of solar energy - PV panels” is not directly connected with the needs of the research community in the context of the 40 principles of Charter and Code. I could continue with other examples of missing actions for gaps identified for principles: 10, 13, 16, 23 partly, 21, 25, ... I recommend reorganizing the Action plan accordingly with Gap Analysis and OTM-R policy.

Answer: In the revised version, we promised to guarantee a prolongation of the employment via the Internal support of science that can overcome some gap in funding from the local and EU grant agencies.

Also, we established an exact communication plan of how to communicate with media interested in science and the working conditions of scientists.

All categories V1-V6 as equivalents of R1-R4 were a part of WG and SC.

The result of the gap analysis is published on the IBP web page.

Also, a table showing an engagement of R1-R4 categories in individual actions and indicators are published on the IBP web page, and this table is a part of the Strategy document of the IBP.

Have a steering committee and working group been established to guarantee the implementation of the HRS4R-process?

Several groups have been established but activities and roles are not clear. Please take in account to increase (include) participation of researchers in WG and SC, relative to top management/leaders staff.

Answer: All categories V1-V6 (R1-R4) were taken into consideration in both WG and SC, as well as all categories were mentioned in individual action. We show how R1-R4 categories participate in a given activity.

Has the research community been sufficiently involved in the process, with a representation of all levels of a research career?

71% of researchers responded to the Gap analysis questionnaire, but it is not clear how they are engaged in the implementation of HRS4R. Please provide more information about survey results.

Answer: After careful revision, results of gap analysis were inserted to the web of the IBP, and the table showing engagement of R1-R4 categories arises from the results of gap analysis, and questionnaire is published on the IBP web page.

Are the relevant management departments sufficiently involved in the process so as to guarantee a solid implementation?

The support of the IBP management team for implementation of C&C is evident. IBP is a small institution, it is not entirely clear if there are specialized departments such as HR Office, or Legal Office.

Answer: As a small institute, we do not have an HR office; it would be a little expensive for us; thus, all HR activities will be organized and guaranteed by WG, SC, the director's collegium, and the director.

Have adequate targets and indicators been provided in order to demonstrate when/how an action will be/has been completed?

Almost all indicators and targets need to be redefined in a quantitative approach.

Answer: All indicators, activities, and proportion of R1-R4 categories in given action are listed in summarizing table.

Is the organisation establishing an OTM-R policy?

According to the OTM-R check list and Gap Analysis, IBP has to improve recruitment and selection policies and practices. But no evidence of the policy is yet visible.

Answer: OTM-R document was created and published on the IBP web page for HR4R. Since October 2021, all scientific positions will be advertised on the EURAXESS portal and posted on the IBP web page.

Are the goals and ambitions sufficiently ambitious considering the context of the organization?

The goals are suitable for the institution, but more actions should be assigned.

Answer: In the revised version, the Action Plan was corrected in accordance with the gap analysis and results of the questionnaire.

Additional notes: We established internal support of science and mobile support to overcome a funding gap from grant agencies. It is the truth that only 30-50% of research (it depends on the department) is supported by the institutional budget, and the rest of the support must be covered from other sources, from grant agencies. However, infrastructure and the purchase of new instruments are covered by the institutional fund.

Results of gap analysis we published on the IBP web page. Very important is the table showing individual activities, indicators, and categories R1-R4 engaged in particular action.

In the future, we want to aim at human resources to establish new research teams and recruit new talented scientists with their scientific strategies.

Our aim is to strengthen the so-called scientific incubator; thus, recruit mentioned talented scientists with the potential to build a new perspective team and to submit their projects to ERC agency, for example.

In a frame of HR4R, we established several motivation tools, including Methodology Award or the Application Award. Also, we are going to organized several advanced courses per year.

We will eliminate gender disbalance; we will support equality from the view of age, citizenship, social categories. From this view, we will use the support from the social fund working on solidarity level.

We revised our classification system V1-V6 and normalized it on EU categorization of research positions R1-R4.

The following new documents will be optimized according to actual needs:

OTM-R – recruitment policy

Salary document

Communication rules

Career rules

The action plan was inserted into the HR4R IBP web page.

The strategy document, including a table summarizing HR activities, is on the IBP web page.

A gap analysis was revised in accordance with the Action plan.

The summary of the meeting of WG and SC is on the IBP web page.