Introduction

English

Many interesting questions were raised in both the English and French HR Public sessions on 26 and 27 April 2021. We have compiled them below (as they were asked), with their answers. (Note: similar questions have been grouped). With regards to the Graduate Programme Review and telework, we remind readers that while the main principles are agreed, many details have yet to be clarified in coming months so the answers are based to the best of our knowledge on the current state of proposals which are still subject to change

Français

De nombreuses questions intéressantes ont été soulevées lors des sessions publiques HR en anglais et en français, les 26 et 27 avril. Nous les avons compilées (telles qu'elles furent posées) ci-après avec leurs réponses (NB : nous avons regroupé les questions similaires). Dans la mesure du possible, les questions en français ont une réponse en français. Concernant le « Graduate Programme Review » et le télétravail, nous rappelons aux lecteurs que bien que les fondements principaux soient convenus, il reste de nombreux détails à clarifier dans les mois à venir.

Contents/Contenu

Programme review Q&A

- Although the timescale for the present process is very long, one of the critical parts - the candidate interviews - have to be done very quickly, in just a week or two. This is extremely stressful for all involved. Will this improve under the new system?
  The time between the application and candidate interviews will still be quite short, given the regular pace of the foreseen "selection moments". We believe that the more targeted job descriptions will help candidates to have a better understanding what CERN offers and make it easier for supervisors to identify and to organise interviews promptly with suitable candidates.

- Are Fellowships going to be only for Physics in the future? What will happen to the current Tech or Admin Fellowships?
  The graduate landscape will be redefined into three programmes. The new 'Fellow' programme will indeed be for physicists only but the Early Career Professionals and Research and Project Graduate programmes (ECP and RPG, note: working titles)integrate all other disciplines so technical and administrative opportunities will still be available.
  The programme review only addresses our graduate programmes (the current Fellowship programme, the traineeships and PJAS). The Student programmes (https://careers.cern/students) will remain unchanged.

- In the Graduate programmes presentation it was mentioned that Fellows shouldn't afterwards work on PhD contract. Could you say why? Would it be fine the other way?
  o Will it still be possible to do a PhD at CERN once one held a Fellow position?
  Fellows in the new Graduate Programme will be post-doctoral Physicists. So there will be no reason for them to engage in a PhD afterwards.
  The CERN Doctoral student programme remains unchanged in the proposed new scheme, once a student has completed the CERN Doctoral Student programme, they will be able to apply for a graduate position. However, as the current proposal stands it would not be possible for someone having benefited from a contract as research/project graduate or ECP programme (employment programmes) to apply for the CERN doctoral student programme. This is to ensure individuals progress at CERN with improving employment conditions in the different stages of their career.

- What about admin Fellows? How will they exactly fit in this new structure? Only within the early career one?
  The admin Fellows can either fall under the ECP or RPG category. We expect the majority would integrate the ECP, but still we can imagine that some will work on well-defined projects with a research/innovation aspect in it, and thus be eligible for RPG.

- There was very little detail in the presentation. When will the details be circulated?
  Further details are still being discussed and fine-tuned. HR and Management in *concertation* with the Staff Association are committed to ensure a fair and competitive package is offered to all graduates who will join one of these three programmes.

- What happens to those who applied this year for a Fellow position for example?
  Nothing changes for the current Fellowship, trainee and PJAS opportunities, they will phase out after the new graduate programmes are introduced. Any individual selected under the current programmes will be hired with the existing conditions. In short, the conditions as described on the web for any open position (Fellowship, trainee such as FTEC, PJAS) are valid for the duration of the contract.

- Will the Early Career Professionals Programme replace the Administrative Students programme ?
  No. Student programmes remain unchanged as they have a clear & well defined identity. The technical, administrative and doctoral studentship programmes remain as they are.

- Why is professional experience that was gained before completing a Master's studies not valued? (NB: question regarding the current Fellowship scheme)
  A person's experience before a Masters' degree is valued by hiring managers in that it may make them more likely to be selected into this very competitive programme.

- When exactly is the transition period? e.g. if we have to hire a PJAS under a signed agreement next month, can we do so with the existing framework?
  We anticipate that the new framework will be introduced in the first part of 2022. PJAS appointments under existing agreements continue until the introduction of the new programmes. There is no intention to remove any possibility for Departments to be able to continue with the existing options until the new options are available.

- Don't you think that reserving the naming Fellow for particle physics will make the other "Fellowships" (engineers, other physicists, material scientists, IT...) less attractive?
  No. We don't believe re-naming the programmes will make them unattractive. On the contrary, the name "Fellow" means little in industry whereas it is a recognised label in the academic world. We believe that renaming and rebranding will make for clear identification of what they represent and be a meaningful addition to the CV for the participants in the future programmes, after they leave CERN.

- In the Graduate Programme Presentation, the slide with the 3 different programmes seemed to indicate that Fellows are only available for graduates in particle physics? For the new Fellow scheme, there is no option for experimental physicist, experts in exotic isotopes or low energy neutrons for instance, to access this program anymore. What is the reason behind limiting the candidates to the Particle Physics field?
  The 'Fellowship' in the proposed new programme portfolio offers opportunities for research physicists, including experimental and theoretical physics, without exclusion of any particular field.

- Will there be any change/improvements on the Fellow conditions (salary, etc.) with the new Graduate Programme Review? If yes, will current Fellows have these improvements?
  The current contractual conditions will not change for anyone recruited under the current Fellowship programmes. We are introducing a new scheme with three new programmes, each with a well-defined identity and eligibility criteria, including lowered required experience. We are examining different models for the stipends taking into account the benchmarking data and ensuring we offer an attractive proposition. It's important to note that all graduates recruited under these new programmes will be provided health insurance under CHIS and will benefit from affiliation to the CERN Pension Fund which is beyond what many have today.

- Since Computing is one of the three main areas, how does not having a Computing Fellowship and having only Physics Fellowship reflect on that stance and how does it not devalue the engineers from CERN? Also what happens to those who leave CERN with that title if it doesn't mean anything anymore?
  Running recent dedicated computing Fellowship pilots have been an invaluable way to find out what type of titles were right in terms of attracting the best candidates. This doesn't seem to be the word 'Fellow' but rather specifying the role itself e.g. Full-Stack Software Developer,

whereas "Fellow" is more immediately meaningful in physics to attract candidates in that field at CERN.

- Comment: being an engineer "Fellow" at CERN doesn't mean that they will go to industry afterwards. We employ a lot of engineers at CERN, many of whom come through the Fellows programme (normally as junior Fellows). The term "Fellowship" is still meaningful for these people (at least to the many in my group).

  Indeed about 30% of staff are hired from the current Fellows (5YR/personnel statistics data), following a rigorous selection process, where their experience and competence is valued, not their programme title. At CERN the term 'Fellow' is currently widely used to encompass a wide range of disciplines and diploma levels. It is a shift in our internal naming convention and does not under-value engineers.

- Will it be possible to enter the graduate programme directly after completing a PhD with the CERN Doctoral Student programme?

  Yes. It will be possible to apply for an RPG position depending on the field (see question above).

- Do you see an increase/decrease in interest working at CERN? And do you get the specialists you need for all specialist positions (IT security etc.) with a salary level that isn't always very competitive in all the member states?

  The current financial conditions are well perceived by our current Fellowship programme participants (cf. the Fellow survey). The main reasons why we lose candidates are either for personal reasons, process-related (slowness) or even related to the fact that we're not always able to provide suitable projects. For example, many IT projects concern work on legacy, in-house developed code which, independent of pay, is a less attractive than working on the latest innovative technologies at a Hi-Tech IT company. Further, as explained in the rationale, it is the complexity of the graduate programmes at CERN that partly drive this evolution in how we recruit, to help candidates better identify with what we have to offer. Based on various benchmarking exercises and surveys, we strongly believe these programmes will allow CERN to be more attractive across the different fields of expertise in which we seek to hire graduates.

- What are the budgetary implications? Will the different graduate programs be managed by dedicated departmental budgets or all together?

  The graduate programmes will be funded by department budgets.

- La proposition permet-elle >vraiment< d'éviter que deux personnes faisant le même travail soient dans deux situations contractuelles très différentes ?

  Oui, nous avons bien défini les objectifs pour chacun des programmes (cf. diapositive 8) dans ce but. Il reviendra bien sûr à l'ensemble de l'Organisation de respecter ces engagements de donner une première expérience de travail (ECP) ; un projet défini de recherche ou appliqué (RPG) ou une recherche postdoctorale.

  Concrètement, les programmes des trainees (FTEC, FCT, VI et une partie de PJAS) seront inclus dans les nouveaux programmes, ce qui donnera un statut de MPE avec l'assurance maladie et l'affiliation à la caisse de pension du CERN.

- Le 'benchmarking' dans le contexte présenté me semble orthogonal aux comparaisons effectuées dans le cadre de la 5YR; comment les réconcilier ?

  L'analyse comparative (« benchmark ») visait à comprendre qui étaient nos concurrents et comment ils attiraient les candidats (par exemple, Google pour les postes en informatique), en terme de contenu de programme. L'analyse comparative pour la revue quinquennale (5YR)

est effectuée avec des instituts de recherche nationaux ou internationaux (EMBL, ESO, ESA) et sert à comparer les mensualités (stipends) versées. Les deux comparaisons sont importantes (l'une d'elles est en fait obligatoire). Nous ne voyons donc pas d'opposition entre les deux études comparatives, plutôt une complémentarité.

- Les 'applied Fellows' disparaissent-ils?
  Non. Les 'applied Fellows' seront inclus dans les programmes Early Career Professionals ou Research/Project Grads selon le profil de la personne.

- Est-ce que ça va aider à résoudre le problème de candidats des pays du nord de l'Europe?
  Oui, nous le pensons, grâce au retour d'expérience d'un pilote sur un recrutement ciblé en 2020 pour les candidats avec une expérience en informatique (4 moments de sélection, des descriptifs de poste plus spécifiques, et un ciblage du sourcing). Nous avons pu observer une amélioration de la diversité dans les deux dimensions : nationalité et genre. Nous avons eu des résultats positifs similaires avec le programme TTE. Il reste important bien sûr de pouvoir proposer aux candidats un projet intéressant.

- Le statut "Fellow" est maintenant réservé aux physiciens. Quid des ingénieurs avec PhD?
  Les ingénieurs avec Doctorat pourront toujours postuler pour un poste RPG. Ce sera une occasion unique pour eux d'approfondir leurs compétences et de développer leur réseau professionnel.

- Ceci signifie-t-il que les Fellows ne sont que des physiciens chercheurs (EP/TH)?
  Ceci est la proposition, mais les discussions sont encore en cours. Selon la proposition actuelle, les Fellows se situeront dans les Départements EP/TH et auront un libre choix de leur domaine de recherche.

- Quel a été l'impact de la pandémie sur le nouveau bassin de candidats? De même, les personnes qui quittent le CERN parviennent-elles à trouver un emploi dans cette crise? Voyez-vous une prolongation des contrats actuels?
  Au niveau de l'impact de la pandémie nous avons ressenti plus de prudence de la part des candidats pour changer de poste mais nous n'avons pas ressenti de difficultés pour les attirer plus particulièrement. En fait le volume de candidatures pour nos programmes de boursiers a été supérieur en 2020 comparé à 2019. L'enquête menée auprès des boursiers en 2019 a montré qu'il y avait une attente de recevoir davantage de soutien en fin de contrat. Nous leur proposons donc désormais une formation pour les accompagner dans leurs prochaines étapes professionnelles (travail sur le CV, réflexion sur leur projet de carrière). Cette formation nommée « Springboard for your career » est très bien reçue. Nous n'avons pas d'information indiquant qu'il est actuellement plus difficile pour nos jeunes diplômés de trouver un emploi après le CERN ; au contraire le secteur STEM est un domaine toujours très demandé et en recherche de talents.

- Est-ce que les Fellows reçoivent les mêmes conditions sociales que les research graduates ?
  Oui. Nous offrirons les mêmes conditions sociales à tous. En particulier, tous auront accès à l'assurance maladie du CERN, CHIS, et une affiliation à la Caisse de Pension du CERN.

- Est-ce qu'il sera possible dans le futur d'avoir des étudiants en alternance au CERN ?
  Rien ne change concernant les programmes pour étudiants, dans lesquels l'alternance n'est en effet pas possible.

- Les transparents ne devraient-ils pas être modifiés pour montrer que les 'applied Fellows' vont subsister ?
  Les diapositives reflètent l'état actuel des propositions, qui sont toujours en cours d'élaboration.

- Avez-vous prévu d'augmenter la visibilité du CERN dans les universités pour augmenter le nombre de candidats pouvant être potentiellement issue des minorités ?
  Un travail continu d'actions 'outreach' est coordonné par HR afin d'augmenter et garantir la visibilité dans nos états membres au niveau universitaire. Nous n'avons pas l'intention d'introduire une politique de discrimination positive.

- Quand ces nouveaux programmes débuteront-ils?
  Nous visons une implémentation en 2022 ; il y aura une phase de transition durant laquelle les deux systèmes, ancien et nouveau, coexisteront.

- Et quand les programmes actuels cesseront ils d'accepter de nouveaux candidats?
  Le programme actuel n'acceptera plus de nouvelles candidatures une fois que les nouveaux programmes seront implémentés.

- Est-ce que le programme des boursiers pour ingénieurs et le programme des doctorants pourraient devenir un seul et même programme?
  Non, les deux programmes sont des programmes différents avec des buts différents ; un Doctorant pourra par la suite postuler au programme RPG, mais l'inverse ne sera pas possible.

- Est-ce-que quelqu'un du programme "Early Career Professionals" pourra ensuite postuler pour le "Research/Project Grads"?
  Oui, cela sera possible si la personne répond aux prérequis du programme RPG. Il ne s'agit toutefois pas d'une volonté générale. Le temps total/cumulé qu'une personne pourra faire comme diplômé au sein des programmes sera limité à un certain nombre d'années (cf. diapositive 12 de la présentation).

- Est-ce que quelqu'un qui est Project Associate/VI/TTE/PhD pourra postuler pour les nouveaux programmes ou toute continuité sera-t-elle impossible?
  - Pendant la période transitoire, sera-t-il possible de « transitionner » des personnes actuellement MPA (PJAS etc.) vers RPG?

  Oui il sera possible pour les MPA actuels de postuler aux nouveaux programmes, sous condition que les personnes répondent aux prérequis.

- Comment allons-nous nous assurer de pouvoir garder les connaissances / les compétences sur le long terme, ayant compris que le Programme Review ne permettra plus d'enchainer différents statuts?
  La politique des contrats des titulaires est celle qui est essentielle pour le maintien des compétences à long terme. Actuellement, le CERN a un taux de rotation du personnel d'environ 4% et près de 70% du personnel est sous contrat à durée indéterminée (IC). Le Graduate Programme Review contribuera à diversifier le vivier de talents. Donc sa vocation n'est pas de stabiliser les compétences dans l'Organisation, à travers ses participants. Il sera cependant encore possible d'enchainer un programme étudiant avec le programme des jeunes diplômés, selon l'expérience. Il y aura certes moins de programmes différents et le temps total/cumulé qu'une personne pourra passer sur ces derniers sera limité.

D&I 25 by '25 Q&A

- Will the gender diversity be considered for contractors?
  The 25 by '25 strategy focuses on CERN's employed members of personnel (MPE's: Staff members & Fellows), as this is the population for which CERN has direct influence on recruitment. However, we do hope that an increased focus and awareness over the next years can have a positive ripple effect on the wider CERN community.
- A 25% nationality cluster is huge, given how many Member States CERN has. Even 10-15% is already significant and should be avoided. At the same time, there are many sections or groups at CERN which have certain nationalities badly overrepresented. After a certain time, it seems that they employ or retain their compatriots more often than not. Will this be identified, and actively fought?
  For nationality, the 25 % will be used as an indicator to spot potential nationality clusters. Meaning, that if there is one or more nationalities represented by 25 % or more in a department, group or sector, that is an indicator of where efforts to 'flip the trend' may be encouraged going forward. The nationality situation is complex. For instance, in some departments, certain nationality clusters can be explained by the need for local expertise, language requirements, etc. In other departments there are nationality clusters, but of under-represented states. This highlights why the strategy has to have a flexible & holistic approach, i.e. that we have to keep both the big picture and the department-specific focus in mind. The 25 % indicator is only one angle for improving nationality balance.
- In terms of nationality balance: Out of the 17 positions for Department leaders and Sector Directors, 5 are from UK, if I am not mistaken. It does not look very balanced to me. Newly appointed: BE DH, SY DH, FAP DH, ATS Sector Director, HR DH.
- It is important to observe long-term trends as, for instance, GB has been and is still considered underrepresented in terms of personnel. This is why, as explained above, we need to combine flexibility with global picture. The very positive development for the Senior Management group is the significant increase in its % of women (NB: the FAP DH is German).
- What actions is CERN going to be prepared to take if we are not on track?
  o R.e. 25 by '25, who is held responsible if the goals are not achieved?
  There are no penalties for not reaching the 25% target, nor is there any material prize for reaching it. Every increase, however small, must be acknowledged and celebrated. The overarching goal of this strategy is to increase awareness and to observe a more diverse workforce long after 2025. The respective Department and Sector Heads are accountable to ensure that the momentum to improve in these areas continues.
- I don't understand what a diversity-positive approach in merit/promotion actually means!
  o If it is linked to the MERIT (as written in the presentation slides), doesn't it state that there are accountability consequences?
  The proposal is to build into our processes opportunities to formally acknowledge actions that foster diversity and / or inclusion. Actions might include: the colleagues who have volunteered to supervise students within the 'Technical Internship for Students with Disabilities' programme; the 25 by `25 focal point, members of the Diversity Roundtable etc. all of which enable the culture of the department/group/sector to become more diverse and inclusive. Just like other contributions such as being a CERN Guide, we would encourage such actions to be referenced in the MERIT exercise, for instance.
  It concerns an acknowledgement of individuals who implement diversity-positive actions and to encourage create a culture of recognition in this area.

- Who are the "focal points" and do they themselves represent a diverse cross section of the CERN staff?
  The focal points are the 'internal working group' and representatives of the 25 by '25 strategy for each department. They will be key stakeholders in creating the department-tailored fitness plans, and serve as the link between the Department Head and the D&I Programme. They will also be the go-to persons for feedback from their Departmental colleagues. Department Heads have been encouraged to identify focal points who represent different nationalities, genders, levels of seniority, age, competency, and how long they've been at CERN.

- Why setting a target at 25%? Was this chosen based on some global indications?
  - Why is the target set at 25%? Since the female representation is say 21% in MPEs, it is just a 4% increase in 4 years, which may not be a not big target to dream.
  25 % was set as a reasonable yet ambitious target. Ambitious because to achieve 4% increase of the overall MPE average, we need to think corresponding recruitment drives of almost 30% women over the next 5 years. This is why we call the target "aspirational", and it would also bring CERN closer to our comparator Organizations in this regard, since we are currently well below the average.

- It was said that Departments where male colleagues are below 75% will be asked to recalibrate: why would we do this? I understand that you do not want to skew the statistics of the more "technical" departments, but it is really counterintuitive that you would push to lower the percentage of women in some departments.
  The overall goal of 25 by '25 on the gender aspect is to create a better gender balance, because gender balance – as any diversity - has a positive effect on the working culture. That goes for department/groups with clusters of men and for clusters of women.

- What about already hired women in management positions?
  The 25 by '25 strategy rather places a focus and a joint, accelerated effort – endorsed and followed up by the top management at CERN – to 'flip the trend' in specific areas related to gender and nationality going forward. The departments/groups that are already quite balanced in terms of gender will look more closely into the positioning of the women and men, by looking into the gender distribution in grades, professional categories and benchmark jobs.

- If 'excellence' is the main factor is above everything else, how does it not contradict 25 by 25'?
  'Excellence' and 'diversity' are not mutually exclusive. Like all science, what leads to innovation is not homogenous group-thinking, but rather a diversity of thoughts, perspectives and opinion. 'Excellence' does not refer to one specific way of doing things.
  The 25 by '25 strategy aims to systemise the already existing efforts to encourage more diversity, as well as find new methods to boost the gender and nationality diversity.
  Long before the 25 by '25 strategy was carved out, 'diversity' has been one of CERN's core values, as well as one of CERN's goals in its mission statement : 'Diversity and bringing nations together'.

- How realistic is it to move from the current 21.x% to 25% in 2025 while the % of young ladies graduating from university in engineering and technology is far less than 25%? This low % is reflected in the small number of female applications submitted to CERN in these fields. To reach the 25 by '25 target, we (mankind) should 1- understand the causes of the gender unbalance observed at university in engineering and technology and 2- identify the in-depth changes required in the education and society to address this unbalance. Such changes can certainly not be effective in 4 years.

We agree that there are a number of societal factors, but by being a world leading science institution, CERN has the opportunity (some would even say responsibility, as a publicly-funded organisation) to lead the change. Citizens the world over are looking to CERN for world-leading science and inspiration, so this is an opportunity to show the global science community that diversity in all its aspects are also important, because it benefits the science. If this is something that can inspire the future generations of scientists and move on from the 21 % proportion of women, that is also a level of success.

The challenge of increasing diversity in an organisation is not solved by solely focusing on recruitment. Many things have to happen simultaneously. As the history of gender and nationality distribution is complex (as the example described above), the solution has to take many aspects into account as well – time being one of the most important ones.

The 25 by '25 strategy is not only about creating a fast change, but it offers an opportunity to look at the entire process from the university level to the employees' journey within the Organization, from for instance junior to senior level.

The 25 by '25 strategy is also about changing certain aspects of the working and science culture in order to become more inclusive and thus *attract* a more diverse candidate pool.

- What about nationality clusters not among all members of personnel in a given department, but among the management of that department?

    Among the many aspects that come under this initiative, also looking into the nationality distribution within the leadership of each department is indeed key.

- Why is 25% a good number? Why is it better than 20% or 30% ? If women are particularly good at a given position, shouldn't we go to 70% ? 80% ? If they are not better than men on a given position, shouldn't we target 50% ? etc.

    (This question is based on the assumption that gender and professional abilities are linked). CERN's Percentage of women has hovered around the 20% mark for many years and CERN's top management has committed to increasing this proportion of women with a reasonable but ambitious starting target of achieving 25% (see answer above), with a particular focus on women STEM.

    For nationality, the 25 % is reasonable, since there is no member state that contributes with more than 25 % of the total budget.

- Is there a plan to recognise non-binary gender in the strategy?

    There is no particular focus on this aspect of gender diversity in the overall 25 by '25 strategy. However, if departments/groups/sectors would like to focus on it, they would be most welcome to do so, with the support of the Diversity & Inclusion Programme. Non-binary gender remains agenda focus for HR, as do all activities beyond nationality and gender.

- How is the building of a non-diverse cluster already being avoided in the hiring process (e.g. men only hiring men, certain nationalities only hiring certain nationalities)?

    CERN's current hiring process embeds diversity in the selection panels (there must be a nationality, gender & department mix in the panel). Part of the process of creating department-tailored fitness plans is to do a self-assessment on the hiring process and practices. The aim is to uncover gaps and improvement areas, and for HR to provide specific tools and actions to help improve in those areas of need.

- Why isn't race being addressed in the program 25 by `25? Shouldn't CERN also increase the contracts with black people?

    Race, just as the many visible and invisible characteristics we work on, is not measured in our personnel statistics. CERN can only measure progress of aspects that we collect data on. Again,

emphasising the flexibility of the strategy, should a department/group/sector wish to include this dimension of diversity in their 25 by '25 fitness plan, the D&I Programme will support the initiative the best way possible, knowing that it might be challenging to report formally on the progress.

- La Gender Target semble pouvoir être assimilée à la mise en place d'un quota sans pour autant vraiment le nommer comme tel.
    - Pouvez-vous confirmer et n'êtes-vous pas inquiets que cela ouvre la voie à la mise en place d'autres quotas toujours plus ciblés ?

Non, un « quota » est un objectif quantitatif obligatoire qui met en valeur et, en priorité, une caractéristique définie comme le genre, l'âge, ou la nationalité. Le concept de « Target » a été choisi expressément pour nous encourager vers un objectif que nous espérons atteindre mais que nous savons très ambitieux. Il n'y a aucune volonté de la part de l'Organisation de mettre en place des quotas.

- Pourquoi ne pas étendre cette obligation à tous les comités (CPCD, CPCR, CPCRI …) ?

Nous avons déjà en place la pratique d'assurer la diversité de ces comités. A noter que le faible nombre de femmes dans certains secteurs rend cela parfois compliqué de trouver des volontaires pour ces rôles sans pour autant solliciter toujours les mêmes personnes.

- Diversité de genre nécessite une meilleure reconnaissance de la parenté partagée. Les pères devraient aussi avoir la possibilité de garder des jeunes enfants, pour (entre autre) permettre aux mères de revenir plus tôt au travail. Or actuellement on leur accorde 2 semaines de congé.

Tout à fait, la parentalité partagée est un excellent moyen d'engager les deux parents (dans les cas où l'enfant a ses deux parents) envers les exigences du rôle parental, et effectivement l'allongement de la durée du congé de paternité ou d'accueil de l'enfant pour l'autre parent est une voie dans laquelle le CERN pourrait s'engager. Même si les choses évoluaient dans ce sens au CERN, le partage dans le couple parental ne pourrait s'appliquer que lorsque les deux parents travaillent au CERN. Nous ne pouvons pas influencer ce qui se passe dans les Etats hôtes.

- Vous parlez de généralisation du langage inclusif. Comment prévoyez-vous de mettre cela en place?

Il existe une excellente formation, ouverte à tous, assurée par l'équipe des traducteurs, T&M sur le langage inclusif, en français. Par ailleurs, nous sommes en train de finaliser un exercice de modification des Statut et Règlement du Personnel pour en rendre la formulation 'neutre' d'un point de vue du genre, en langue anglaise en premier lieu (la révision de la version française est en cours). Nous sommes tous encouragés à prendre conscience de notre propre usage de la langue (anglais et français) et à ne pas hésiter à proposer des alternatives lorsque nous lisons ou entendons des termes non-inclusifs.

- Comment faire face à la difficulté de trouver des candidates qui correspondent à ces objectifs, en particulier dans les métiers techniques (mécanique) ? Il y a déjà peu d'effectifs féminins dans les écoles…

Il est vrai qu'il existe une réelle difficulté à trouver des candidates pour certains postes dans ces certains domaines. Mais il faut redoubler d'efforts.

Nous devons nous mobiliser à tous les niveaux, pas seulement lors de recrutement. Par exemple, le projet annuel du groupe Education et Communication au mois de février qui consiste à inviter des femmes scientifiques du CERN à partager leurs expériences dans les écoles de la région locale a toujours besoin de nouveaux volontaires.

- Avez-vous prévu d'augmenter la visibilité du CERN dans les universités pour augmenter le nombre de candidats pouvant être potentiellement issue des minorités ?
  Oui, c'est la situation actuelle. Des actions multiples dans nos états membres sont assurées par HR et la collaboration des collègues de tous les départements est la bienvenue pour renforcer le message que le CERN est un employeur de choix.

- Le laboratoire semble plus préoccupé par la stratégie de diversité et inclusion que par le recrutement de personnels talentueux, quels que soit leur genre, origine, couleur de peau ou quelque autre critère. Pouvez-vous nous rassurer sur ce point ?
  La diversité et l'excellence ne sont pas mutuellement exclusifs. Toute sélection a été jusqu'ici et demeure à ce jour axée sur les compétences. L'Organisation se préoccupe du fait que la proportion de femmes reste stable depuis 10 ans et semble décroitre même dans les STEM. Il est donc important d'adresser ce problème et ce d'autant plus que d'autres organisations voient leur situation s'améliorer de ce point de vue.   En outre, il faut prendre en compte le grand nombre d'études qui prouvent que les équipes diversifiées atteignent de meilleurs résultats. Pour cette raison, il faut évaluer le potentiel du candidat ou de la candidate, aussi au regard de sa contribution à l'excellence de l'équipe.

- On parle de diversité et je pense que la diversité dans les langues est aussi importante, car la diversité de la pensée passe aussi par la diversité de la langue. Or de moins en moins de textes sont également en Français au CERN (sans parler des autres langues), à commencer par les notices d'emploi et le site de la Diversité en anglais seulement.
  Tous les documents officiels et le site principal du CERN sont publiés dans les deux langues. La traduction d'autres documents et sites internet dans la langue française est surtout une question de ressources à l'heure actuelle.   L'anglais étant la langue commune utilisée dans le monde global scientifique, la priorité est donnée au contenu en cette langue pour assurer la diffusion au plus grand nombre, tout en gardant la volonté de tout fournir dans les deux langues dans la mesure où cela est possible.

Telework Q&A

- Thanks to increased usage of teleworking, could CERN also find a solution to the shortage of on-site offices, and free up resources to improve some of its premises that are in dire need of renovation work?

  Within the budget limits, CERN is continuously trying to improve its facilities. The use of telework could help relieve the pressure on office spaces and other infrastructures at CERN, such as restaurants and parking places and lead to the possibility of upgrading or improving our facilities.

- Will people on new contracts (i. e Fellowships) be allowed to telework several days per week (thus, keeping current residence outside local area or do they need moving and living in the local area?

  o Is it mandatory to be in the area to perform the 40% teleworking in the future?

  In replying to this question it is important to differentiate between TW during the pandemic whereby the Organization mandates a level of TW, and TW during 'normal' (non-pandemic) circumstances whereby an individual may request to TW.

  The new telework proposal states that in general, members of personnel are expected to spend the majority of their work time on site (i.e. 60%) hence this implies taking up residence in the local area. Under some circumstances, and depending on the needs of service, people may be allowed to telework from outside the local areas for defined periods to be agreed with the supervisor.

  With regards to the telework modalities in the current context, all details on the arrangements (default and possible exceptions to that default) can be found on the HSE COVID-19 pages: https://hse.cern/content/teleworking-covid-19. Situations shall be discussed with the supervisor, and may include an exception to the immediate full-time stay in the local area. In case of doubt, you can always contact your DAO, HR adviser or contact the HR COVID-19 helpline.

- Many people have been able to use limited amount of their holiday during the pandemic, and taking out holiday when you need to spend it alone in your small apartment is not always good for the mental health. Will there be a possibility to transfer more than 30 days to next leave year as a short term solution?

  o What about home leave? Will it be possible to have a carry over?

  It is true that due to the restrictions on travel many people have not taken leave. We cannot stress enough the importance of taking a break and some time off – even if one is unable to travel afar. It is key for our wellbeing. There are no plans to increase the carry forward of 30 days for Staff (plus 22 days SLS). Surplus SLS days may be transferred to the LTSL account. Regarding home leave, flexibility is in place around the dates. See the absence management table section C2, https://cds.cern.ch/record/2712801/files/AbsenceManagement-Table.pdf

- With the new hybrid approach, will you allow to telework outside the local area if the tasks allow the person to do so?

  o Are there any thoughts of changing the policy of Teleworking outside of the local area? It can also be very helpful for mental health to sometimes can work from somewhere else.

  We need to distinguish between the existing TW policy (OC7) and the current TW arrangements during the pandemic.

In normal circumstances OC7 allows MPE to telework outside the local area and the new framework (post-Covid-19) will continue to do so. The amount of TW done outside the local area must be compatible with the needs of the service and the functions of the person teleworking, and agreed with the supervisor.

During the current TW arrangements linked to Covid-19, CERN implemented special teleworking and time & attendance provisions, available at https://cds.cern.ch/record/2712801/files/AbsenceManagement-Table.pdf.

These provisions require us to telework by default from the local area.

- In what time frame (e.g. every month?) will the 40-60% of on-site/ teleworking be calculated?
  - Will it be possible to accumulate teleworking across several weeks? Like one full week teleworking followed by three weeks on site?
  - How will the 60/40% be distributed? Per week or can it also be done per month?
  - Can the 40/60% be spread over a month or is on site presence of 60% needed every week? In case of the latter, why?
  - Can some spend 1 week per month outside the local area on teleworking following the new teleworking policy?

The implementation details are still under discussion. The policy is intended to increase flexibility for members of personnel while maintaining the richness of on-site work and collaboration. In this regard, most members of personnel will be required to maintain a regular presence on site. In some situations though, where the needs of service and the functions allow it, an application of the 40% over a defined, longer period may be possible. In any case, TW requests are not to be considered as an entitlement and will be treated on a case by case by the supervisor.

- For those who had to spend most of their contract time teleworking due to the pandemic, are there any plans to accommodate them or grant extensions to give them are fuller experience?
There is no plan to systematically review the contract duration of MoPs having experienced CERN in a remote-working mode.

- How will meetings be organised in the future (virtual/on-site). This might be a problem when one tries to organise his/her telework.
Some meetings may require on-site presence while some may be done remotely or as hybrids, partially on site and partially remotely. This will depend on the format that better suits the needs of the Organization and of the people involved.

- When is it foreseen to put the telework measure into place? What does "after Covid" mean in this case?
  - When will the new teleworking policy start?

The timeline to approve the new policy depends on a process of internal *concertation* with Staff Association and Management. The intention is to have it ready by the time for full return to work, and at the latest the last quarter of 2021 (September or October). The implementation is also linked to the new colour-coded system for COVID-19 due to be rolled out soon and referred to by the Head of HSE in the recent public presentation. We are working to ensure a smooth transition between the different stages of return to site.

- Given the fact that many of us have not been able to see our families now for around a year, will the teleworking conditions be flexible enough to allow us to visit our home stations for an extended period and work for a part of it?

In some situations and where the needs of service and the functions allow it, a flexible application of the telework policy may be possible. This means that it may potentially allow people to telework for a reasonable period of time close to their families.

This is not limited to our future policy and while it should not be considered as an entitlement it could potentially be arranged under our current policy framework.

- What is the difference between 2 days maximum per week of TW and the future 40% TW?
  Currently Operational Circular 7 allows one day a week, two under exceptional circumstances, with justification. The new framework will allow 40% without requiring exceptional circumstances justification. Modalities for a more flexible use are being worked out in the ongoing concertation process.

- Quand l'Organisation contribuera-t-elle financièrement aux frais encourus pour travailler à la maison comme certaines OIs le font ?
  Comme dans la politique actuelle, ou son adaptation en vigueur adoptée pour la période COVID-19, il n'est pas prévu pour l'instant que l'Organisation contribue aux dépenses occasionnées par le télétravail.

- 70 ou 80 %, comment concilier 40% en télétravail. Un prorata en télétravail n'a pas de sens si on doit venir une partie de journée ? le télétravail pour avoir un intérêt en terme de trajet doit se faire en journée complète ? Est-ce que dans ce cas, on pourrait dépasser les 40 % pour faire par exemple 2j de télétravail ?
  La nouvelle politique comprendra de fortes recommandations à être sur site 60% du temps de travail afin de pouvoir maintenir les liens dans les équipes et de bénéficier des échanges informels, possibles seulement en présentiel, et si importants pour la collaboration. La granularité de notre système d'enregistrement des congés dans EDH est la ½ journée, donc bien entendu ces pourcentages de TW devront être arrondis. Le dépassement des 40% n'est a priori pas prévu.

- This is a great opportunity for all the people working at CERN, but what if the supervisor does not agree on allowing Teleworking?
  The HR department and department heads will monitor the application of the policy to ensure that requests are treated fairly and that any refusals will be fairly motivated and adequately explained.

- 40% est une donnée qui peut être annualisable ?
  Non. Dans certaines situations, si les besoins du service et les fonctions du MdP le permettent, une application des 40% sur une période allant au-delà de la semaine pourrait être possible. Rappelons que le télétravail n'est pas un droit ; toute demande de télétravail doit être approuvée par le superviseur qui prend en compte le contexte et les besoins du service.