

## Evaluation by EC (Logo HR)

**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?**

Partly

The report clearly indicates that the organization's priority for the next period is to reach OTM-R requirements. However, a clearer statement on initially set actions yet to be achieved would help follow the progress made over the period. Also, the lack of explanations on delay or postponing of actions from the initial action plan does not help in fully assessing how the 2-year implementation period went.

**Has the organisation published an updated HR Strategy and Action Plan been updated with the actions' current status, additions and/or modifications?**

No

The assessor did not find the interim report on the institutional website. Only a brief one-page overall list of goals linked to OTM-R is published at [https://www.upwredu.pl/p/pracownicy/karta\\_naukowca/action\\_plan\\_for\\_the\\_implementation\\_phase.pdf](https://www.upwredu.pl/p/pracownicy/karta_naukowca/action_plan_for_the_implementation_phase.pdf), therefore not providing detailed information on the current status of originally set actions, additions nor modifications. Unfortunately, it lacks the expected level of details that can allow proper assessment of progress made towards the initial action plan.

**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?

Partly

At the time the organization applied for the HR Excellence logo in 2016, OTM-R had not been introduced in HRS4R process. At interim time, WUELS has appropriately carried out its OTM-R assessment, and has formally committed to enhancing its recruitment process and publishing it over the next phase (years 2019-2022).

WUELS presents a promising Action plan and good general results, showing that HRS4R is fully embedded in the institution's strategy. However, the report lacks essential elements to fully appreciate the progress made and the quality of the implemented HRS4R.

## Strengths

- The support and commitment from the highest representatives at WUELS is obvious, and proof is found that the institution has devoted significant time and effort to deeply and durably embed HRS4R as part of its general strategy (for that matter, the initial gap analysis and action plan are of excellent quality).
- All staff categories (members of governance, administration, teaching and research staff - including R1-R4 researchers) are involved in the development and monitoring of HRS4R. Likewise, the implementation is not limited to the HR department and encompasses all relevant administrative departments
- Set actions are clearly linked to observed gaps, particularly with regards to OTM-R (OTM-R related targets are part of a Work Package of a nationally-funded project that WUELS specifically applied for and received).
- 47% of the set goals from the initial action plan is achieved

## Weaknesses

- The report lacks details on how the implementation and monitoring are done ("meets on a regular basis" is too vague): for instance, an update on the groups' composition (including the number of researchers and their category in each group - R1 to R4) is missing; so is the number and frequency of meetings of the various groups.
- Referring to the various teams or bodies in charge of carrying out HRS4R while using different names makes it confusing to follow (Working group, monitoring group, Team of the C&C implementation, Committee for implementation..., ). For instance, the report mentions a HR logo coordinating team without indicating who is in it. It is unclear whether it is the same as the Working group or the Monitoring group, or if it is a whole different set of stakeholders in the university.
- No explanations are provided as to why some target dates from the initial action plan are not met, why there are early or late (i.e. actions 7 and 1 respectively), nor why a change in the team/department in charge was made (actions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 15). It is unclear whether the target dates indicated in the interim report under the *Proposed actions*

comparative table are the updated ones (if so then, why are most target dates for actions marked as "in progress" not set within the 2019-2021 period?).

- Although indicators are defined for every action, no values are reported in the interim report (i.e. number of students who received advice, number of academics informed, number of researchers who participated in scientific grants, and so on) therefore not providing the necessary evidence to assess progress effectively.
- Neither the interim report nor an updated action plan showing the state of achievement (like a summary table similar to Annex 5 of the initial action plan) are published on the institutional website.

**Suggestions to better showcase the progress achieved by WUELS towards HRS4R initial and set objectives:**

1. Provide more details on the implementation and monitoring process: i.e. indicate the number and frequency of meetings of the groups; update the groups' list of members and clarify their composition (how many people, including the number of researchers and their category - R1 to R4); refer to various groups using consistent names to avoid confusion.
2. Provide explanations when deviations to set-targets or change of teams in charge occur;
3. Clarify updated target dates for the 2019-2021 period;
4. Provide values for defined indicators (actions 1, 2, 6, 12, 13, 14);
5. Publish the full interim report and a precise updated action plan the next period under the form of a summary table (like in Annex 5 of the initial action plan) on the institutional website.