GAP ANALYSIS

Name of organisation under review: VHIO (Vall d'Hebron Institute of Oncology)

Organisation's contact details: Sergi Cuadrado (scuadrado@vhio.net)

SUBMISSION DATE: MARCH 22RD 2018

DATE ENDORSEMENT CHARTER AND CODE: JUNE 14TH 2017.

Please provide the date when your organisation officially endorsed the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers.

1. PROCESS (MAX. 300 WORDS)

The implementation of HRS4R within VHIO is a decision from the Board of Trustees, and has so far involved all governing bodies of the institution, which have been precisely informed during their regular meetings of all steps taken (Board of Trustees – May, 8th 2017/ Executive Board – March, 29th 2017).

Initially, a survey addressed to all VHIO research staff (130 researchers), regardless of position or seniority, was launched with the objectives to perform an internal analysis and to identify areas of improvement according to the principles stated both in the Charter and the Code. The survey consisted of 40 statements, related to the 40 principles of the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers, in which VHIO researchers were asked to score from 1 to 5, according to their agreement with the statement. The survey was approved and launched on April 2017, 10th. The results of the survey have been analysed in detail by VHIO's Deputy Managing Director, as well as by the HR manager, and presented to the VHIO HRS4R Committee, which was constituted on July, 13th, as the body responsible for designing and monitoring the HRS4R implementation process. Its composition is the following:

- Sergi Cuadrado (HRS4R Project Leader)   - Malluc Senserrich (Head of Personnel)
- Judith Balmaña (Clinical PI)   - Alejandro Navarro (Clinical Researcher)
- Violeta Serra (PI)   - Francesc Canals (PI)
- Francesco Mattia Mancuso (Bioinformatic)   - Miriam Sansó (Post-doc)
- Laura Duran (Pre-doc)   - Joan Casals, PhD (external consultant)

The survey results have been used as the principal input for the elaboration of the following Gap Analysis. The results of the survey were analysed by segmenting the answers according to 7 different categories (gender, nationality, research program, professional category, seniority in VHIO, Research Program, professional category and international exposure) in order to build a more tailored, and thus effective, Action Plan. The VHIO HRS4R Committee met again on July, 25th in order to approve the resulting Gap Analysis and Action Plan.

GAP ANALYSIS

European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers: GAP analysis overview			
Status: to what extent does this organisation meet the following principles? *		In case of -, -/+, or +/-, please **indicate the actual "gap"** between the principle and the current practice in your organisation. If relevant, please list any national/regional legislation or organisational regulation currently impeding implementation	Initiatives already undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement
A. Ethical and Professional Aspects			
1. Research freedom	+		
2. Ethical principles	+		
3. Professional responsibility	+		
4. Professional attitude	+/-	PhD students and reserachers with less seniority in the organization seem not to be familiar enough with the institutional strategic goals and existing governing bodies.	*Update of VHIO's Transparency portal.*
5. Contractual and legal obligations	+/-	PhD students claim not to be familiar enough with the national, sectorial or institutional regulations governing training and/or working conditions	*Make national, sectorial or institutional regulations affecting researchers available at VHIO's website.*
6. Accountability	+		
7. Good practice in research	+		
8. Dissemination, exploitation of results	+		
9. Public engagement	+		
10. Non discrimination	+		
11. Evaluation/ appraisal systems	+/-	VHIO's evaluation / appraisal systems of assessing researcher's professional performance is not considered, mostly by Phd Students and Post-Doctoral fellows, but also by researchers from the Preclinical research Program, to be as transparent and independent as desired.	*Establishment of a performance evaluation procedure.*

Code: + = **fully implemented   +/- = **almost but not fully** implemented   -/+ = **partially** implemented   - = **insufficiently** implemented*

European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers: GAP analysis overview

Status: to what extent does this organisation meet the following principles? *		In case of -, -/+, or +/-, please **indicate the actual "gap"** between the principle and the current practice in your organisation. If relevant, please list any national/regional legislation or organisational regulation currently impeding implementation	Initiatives already undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement
B. Recruitment and Selection – please be aware that the items listed here correspond with the Charter and Code. **In addition**, your organisation also needs to complete the checklist on **Open, Transparent and Merit-Based Recruitment** included below, which focuses on the operationalization of these principles.			
12. Recruitment	+/-	Researchers with less seniority, as well as those with more international exposure, consider VHIO's entry and admission standards are not as clearly specified as desired and do not facilitate access for disadvantaged groups or for researchers returning to a research career. There is significant variablitiy on perception between reserachers from different categories and Research Programs.	*Improve the established recruitment procedure.*
13. Recruitment (Code)	+		
14. Selection (Code)	+/-	Staff scientists consider selection committee's composition could be improved	*Improve the established recruitment procedure.*
15. Transparency (Code)	+/-	An appreciable % of researchers from the Preclinical and Translational Research Programs, as well as Post-Doctoral fellows and Phd Students, feel transparency within VHIO's selection processes could be improved.	*Improve the established recruitment procedure.*
16. Judging merit (Code)	+		
17. Variations in the chronological order of CVs (Code)	+		
18. Recognition of mobility experience (Code)	+/-	Staff scientists consider VHIO does not value mobility experience as much as it should.	*Update of VHIO's professional categories, particularly on how key aspects such as mobility experience, seniority and qualifications are acknowledged.*
19. Recognition of qualifications (Code)	+/-	Staff scientists consider qualifications should be better assessed and evaluated	
20. Seniority (Code)	+/-	Staff scientists consider that sometimes qualifications required could be an entry barrier	
21. Postdoctoral appointments (Code)	+/-	Most reserachers from the Translational Research Program, as well as a significant % of Post-Doctoral fellows and Phd Students, consider VHIO does not establishes clear rules and explicit guidelines for the recruitment and appointment of postdoctoral researchers.	*Improve the established recruitment procedure.*

Code: + = **fully implemented   +/- = **almost but not fully** implemented   -/+ = **partially** implemented   - = **insufficiently** implemented*

European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers: GAP analysis overview

Status: to what extent does this organisation meet the following principles? *		In case of -, -/+, or +/-, please **indicate the actual "gap"** between the principle and the current practice in your organisation. If relevant, please list any national/regional legislation or organisational regulation currently impeding implementation	Initiatives already undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement
C. Working Conditions and Social Security			
22. Recognition of the profession	+		
23. Research environment	+		
24. Working conditions	+/-	Staff scientists would like more flexibility in order to better combine family and work.	*Organization, within VHIO's annual retreat, of a training seminar focused on Labour regulations and work and family life conciliation issues, addressed mainly to PIs and group leaders*
25. Stability and permanence of employment	+/-	Staff scientists and Clinical Research fellows, as well as researchers with wider international exposure feel that VHIO's commitment to improve the stability of	*Agreement on employment conditions with the works council*
26. Funding and salaries	+/-	There are significant diferences among reserachers from different professional categories and Research programs, according to their perception of fairness and attractiveness of the conditions of funding and/or salaries.	*Agreement on employment conditions with the works council*
27. Gender balance	+/-	Staff scientists consider gender issues could be improved within the organization.	*Implementation of the actions established in the already approved VHIO's Gender Equality Plan*
28. Career development	-/+	VHIO's career development strategy does not fully fit most reserachers' needs. It does not affect researchers from the Clinical Research Program, who consider VHIO's strategy suitable enough.	*Agreement on career development*
29. Value of mobility	+		

Code: + = **fully implemented   +/- = **almost but not fully** implemented   -/+ = **partially** implemented   - = **insufficiently** implemented*

European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers: GAP analysis overview

Status: to what extent does this organisation meet the following principles? *		In case of -, -/+, or +/-, please **indicate the actual "gap"** between the principle and the current practice in your organisation. If relevant, please list any national/regional legislation or organisational regulation currently impeding implementation	Initiatives already undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement
C. Working Conditions and Social Security			
30. Access to career advice	+/-	Post-Doctoral fellows and researchers from the Translational Reserach Program consider that VHIO could offer better career advice and job placement assistance.	*Establishment of a yearly session focused on the Labour market*
31. Intellectual Property Rights	+		
32. Co-authorship	+		
33. Teaching	+		
34. Complains/ appeals	+/-	Half of the PhD Students, researchers with more than 3 years of international exposure and researchers with 1-3 years of seniority in VHIO think that there have not been established appropriate procedures to deal with complaints/appeals of researchers.	*Establish a compliance procedure*
35. Participation in decision-making bodies	+/-	Some researchers, particularly PhD Students, but also researchers from the preclinical and the Translational research program, do not feel that VHIO allow them to be legitimately represented in the relevant information, consultation and decision-making bodies of the institute, in order to protect and promote their individual and collective interests as professionals and to actively contribute to the workings of the institute.	*Definition of new tools to identify needs and ideas from all professional categories, including PhD and post-doctoral students, that will be addressed to decision making-bodies*

*Code: + = **fully** implemented   +/- = **almost but not fully** implemented   -/+ = **partially** implemented   - = **insufficiently** implemented

European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers: GAP analysis overview			
Status: to what extent does this organisation meet the following principles? *		In case of -, -/+, or +/-, please **indicate the actual "gap"** between the principle and the current practice in your organisation. If relevant, please list any national/regional legislation or organisational regulation currently impeding implementation	Initiatives already undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement
D. Training and Development			
36. Relation with supervisors	+		
37. Supervision and managerial duties	+		
38. Continuing Professional Development	+/-	PhD students show their interest for activities that may contribute to their professional development, such as workshops, and conferences	*Establishment of an internal scientific meeting agenda & reinforcement of the external scientific meeting agenda*
39. Access to research training and continuous development	+/-	PhD students consider VHIO is not giving them enough opportunities for professional development	*Establishment of a PhD Training Program and Implementation of new training tools*
40. Supervision	+		
*Code: + = **fully** implemented +/- = **almost but not fully** implemented -/+ = **partially** implemented - = **insufficiently** implemented*			
Any additional issues			

Template 1 – Annex: Open, Transparent and Merit-based Recruitment Check-list[1]

OTM-R checklist for organisations

	Open	Trans-parent	Merit-based	Answer: ++ Yes, *completely* +/-Yes, *substantially* -/+ Yes, *partially* -- *No*	Suggested indicators (or form of measurement)
OTM-R system					
1. Have we published a version of our OTM-R policy online (in the national language and in English)?	x	x	x	--	Website (www.vhio.net), once published
2. Do we have an internal guide setting out clear OTM-R procedures and practices for all types of positions?	x	x	x	--	Availability of OTM-R procedure
3. Is everyone involved in the process sufficiently trained in the area of OTM-R?	x	x	x	--	There are no training programmes for OTM-R
4. Do we make (sufficient) use of e-recruitment tools?	x	x		+/+	Website (www.vhio.net)
5. Do we have a quality control system for OTM-R in place?	x	x	x	--	Establishment of a quality controls system
6. Does our current OTM-R policy encourage external candidates to apply?	x	x	x	++	Increase of applicants from outside the organisation
7. Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to attract researchers from abroad?	x	x	x	++	Increased share of applicants from abroad
8. Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to attract underrepresented groups?	x	x	x	-/+	Approval of the Equality Plan and increased share of women's applications
9. Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to provide attractive working conditions for researchers?	x	x	x	++	Flexibility in working conditions according to the need of the applicant
10. Do we have means to monitor whether the most suitable researchers apply?				--	

---

[1] http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/index.cfm/services/researchPolicies

Advertising and application phase					
11. Do we have clear guidelines or templates (e.g., EURAXESS) for advertising positions?	x	x		+/-	An example is available to researcher's staff.
12. Do we include in the job advertisement references/links to all the elements foreseen in the relevant section of the toolkit? [*see Chapter 4.4.1 a) of the OTM-R expert report*[2]]	x	x		--	Inclusion of references and links
13. Do we make full use of EURAXESS to ensure our research vacancies reach a wider audience?	x	x		-/+	It depends of the type of vacancy.
14. Do we make use of other job advertising tools?	x	x		+/+	Use of different web sites: Biocat (www.biocat.cat), B-Value (www.bvalue.com), LinkedIn and Infojobs. In certain cases, even Naturejobs.
15. Do we keep the administrative burden to a minimum for the candidate? [*see Chapter 4.4.1 b)* [45]]	x			-/+	
Selection and evaluation phase					
16. Do we have clear rules governing the appointment of selection committees? [*see Chapter 4.4.2 a)* [45]]		x	x	-/+	Statistics on the composition of panels
17. Do we have clear rules concerning the composition of selection committees?		x	x	+/+	Selection committees are composed by the Principal Investigator and HR.
18. Are the committees sufficiently gender-balanced?		x	x	-/+	Approval of the Gender Equality Plan
19. Do we have clear guidelines for selection committees which help to judge 'merit' in a way that leads to the best candidate being selected?			x	--	Establishment of a procedure

---

[2] http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/index.cfm/services/researchPolicies

---

Appointment phase					
20. Do we inform all applicants at the end of the selection process?		x		+/+	Candidates who are interviewed are informed according to the different phases and requirements bases in each position.
21. Do we provide adequate feedback to interviewees?		x		-/+	Approval of the new recruitment procedure
22. Do we have an appropriate complaints mechanism in place?		x		--	Approval of the Compliance Policy
Overall assessment					
23. Do we have a system in place to assess whether OTM-R delivers on its objectives?				--	