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- **Introduction** (A.-S. Catherin)
- **Outcome of the 2011 staff survey** (M. Body)
- **Diversity programme** (S. Datta-Cockerill)
- **Learning & Development Policy** (P. Goy)
- **Conclusion** (A.-S. Catherin)
Introduction

Anne-Sylvie Catherin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HR initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Competency Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Learning &amp; Development Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Internal Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MARS Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CERN Code of conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Recruitment &amp; Sourcing Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff survey - History

Historically Staff Association prior to each 5YR

2008 - SA on Health, Pension, Contract Policy, Work-life balance & image of SA

2009 – First HR Survey with University of Lyon, M.-L. Falipou as Project Leader

• Work environment
• Careers
• Financial & Social Benefits
• HR Department
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Excellent level of job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Passionate personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interesting work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creative work which allows a psychological development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pride to take part in the fundamental research particle physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very pleasant «International campus» environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highly qualified colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Variety of skills and professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effectiveness of continuous learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pleasant conditions (except buildings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concern regarding LD contracts
Feeling of unequal treatment depending on date of 1st staff contract, department and hierarchy
Weight of diplomas compared to experience
Some people losing their motivation (“with the wall cupboard” or non-satisfactory career)
Difficulties in changing functions
Certain aspects of the MARS scheme: time consuming, not adapted to team work, short-term perspective
Increasing strain and stress
Work-life balance
Fears regarding the maintenance of social security and financial benefits
Little assistance for young children
Old age of the buildings
Outcome of the 2011 Staff Survey

Marcus Body
Staff Survey 2011
Enquête auprès du personnel 2011
Participant profile

552 respondents

Fully Representative of CERN population
Internal Mobility
‘The key point is to be able to move to a different job without leaving CERN. This is often hampered by the quotas assigned to departments and the unwillingness of management to lose staff.’
Do you want to move?

For most the demand is not immediate. The majority of those who do want to move now are in scientific, technical or engineering roles.

“Internal mobility is healthy for such long careers as at CERN”

“Internal mobility is simply a way of maintaining people's interest and motivation in a job and avoiding situations where someone becomes "essential".”
How often have you changed?

“Chefs de section et groupe farouchement opposés à cette mobilité, HR attentiste.”
Opinions on internal mobility

Overall, people are positive about internal mobility and its potential impact on their careers, but many think it’s hard to actually make it happen.

36% think it’s easier to leave CERN.
Why would you move?

The top motivators are about personal development, rather than a dissatisfaction with their current role, manager or team.

This may reassure managers who might see a request as an implicit criticism of the employee’s current situation.
Half disagree, and while half agree they have very different opinions about the frequency.

It is likely that any mandatory system would be viewed negatively by most.

“Internal mobility should not be forced upon anyone, people shouldn't be moved for moving's sake if it's not in the interest of the Organization. However, internal mobility should be encouraged where staff members are interested in moving.”
What is your current attitude?

The key issue is clarity on the procedure and opportunities.
Opinions on the new job

79% of those who have moved are happy in their new role, but other views are shown on the right.

“I am very happy in my new job, 262, 47%”

“I've never moved jobs, 222, 40%”

“Other, 68, 13%”

“New supervisor not happy with my performance, 2”

“Old supervisor blames me for lack of continuity, 3”

“Don’t have the skills for new role, 4”

“I don’t like my new job, 12”

“I don’t like my new supervisor’s style of management, 22”

“Other, 25”

“Responsabilités quasi nulles après 12 ans d'expérience, je dois refaire mes preuves et repartir de 0.”
Biggest barriers?

I do not know of a supportive policy

Pressure to stay in current job & keep services running smoothly

Manager will not allow me to move

Other departments unwilling to hire internally

Cannot find a role to move to

Legend:
- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Internal mobility - key findings

• Personal experiences of internal mobility are positive
  - Present on last two years’ results with a typology of the different success cases (59 & 57 registered cases in 2010 and 2011 respectively)

• “Systematic and mandatory” proposal rejected
  - Pragmatic approach rather than full-fledged policy

• Biggest barriers are clarity on procedure and possibilities
  - Clarify and communicate process (eligibility criteria, notice period, transition…)

• Most take personal responsibility, but would like support from managers and HR
  - Equip managers with career management tools (e.g. how to carry out development conversations)

• Managers have concerns about continuity, and staff see this as a barrier
  - Enhance succession planning

• Technical, scientific and engineering staff move least often
  - Possible correlation with CERN structure and staff specialisation? Monitor & acknowledge intra-group mobility
MARS
How often should interviews happen?

Most staff (84%) think an annual process is appropriate.

That said, many staff highlighted a need for more frequent informal feedback too.
How long do and should interviews last?

Although there is some variability, we cross-referenced preferred and actual times, and 81% have a length of interview that reflects their preference.

Any attempts to impose a fixed time would therefore disappoint more than it helps.
Is the process time-consuming?

The majority of supervisors think the process takes up too much time, but there’s less support for this view from supervisees.

“The MARS as such is not bad, but it takes too much time to do the written part, in that perspective it is too heavy.”
Are clear work objectives defined?

Although most say that clear work objectives are defined during their MARS interview, there are still a significant number of respondents who felt this is not the case.

"Il aurait été bien de demander si le bilan de l'année écoulé est conforme aux objectifs énoncés dans le MARS précédent. Dans mon cas, ce n'est pas le cas; les objectifs fixés sont clairs, certes, mais ne sont pas respectés en raison d'autres priorités; cela se produit systématiquement toutes les années."
Do you discuss advancement?

Two thirds do not, but a third do.

Looking at the responses from supervisors only, this rises to 38% who do.
Personal opinions of MARS

- Receive honest & fair feedback of my work:
  - Strongly agree: 131
  - Agree: 220
  - Neutral: 113
  - Disagree: 62
  - Strongly disagree: 26

- Chance to put acknowledged views across:
  - Strongly agree: 125
  - Agree: 237
  - Neutral: 119
  - Disagree: 42
  - Strongly disagree: 29

- Have received fair advancement in past 2 years:
  - Strongly agree: 121
  - Agree: 165
  - Neutral: 127
  - Disagree: 82
  - Strongly disagree: 57

- Career position is fair reflection of qualifications & experience:
  - Strongly agree: 88
  - Agree: 151
  - Neutral: 147
  - Disagree: 94
  - Strongly disagree: 74

- Results provide accurate reflection of accomplishments:
  - Strongly agree: 83
  - Agree: 196
  - Neutral: 143
  - Disagree: 86
  - Strongly disagree: 54

- Career position is fair reflection of complexity of role:
  - Strongly agree: 79
  - Agree: 134
  - Neutral: 160
  - Disagree: 102
  - Strongly disagree: 77

- Advancement has been fair compared to peers:
  - Strongly agree: 74
  - Agree: 135
  - Neutral: 228
  - Disagree: 63
  - Strongly disagree: 52

- Able to ask for re-assessment in event of unfair result:
  - Strongly agree: 71
  - Agree: 133
  - Neutral: 169
  - Disagree: 91
  - Strongly disagree: 68

- Helps me understand my strengths & weaknesses and plan career:
  - Strongly agree: 45
  - Agree: 123
  - Neutral: 183
  - Disagree: 116
  - Strongly disagree: 85

- Rewards teamwork:
  - Strongly agree: 21
  - Agree: 57
  - Neutral: 212
  - Disagree: 123
  - Strongly disagree: 139
MARS and supervisors

“I agree with the theory of objective-based management. Unfortunately, I think MARS is not a good implementation because it is not achieving its goals. In particular the link of performance with recognition is at best random. I think that a step forward would be to take feedback from supervisees as part of the evaluation of the manager (as done in IBM).”
## The MARS system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The aims of the MARS system are clear to me</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARS is an improvement on the previous MAPS system</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MARS system has improved in the last two years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes sense that salary increase is connected to the annual performance review</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes sense that the promotion is connected to the annual performance review</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MARS process motivates me, and rewards me appropriately</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MARS process and objectives help me focus my efforts throughout the year</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives-based management is fair and clear</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many have concerns about the current distribution:

“Je pense que la répartition des échelons recommandée actuellement fonctionne relativement bien mais qu'elle n'est pas appliquée de façon équitable”

“the distribution is not right and damages rewarding team work”

“Choosing the low performers is backwards”
What do you view as recognition?

“Simplement dire merci”
MARS - key findings

- Variability of interview lengths is viewed positively
  - No change

- Some feel MARS is not aiding development
  - Development objectives introduced in 2012

- Managers are implementing MARS with varying success
  - Enhance training for managers; increase HR support

- Many feel MARS does not help with poor performance
  - Communicate on existing tools; gather feedback; adjust if needed; learn from past cases; provide support upstream

- Supervisors find the formal system too time-consuming, and supervisees want more regular informal contact
  - MARS quality survey; understand where time is invested (or wasted); reinforce training

- The distribution of steps is seen as unfair by many, and not an improvement on MAPS
  - Caveat: Is any advancement scheme perceived as fair? However monitor closely as part of the Diversity Programme

- Majority opinion is neutral on the system overall
  - MARS must be a high priority in the next 5YR
Diversity
Current attitude to diversity at CERN

- CERN is an exceptionally diverse environment, and we are very good at treating everyone fairly, 282, 51%
- CERN has a generally good attitude to diversity, but there are still areas where we could improve substantially, 145, 27%
- I have concerns about some areas of diversity at CERN, and I feel there is substantial work to be done, 77, 14%
- Other, 45, 8%
Opinions by gender

There are more concerns from female staff members, and this is reflected later in the personal experiences too.
When asked what the diversity office should focus on, the emphasis was towards supporting rather than intervening, even amongst those who see problems now.

A few respondents questioned the need for a diversity office at all.
### Personal experiences of discrimination

#### All staff, all criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion or beliefs</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture or values</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity or race</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working parents</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time working</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career path</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of contract</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional category</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal experiences - age

- 1980s: 32 Never, 14 Occasionally, 1 Often
- 1970s: 137 Never, 54 Occasionally, 8 Often
- 1960s: 99 Never, 68 Occasionally, 13 Often
- 1950s: 42 Never, 30 Occasionally, 8 Often
- 1940s: 4 Never, 5 Occasionally, 1 Often

Legend:
- Green: Never
- Yellow: Occasionally
- Red: Often
Personal experiences - gender

Male:
- 320, 73% (Often)
- 108, 25% (Occasionally)
- 10, 2% (Never)

Female:
- 49, 44% (Occasionally)
- 39, 35% (Never)
- 23, 21% (Often)
Personal experiences - nationality

“Other” contains all nationalities with less than 10 respondents:
- Finnish
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Norwegian
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Russian
- Slovakian
- Romanian
- Swedish
- Swiss
- Danish
- French
- German
- British
- Italian
- Austrian
To what extent is your voice heard?

Although the balance of opinion is positive, there is clearly an opportunity to improve.
Aspects of fairness

Although the balance of opinion is positive, promotions and development are the most significant focus of concerns.
Impact of environmental factors

For “hindering factors” the top two were MARS and supervisors, although supervisors also came top for “helping factors”.

For some of these (e.g. maternity or part-time work) “no impact” should be regarded as a positive result, but for others (e.g. training or MARS) it’s a negative.
The proportion who reported “no effect” is given on the left, and this is ranked in order of impact (positive or negative) on career.
Impact - gender

- Male:
  - No impact, 393, 90%
  - Helped, 33, 7%
  - Hindered, 12, 3%

- Female:
  - No impact, 70, 63%
  - Helped, 14, 13%
  - Hindered, 27, 24%
Diversity - key findings

- Half of all staff think CERN is doing well, but the other half have concerns.
- Most back the diversity office to taking an advocacy, rather than intervention, role.
- Most had not seen or experienced discrimination against most criteria, although no criteria received a 100% pass rate.
- 21% of females report that they “often” see or experience gender discrimination.
- Most feel listened to, but there is backing for more “informal” networking.
- A majority feel fairly treated, but a fifth disagreed that there is fairness in promotions or career development.
- 51% of all respondents felt they had been hindered by at least one type of discrimination, with only 29% reporting no problems of any kind.
Staff Survey 2011
Enquête auprès du personnel 2011
Diversity

“Appreciating differences, fostering equality & promoting collaboration”

CERN’s excellence derives from an environment in which the knowledge and perspectives of a diverse workforce are valued and dialogue is encouraged at all levels.

CERN Code of Conduct
CERN Diversity Programme

Interviews with CERN Management & SA President to collect their insights about what Diversity at CERN means to them

HR Survey conducted - nine questions related specifically to Diversity – aim to understand the perceptions of the “Cernois” about what diversity at CERN means to them
Diversity is more than gender…

"They say we're not placing enough emphasis on diversity."

Gender remains a priority…

Diversity @ CERN – sdc – HR Public meeting June 2012
AIMS

- Optimally **diversified workforce** to achieve the goals of a world laboratory

- Creativity & Innovation through the ‘collision’ of **diverse ideas, perspectives, approaches** – at the heart of the scientific method

- Work environment & **behaviour that reflects the Organization’s value of diversity** in all its policies, procedures & practice

**Strong backing for the Diversity Office to take an advocacy role**

“It’s part of our DNA…”

Diversity @ CERN – sdc – HR Public meeting June 2012
POLICY
Diversity Principles

- Appreciating differences
  - leveraging the added value that comes from bringing together people of different nationalities, genders, professions, ages, skills, backgrounds, perspectives … and enabling them all to contribute to their full potential

- Fostering equality
  - optimising talent & performance through a leadership culture that focuses on fair treatment and rules out all forms of discrimination and bias

- Promoting collaboration
  - creating an inclusive work environment based on mutual respect & exchange

"It’s about creating a level playing field…"

Half the staff have concerns about Diversity at CERN

Diversity @ CERN – sdc – HR Public meeting June 2012
POLICY

Diversity Dimensions

“There are no barriers in science, collaboration is the key…”

Positive Action ≠ Positive discrimination

‘enable all – favour none’

Room for improvement on informal networking … junior staff with senior colleagues

Diversity @ CERN – sdc – HR Public meeting June 2012
POLICY
Diversity Programme

“...It brings challenges, even in an international organisation where it is ‘de facto’ present...”

Half of the respondents felt hindered by at least one type of discrimination

Recruitment – Career Development – Work Environment

Diversity @ CERN – sdc – HR Public meeting June 2012
POLICY
Implementation

Diversity Principles integrated into

Recruitment (initial / long term)
- Sourcing
  - VNs / Applications
  - Long / short lists
- Selection
  - CBI Interviewing
  - Selection Board membership

Career Development
- Staff Learning Programmes
  - Access to training
  - Development Planning
- Leadership Development
  - Succession Planning
  - Coaching / Mentoring programmes
- Performance Management
  - Assignments
  - Feedback / Advancement

Work Environment
- Awareness
  - Events / Workshops
  - Surveys / Interviews
- Support
  - Work / Life Balance
  - Family-friendly structures
  - Disability / Re-deployment

"It’s one of our strengths, but needs to be continually nurtured…"

Attract
- Motivate
- Develop
- Retain

Diversity @ CERN – sdc – HR Public meeting June 2012
FRAMEWORK
Implementation – Roles & Responsibilities

Member States
- Assist in sourcing diverse talent across all dimensions

Enlarged Directorate
- Clearly articulate aim & lead by example
- Define strategic objectives – short term goals – KPIs

Group Leaders
- Drive commitment & assume accountability for implementing policy & strategic objectives

Section Leaders
- Drive actions in line with defined objectives
- Integrate diversity principles into daily management

CERN Contributors
(as defined in the Code of Conduct)
- Demonstrate a spirit of mutual respect & inclusiveness in all actions / interactions
7 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES 2012-2014

Agreed with Enlarged Directorate

RECRUITMENT

1. Improve distribution of under-represented nationalities through positive action in recruitment – “excellence” remaining over-arching criterion

2. Achieve optimal gender distribution in recruitment for all categories – “excellence” remaining over-arching criterion

- Reinforce efforts at sourcing & shortlisting stages
- Monitor to maintain progress & re-dress anomalies

“still only 20% female staff…”

“people actively seeking to short list and only to employ a specific nationality…”

Diversity @ CERN – sdc – HR Public meeting June 2012
7 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES 2012-2014
Agreed with Enlarged Directorate
CAREER DEVELOPMENT

3. More gender role models
   - Succession Planning & Leadership Training
   - Coaching & Mentoring

4. Propose parallel Career Development (technical & managerial paths in parallel)
   - Review Career Path Guide
   - Development Planning

“Lack of formal career development discussion or mentoring…”
“Still not enough diversity in role models ….”
7 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES 2012-2014
Agreed with Enlarged Directorate

WORK ENVIRONMENT

5. Promote exchange of ideas & understanding between generations & professions

- Workshops in departments or CERN-wide

- Assess necessity of email / meetings outside working hours – impact within hierarchical relationship

- Part-time, SLS, Work from home, etc...

6. Explore ways to improve work/life balance

- Events & regular communication

7. Promote a work environment based on mutual respect and inclusiveness

“work life balance for people without “traditional” family, too!”

“Having a good personal network around CERN […] has helped my career…”

«les règles de flexibilité horaire, télétravail, formation gagneraient à être plus homogènes et ne pas dépendre de la hiérarchie directe.»

Diversity @ CERN – sdc – HR Public meeting June 2012
NEXT STEPS

In line with ED & HR Survey

I. Strategic objectives 2012 – 2014 and KPIs

II. Continued focus on gender diversity as appropriate

III. Ongoing support for work/life balance, family-friendly structures, disability & re-deployment

IV. Diversity Policy
Key to Success

May imply overcoming underlying attitudes, habits, unconscious biases that could undermine policies…

Diversity @ CERN – sdc – HR Public meeting June 2012
Learning & Development Policy

Pascale Goy
OVERVIEW

1. A long and careful consultative process
2. Overall Aims
3. Five underlying principles
4. Some definitions
5. Scope
6. Areas of learning considered a corporate priority
7. Roles and Responsibilities
8. Budget Rules and learning days
9. Identification of learning needs - Monitoring - CERN Learning Centre
10. Some realistic improvements
A LONG AND CAREFUL CONSULTATIVE PROCESS

1. Involving an active participation of various bodies:
   - Joint Training Board
   - HR Department
   - Directorate (June 2011 and May 2012)
   - Department Heads (Breakfast Meetings)
   - DTOs, CCP

2. Taking into account:
   - Recommendations from the Internal Audit
   - Benchmarking with other organizations
   - Information obtained from the staff survey conducted in 2009
OVERALL AIMS

Build and sustain a working environment that supports learning and development

Reinforce effectiveness and motivation of employees

Enable employees to meet their objectives through the systematic development of technical and behavioural competencies*

*Using the CERN Competency Model as a foundation
A strategic activity sponsored at the highest level and enabling organizational strategy

Personal and professional development

Equitable access to all employed members of personnel

Driven by organizational short-term and long-term needs

Monitored and evaluated to ensure organizational effectiveness

*Using the CERN Competency Model as a foundation*
**DEVELOPMENT**
Systematic enhancement of competencies leading to personal and/or professional growth

**LEARNING**
Variety of **formal and informal** actions aimed at MPE development

**TRAINING**
A sub-set of learning consisting of **formal** development actions that target **specific** outcomes
SCOPE

DEVELOPMENT
Systematic enhancement of competencies leading to personal/professional growth

LEARNING
Variety of formal & informal actions aimed at MPE development

TRAINING
Formal programmes delivered internally and externally with specific outcome

- CERN training catalogue
- External training
- Under Dept responsibility
- Under L&D responsibility
- Under Dept responsibility with L&D guidance

- Conferences
- Assignments
- Knowledge sharing
- Academic Seminars
- Job shadowing
- On-the-job
- Job rotation
- Projects
- Self-learning
- Distance learning
- Individual coaching
- Team actions
1. **Mandatory** to perform a function or a role in the Organization:
   - safety-training and awareness, as appropriate
   - technical training improvement programmes (including language training)
   - leadership and supervisory skills improvement programmes to acquire the required managerial competencies

2. **Necessary** to ensure a successful integration in the Organization and/or the local area:
   - induction to CERN to ensure that all MPE have a common understanding of the Organization’s mission
   - office software to ensure that personnel at all levels may take advantage of the full capacity of the CERN systems (EDH, HRT, etc)
   - basic language and safety training, if not already covered under paragraph 1)

3. **Aimed at** fostering mutual understanding in the Organization:
   - core communication programmes
   - sensitization to diversity issues in the workplace
1. **Budget distribution** according to:
   - Individual needs
   - Appropriateness and cost effectiveness of learning and development

2. **Centralized budget** managed by L&D for corporate training (excluding technical training but not language training) - Safety training has a centralized budget monitored by HSE.

3. **Pro-rata based** budgets allocated to departments for other learning activities and **earmarked for training / learning only**

4. **Average of 5-10 days** of **learning** per year
1. IDENTIFICATION OF LEARNING NEEDS
   1. Performance management process
   2. Ad-hoc requests throughout the year
   3. In the context of career profiling

2. MONITORING & EVALUATION
   Evaluation and Follow-up
   1. More systematic evaluation with regard to
      - Level 3 evaluation (how does learning apply in work place?)
      - Level 4 evaluation (what is added value for CERN?)
   2. Matching of the proposed learning offer with CERN needs

3. CERN LEARNING CENTRE
   An integrated and coherent approach to learning, including evaluation & validation, as a tool to achieve CERN’s goals
By end of 2012

- Integration of competencies in training programme
- Clarification of roles & responsibilities (mainly with DTOs)
- Enhanced process for training needs identification with Depts and Dept Training plans

Over 2013 – 2015

- Roll out of centralized budget
- Revamping of learning catalogue
- Guidelines about appropriate Language Training and MPA training
- Implementation of an automatic evaluation system
- Individual development plans

SOME REALISTIC IMPROVEMENTS
Thank you and a nice summer to all!