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Our objective TODAY is that you:

- understand what C&C, HRS4R and article 32 of the MGA mean,
- learn about the benefits of it,
- hear about success & impact

- know how to:
  - implement C&C principles
  - establish your institution's HR strategy (incl. OTM-R)
  - comply with art. 32 under H2020
  - cope with potential checks, reviews and process audits
1. More effective national research systems
2. Transnational Cooperation and Competition
3. An Open Labour Market for Researchers
   - Charter & Code, HR Strategy for Researchers
   - Innovative doctoral training
   - Open, transparent and merit-based recruitment
   - Pensions (RESAVER)
   - EURAXESS
   - Scientific visa package
   - Working with Member States & monitoring
4. Gender Equality
5. Access and Circulation of Knowledge
6. International Cooperation
CHARTER and CODE

• What is it?
• What are the principles?
• Who should implement?
Reference framework for rights and obligations of researchers, their employers and funders:

The **EUROPEAN CHARTER FOR RESEARCHERS** covers (amongst others):

- Recognition of the profession
- Career development
- Value of mobility

The **CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE RECRUITMENT OF RESEARCHERS** covers (amongst others):

- Recruitment principles
- Selection criteria
- Postdoctoral appointments
40 principles of Charter and Code which can be summarised to 4 broad principles:

- **Ethical & professional aspects**, incl. research freedom and accountability, non-discrimination, evaluation/appraisal
- **Recruitment**, incl. transparency of the process, judging merit, recognition of value of mobility and qualifications
- **Working conditions & social security**, incl. research environment, stability of employment, gender issues, career development, and representation in governance
- **Training**, incl. supervision, continued professional development and access to training
WHY
should institutions implement these principles?

BECAUSE:

• it **leads to benefits** for researchers and the institution
• it **potentially impacts** the institution
• it **adds credibility** – internally and externally, national authorities, funders etc.
• it **adds to the institution's reputation**
• it **contributes to the institution's visibility**
• because of your **participation in H2020 projects and contracts** (*article 32*)
ARTICLE 32

- Where can it be found?
- What does it say?
- What are the consequences of non-compliance?
Horizon 2020 Grant Agreement(s) *

- in all multi-beneficiary GAs
- except: MSC-COFUND (Marie-Curie…)
  SME instrument (Small & Medium Enterprises)
  ERA-NET Cofund
  PCP-PPI COFUND (joint public procurement/innovative solutions)
  EJP COFUND (European Joint Programme)

SECTION 4: OTHER RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS

* AGA- annotated model grant agreement, version 2.0.1 of 12.5.2015
RECRUITMENT & WORKING CONDITIONS for researchers

32.1 **OBLIGATION** to take measures to implement the 'European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers' *

- working conditions
- transparent recruitment processes based on merit
- career development

32.2 **CONSEQUENCES** of non-compliance

*(application of any of the measures described in Chapter 6)*

Article 32 is a 'best effort obligation'

This means that the beneficiary must be proactive and take specific steps to address conflicts between their policies and practices and the principles set out in the Charter and Code of Conduct.

In this sense, the obligation to keep appropriate documentation refers primarily to documentation evidencing the steps taken and measures put in place.
Non-compliance with the stipulations of article 32:

- beneficiary did not take measures to implement Charter & Code
- beneficiary did not undertake steps to address conflicts between its policies and the principles of Charter & Code
- beneficiary has no clear policy for recruitment and selection of researchers
- beneficiary did not make vacancies/fellowship awards publicly available
- …
CHAPTER 6 (AGA, pages 260-314):

- **Rejection** of costs claimed
- **Reduction** of the maximum grant amount
- **Recovery** of undue amounts
- Administrative and financial **penalties**
- **Suspension** of project/contract/payments
- **Termination** of project/contract
- **Termination** of participation of beneficiary

*depending on the severity of the breach*
All beneficiaries of H2020 should sign and implement the Charter & Code

EVIDENCED by:

> 900 individual endorsements & commitments
> 40 countries involved (& various Inter-national / European organisations)
> 1200 individual institutions represented (including universities, research institutes, funding bodies, umbrella organisations and professional associations)

> 375 institutions progressing with the implementation of the C&C principles – 5 universities/research institutions from Switzerland of which 4 members of swissuniversities
HOW to implement the principles of Charter and Code?

For guidance, see the 'Human Resources Strategy for Researchers’ tool developed by the Commission.
The Human Resources Strategy for Researchers  

HRS4R

**TOOL** *(developed in 2008)* to implement the 40 principles of C&C

- voluntary, flexible, step-wise procedure
- based on gap-analysis, action plan and HR strategy development *(incl. OTM-R* issues)*
- based on self-assessment, peer review and site visits
- monitoring of progress
- striving towards quality
- leading to recognition and high visibility

*OTM-R* means Open, Transparent and Merit-based Recruitment
INITIAL phase

T0 => T+1 (12 month)

DESIGNING the:

1. **GAP-analysis** *(on template 1)*
   
   *identify gaps between current policies and practices versus the 40 Principles of C&C*

2. **draft ACTION plan** *(on template 2)*
   
   *propose actions to tackle the identified gaps*

---

**Applicants are required to confirm** in their accompanying letter that the information presented in the application (including qualitative and quantitative data) is an **honest, accurate and true representation of the institution**.
ASSESSMENT (remote):

- independant external experts (peer reviewers) – (on template A)
- check **consistency** between gap-analysis and draft action plan
- gauge **appropriateness, coherence and quality** of proposed actions
- **detailed and general** assessment
  - eligibility *(formal criteria, i.e. endorsement/commitment, publication, support by hierarchy)*
  - quality *(level of ambition, quality of progress to be reached)*
  - recommendations *(suggestions for alterations or revisions, comments on ambition etc.)*
Assessment CRITERIA:

1. Sufficient and clear **overview** of the organisation

2. Clear, detailed and comprehensive explanatory text (i.e. **narrative**) on the state of play of the four **thematic areas** of the Charter and Code at the institution

3. **Actions** for the implementation of the principles of the Charter and Code

4. Examples of how the implementation of the HRS4R Action Plan and the Charter and Code are being further **embedded** in the institution.
OUTCOME of the assessment:

**Accepted**
The institution meets the criteria and the ‘HR Award’ is granted by the Commission services.

**Accepted pending minor alteration**
The institution broadly meets the criteria and needs to send an update within 1 month.

**Declined pending (major) revisions**
The institution does not meet the criteria and the HR award is put on hold until next submission after 12 months (and not before).
T+1 => T+3 (24 month) IMPLEMENTATION phase

1. IMPLEMENTING the ACTION plan
   • keep to proposed timeline to implement the actions
   • prepare your self-assessment/internal review (on template 3) for the INTERIM ASSESSMENT

Use the TEMPLATES
INTERIM ASSESSMENT:

- undertaken by external experts / peer reviewers
- based on self-assessment / internal review prepared by the institution
  - justify altered actions & revised timeline
  - show progress and quality of the actions
  - detail accompanying measures (i.e. embedding the HR strategy into the institutions policies)
- detailed assessment
  - quality of progress (intended and obtained)
  - strengths and weaknesses of the HR strategy
Assessment CRITERIA:

1. Sufficient and clear overview of the organisation

2. Clear, detailed and comprehensive explanatory text (i.e. narrative) on the state of play of the four thematic areas of the C&C at the institution

3. Actions for the implementation of the principles of the C&C within the next 3 years (i.e. in view of the site visits)

4. Examples of how the implementation of the HRS4R Action Plan and the C&C are being further integrated into the institution's policies.

At this point of the interim assessment, the participating institution does not jeopardise maintaining the 'HR award', but receives detailed feedback for the next period.
OUTCOMES of the assessment:

1. The institution is progressing with appropriate and improved quality actions as described in its Action Plan.  
   *There is evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded into the institution’s policies, routines and organisational structures.*

2. The institution 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 into the institution’s policies, routines and organisational structures.*

3. The institution 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 into the institution’s policies, routines and organisational structures.*
2. IMPLEMENTING the revised ACTION plan

- peer review by international independant external experts
- based on self-assessment / internal review prepared by the institution
  
  ➢ prepare your self-assessment / internal review for the ASSESSMENT & SITE VISITS (at T+6)
ASSESSMENT & SITE VISIT:
undertaken by external experts / peer reviewers

1. Assessment:
   • based on self-assessment / internal review prepared by the institution (same as for T+3)

2. Site visit:
   • meeting (confidential) key stakeholders (incl. researchers, management & practitioners)
     ➢ discuss issues and questions from the analysis of the self-assessment document
1. ACCEPTED
The institution is progressing with appropriate and appropriate and improved good quality actions as described in its Action Plan. There is evidence that the HRS4R is further embedded into the institution’s policies, practices and organisational structures.

2. ACCEPTED pending minor alterations
The institution 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 into the institution’s policies, practices and organisational structures.

3. NO FURTHER USE PERMITTED pending (major) revisions
The institution 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 into the institution’s policies, practices and organisational structures.
IMPLEMENTING the revised ACTION plan incorporating OTM-R policy

- peer review by international independent external experts
- based on self-assessment / internal review prepared by the institution
  
  ➢ prepare your self-assessment / internal review for the ASSESSMENT & SITE VISITS (at T+9, T+12 etc.)
Self-assessment / internal review
for the ASSESSMENT & SITE VISITS (at T+9, T+12 etc.)

- evidence how the HRS4R process has been embedded into the institutional policy
- publish the updated HR strategy on the institution's website
- include a dedicated section on the evolution of the OTM-R policy

The experts will:
- assess progress against proposed actions
- analyse indicators and targets for success according to the same procedure as for T+6
Maintaining or not maintaining the 'HR award' relies on the judgement of the experts who inform the Commission services on their decision.

Institutions having successfully reached this stage, enter into 3-year cycles of monitoring continuous improvement and assessment wherein the move from progress to quality needs to be evidenced.
TEMPLATES:

TEMPLATE 1
- annex
- Gap Analysis
- OTM-R checklist

TEMPLATE 2
- Action Plan

TEMPLATE 3
- Internal Review / Self-assessment

TEMPLATE A
- Initial external assessment

TEMPLATE B
- Interim external assessment

TEMPLATE C
- Renewal external assessment based on site visit