GAP ANALYSIS

Project: HR Excellence in Research of University of Ostrava

Reg. No.: CZ.02.2.69/0.0/0.0/16_028/0006225

November 2018/March 2019

CONTENT

European Charter for Researchers

General Principles and Requirements applicable to Researchers:

Research Freedom	+/+

Research Freedom Researchers should focus their research for the good of mankind and for expanding the frontiers of scientific knowledge, while enjoying the freedom of thought and expression, and the freedom to identify methods by which problems are solved, according to recognised ethical principles and practices. Researchers should, however, recognise the limitations to this freedom that could arise as a result of particular research circumstances (including supervision/guidance/management) or operational constraints, e.g. for budgetary or infrastructural reasons or, especially in the industrial sector, for reasons of intellectual property protection. Such limitations should not, however, contravene recognised ethical principles and practices, to which researchers have to adhere.

Current situation:

In the Czech Republic, the research freedom at the universities is defined by the Higher Education Act. The Statute of the University of Ostrava, which is in compliance with the Higher Education Act, also declares the freedom of science, research and artistic creation. The UO has started creating a stimulating working environment for researchers even before it got involved in the HR Excellence in Research project. Simultaneously, the university optimised its strategic goals in compliance with the initiative of the European Commission aiming to enhance the quality of research and innovations in Europe. The UO does not limit research activities, even though it prefers certain directions of research (main directions in research), which have a tradition at the university, which are stable thanks to staffing of the teams, and which have excellent results. The results of the survey prove this statement, as the vast majority of respondents are satisfied with the university approach to research freedom.

In 2017, based on the Strategic Plan of the University of Ostrava, the university revised the main directions of research and created a concept of support of so-called prospective research directions. Based on the decision of the Committee for Evaluation of Science and Research at the University of Ostrava, a part of the prospective directions was also financially supported within development programme of the university (IRP Perspective).

GAP:
- The UO is fully in compliance with this principle of the Charter and Code.

Action:
- UO does not propose any actions regarding this principle.

Survey results:

Academics, researchers (366 respondents)
- 59 % of respondents are satisfied with the UO approach to research freedom, the remaining almost 40 % are rather satisfied. Only 0.5 % is dissatisfied.

Ethical principles	+/-

Researchers should adhere to the recognised ethical practices and fundamental ethical principles appropriate to their discipline(s) as well as to ethical standards as documented in the different national, sectoral or institutional Codes of Ethics.

Current situation:

Ethical principles and fundamental ethical practices are defined in the new Code of Ethics of the University of Ostrava. The cases of non-ethical behaviour are investigated by the Ethics Committee of the University of Ostrava and the issues related to the ethics of the research are dealt by the Ethics Committee for the Research at the University of Ostrava. Both types of committees may be established

also by the Faculties (currently, only the Faculty of Medicine took advantage of this privilege). The Ethics Committee for Research supervises ethicals aspects of the research in the projects where it is required by the funder (e.g. the publisher) or the legislation.

GAP:

- There is a lack of internal standards and methodology, especially a lack of a complex Good Practice in Research Guideline (GPRG) including rules for co-authorship, data policy, rules for handling biological material, rules for sociological research, GDPR, rules for intellectual property protection, confidentiality commitment in contractual research, etc.
- Employees and students are not systematically trained in ethics.

Action:

- Preparation of the document GPR Guideline and related documents.
- Inclusion of the ethics into a complex training system.

Survey results:

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- 90 % of respondents believe that the rules ensuring observance of ethics in research/development at the University of Ostrava are or rather are sufficiently set. Only 1.5 % think that these rules are not sufficiently set.

Professional responsibility	+/-

Researchers should make every effort to ensure that their research is relevant to society and does not duplicate research previously carried out elsewhere. 12 They must avoid plagiarism of any kind and abide by the principle of intellectual property and joint data ownership in the case of research carried out in collaboration with a supervisor(s) and/or other researchers. The need to validate new observations by showing that experiments are reproducible should not be interpreted as plagiarism, provided that the data to be confirmed are explicitly quoted. Researchers should ensure, if any aspect of their work is delegated, that the person to whom it is delegated has the competence to carry it out.

Current situation:

Professional responsibility principle is largely included in the new Code of Ethics. Duplication of theses or scientific publications is currently supervised directly by the publishing house; plagiarism of theses is supervised in the thesis registration system "Theses". Potential justified repetition of the experiments is not automatically considered as a plagiarism. If a match with other document is detected, there is always a possibility to let the supervisor or some other assessor express themselves.
The protection and management of intellectual property are currently covered in a Rector's directive from 2009.

GAP:

- Rector's Directive on Intellectual Property Protection does not entirely correspond with current legislative requirements.
- The Code of Ethics does not include some particularities related to professional responsibility and more detailed methodology on plagiarism.
- The respondents from the academic and research community admitted the presence of unspecified copyright infringement.

Action:

- With regard to the creation of the Knowledge and Technology Transfer Centre, the university will prepare amended Rector's measure on intellectual property protection and modify the documents related to intellectual property.
- Particularities of professional responsibility will be included in the upcoming document GPRG.
- This principle will also be included in employee training strategy and implemented in form of individual development plans.

Survey results:

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- 85 % of respondents have not encountered any form of copyright infringement while working at the University of Ostrava. The remaining 15 % have experienced some kind of misconduct in this field.

Professional attitude	+/+

Researchers should be familiar with the strategic goals governing their research environment and funding mechanisms, and should seek all necessary approvals before starting their research or accessing the resources provided. They should inform their employers, funders or supervisor when their research project is delayed, redefined or completed, or give notice if it is to be terminated earlier or suspended for whatever reason.

Current situation:

Strategic goals of individual research teams are defined by the heads of the teams (alternatively by the head of the institute/department or research centre), in case of projects by the project leaders in compliance with the project specifications. Although there is no general measure on communicating changes in project solving, the project managers are obliged to inform their superiors about the progress in the project, even in case of internal projects of the UO (interim and final reports, alternatively public defence of internal or external projects). Other notification conditions depend on the provider of financial support (stipulated by a legal act or a tender documentation).

GAP:
- There are no fundamental imperfections, nevertheless, there is still some space for improvement.

Action:
- UO does not propose any actions regarding this principle.

Survey results:

UO (591 respondents)
- 54 % of respondents are familiar with the Strategic Plan of the UO, whereas 97 % of them completely or rather agree with it.

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- 59 % of respondents are familiar with the Strategic Plan of the UO, whereas 97 % of them completely or rather agree with it.

Contractual and legal obligations	+/-

Researchers at all levels must be familiar with the national, sectoral or institutional regulations governing training and/or working conditions. This includes Intellectual Property Rights regulations, and the requirements and conditions of any sponsor or funders, independently of the nature of their contract. Researchers should adhere to such regulations by delivering the required results (e.g. thesis, publications, patents, reports, new products development, etc) as set out in the terms and conditions of the contract or equivalent document.

Current situation:

Researchers at all career stages are acquainted with basic regulations related to their studies or work. They are trained in OSH and Fire Safety, alternatively in working in a lab, providing first aid, etc. The students and employees from individual faculties and workplaces are acquainted with operating instructions of laboratories.
The treatment of intellectual property is covered in current Rector's directive. Simultaneously, this topic is together with contractual and legal obligations arising from research integrated into ongoing workshops for employees.

GAP:

- There is no systematic approach towards the offer of trainings, nor a unified place for recording employees who attended the trainings. The attendance on optional trainings is not systematically taken into consideration during the evaluation of the employee performance.

Action:

- Within the upcoming onboarding system, the new employees (including researchers) and doctoral students will be acquainted with legal and internal regulations and university processes. At the same time, the trainings will be integrated into a complex system aiming to increase employee competencies.

Accountability	**+/-**

Researchers need to be aware that they are accountable towards their employers, funders or other related public or private bodies as well as, on more ethical grounds, towards society as a whole. In particular, researchers funded by public funds are also accountable for the efficient use of taxpayers' money. Consequently, they should adhere to the principles of sound, transparent and efficient financial management and cooperate with any authorised audits of their research, whether undertaken by their employers/funders or by ethics committees. Methods of collection and analysis, the outputs and, where applicable, details of the data should be open to internal and external scrutiny, whenever necessary and as requested by the appropriate authorities.

Current situation:

Effective financial management is explicitly stipulated in the Code of Ethics of the University of Ostrava. Consultations on financial management are provided by university or faculty project support departments. The UO carries out financial controls of projects via internal and external audits as a protection against sanctions.

Even though the data and methodology storage is not treated at the UO, methods and analyses used in research are indicated in the results of creative activity, final reports, alternatively in public databases of results, and they are accessible to the provider of the financial support. All project managers are obliged to cooperate on controls and audits.

GAP:

- The internal regulations do not cover the principles on storage and accessibility of data (except for the rules on data handling, which were stipulated within theses).

Action:

- There are no fundamental imperfections, nevertheless, there is still some space for improvement.

Good practice in research	**+/-**

Researchers should at all times adopt safe working practices, in line with national legislation, including taking the necessary precautions for health and safety and for recovery from information technology disasters, e.g. by preparing proper back-up strategies. They should also be familiar with the current national legal requirements regarding data protection and confidentiality protection requirements, and undertake the necessary steps to fulfil them at all times.

Current situation:

The UO has set rules for safe work, which are in compliance with legal standards of the Czech Republic, and the employees are regularly trained in this field. Personal data protection at the UO is in compliance with the Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the GDPR. Other principles are defined in the Code of Ethics, alternatively, the university prepares a methodology for specific research activities (handling biological material, etc.). Apart from that, the university provides OSH and Fire Safety trainings, first aid trainings for employees (optional), safety training on working at heights, training for car drivers (when using a car for work purposes), trainings on working in labs and other trainings.

GAP:

- Good practice in research rules are not present in any comprehensive methodology (UO employees are instructed only by partial laws, alternatively by several internal standards).

Action:

- Good practice in research will be included in a comprehensive methodological guideline (GPRG) together with several ethical standards.
- This topic will be systemically integrated into UO employee training strategy and implemented in the form of individual development plans.

Dissemination, exploitation of results	+/-

All researchers should ensure, in compliance with their contractual arrangements, that the results of their research are disseminated and exploited, e.g. communicated, transferred into other research settings or, if appropriate, commercialised. Senior researchers, in particular, are expected to take a lead in ensuring that research is fruitful and that results 14 are either exploited commercially or made accessible to the public (or both) whenever the opportunity arises.

Current situation:

Evaluation of researchers is based on published research results, i.e. on scientific publications and presentations at conferences and workshops. One of the scientific publication criteria is the citation frequency. Therefore, every researcher aims to disseminate the maximum of his/her research results and its use. Non-published results (except for the results protected by specific contracts) are not considered as adequate outputs. The list of publications of every researcher is published on the UO webpage and significant news related (also) to research are published on the OU@live webpage (https://alive.osu.cz/). Many researchers aiming to promote their research results use the profile on Google Scholar, Research Gate or Academia.edu. Such activities are not limited at the UO but they are neither systematically treated.

Speaking about the knowledge and technology transfer, the UO has not had complex and effective tools to promote and disseminate applied research results. Nevertheless, within university development projects, the university was annually launching a call "Company vouchers", which supports communication and cooperation of researchers with the applied sector. Very recently, within establishing Knowledge and Technology Transfer Centre, the university hired a person to intensively deal with applied research marketing.

GAP:

- There is a lack of systematic training on dissemination of results of fundamental research.
- The UO does not have any effective tools to promote and disseminate especially applied research results.

Action:

- The question of disseminating research results will be integrated into a complex system of employee trainings.
- The Knowledge and Technology Transfer Centre of the University of Ostrava will present new marketing strategy including promoting knowledge, results and technologies via catalogue, and organisation of roundtables and workshops for partners from the applied sector.

Public engagement	-/+

Researchers should ensure that their research activities are made known to society at large in such a way that they can be understood by non-specialists, thereby improving the public's understanding of science. Direct engagement with the public will help researchers to better understand public interest in priorities for science and technology and also the public's concerns.

Current situation:

A complex concept and support of popularization of science, research and other results of creative activities at the University of Ostrava has not existed so far and depended on individual activities of faculties, alternatively research teams or individuals. This is one of the reasons why the popularization

of creative activity has become one of the main priorities of the current Strategic Plan of the University of Ostrava. Within the preparation of the Action Plan, the university founded a working group, which started to prepare a complex system of science and research marketing at the UO, which will include dissemination and popularization of creative activities at the UO.

GAP:
- The non-existence of a complex strategy of the popularization of science and research at the University of Ostrava.
- The popularization of science does not have sufficient tradition at the university, the employees are not aware of it (including doctoral students). Furthermore, it is difficult to quantify and to evaluate such activities.
- The absence of employee training in various forms of the popularization of science and research, including the presentation in the media.

Action:
- The marketing strategy and system for popularization of results of creative activity.
- Employee training on effective communication with media and possibilities of the popularization of results of a creative activity.
- Systemic implementation of evaluation of UO researchers' popularization activities into the career system of the UO.

Survey results:

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- Almost 65 % of respondents are involved in the university's community engagement.
- 66 % of those who are involved in the university's community engagement devote max. 10 % of their FTE to such activities.
- Only 51 % of those who are involved in the university's community engagement think, that this activity is sufficiently taken into consideration while being evaluated by their superior.

Relation with supervisors	+/-

Researchers in their training phase should establish a structured and regular relationship with their supervisor(s) and faculty/departmental representative(s) so as to take full advantage of their relationship with them. This includes keeping records of all work progress and research findings, obtaining feedback by means of reports and seminars, applying such feedback and working in accordance with agreed schedules, milestones, deliverables and/or research outputs.

Current situation:

Doctoral students regularly present annual study plans, which are supervised by student's supervisor, and its setting and implementation are approved by the doctoral board. The departments or research teams organise regular meetings. Most research teams organise doctoral colloquia, lab meetings, alternatively journal clubs where the doctoral students and postdocs meet with the Heads of the research teams and consult progress in solving the research. The internal regulation – Rector's Directive from 2016 recommends credit evaluation for doctoral study programme activities including fulfilment of study duties, research activities (including publication activities), and pedagogical activities. The postdocs are evaluated in a similar way – the heads of the departments annually check the annual plans, alternatively (in case of all-university projects supporting the postdocs) the university organizes a colloquium where the researchers present their results and are evaluated by the Council for Internal Evaluation of the Quality of Research at the University of Ostrava.

GAP:
- Even though the checks of students and postdocs are obligatory, the requirements on the employees are managed by individual faculties and departments. The UO does not have a unified control system.
- The requirements and ways of checking the doctoral students and postdocs are not treated in the same way at all the university faculties (students are often not informed about their duties in advance).

- The supervisors are not sufficiently trained in supervising junior researchers, furthermore, the university does not require any pedagogical qualification from the supervisors.

Action:
- The actions from the Action Plan will include the unification and publication of standards for doctoral students and postdocs (with regards to the particularities of their study programme).
- The relation-with-supervisors´ system will be integrated into basic initial trainings and trainings for supervisors and mentors.
- This principle will be systemically included in employee training strategy and implemented in the form of individual development plans.

Survey results:

UO (591 respondents)
- Only 32 % of employees have developed a strategy of further career development together with their superior.
- 72 % of employees fully or rather assume that they were given sufficient support from their superior while starting working on their current job position. 11 % of employees stated that the support was not sufficient.

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- Almost 44 % of respondents have developed a strategy of further career development together with their supervisor/superior.
- 79 % of employees fully or rather assume that they were given sufficient support from their superior while starting working on their current job position. 7 % of employees stated that the support was not sufficient.

Supervision and managerial duties	+/-

Senior researchers should devote particular attention to their multi-faceted role as supervisors, mentors, career advisors, leaders, project coordinators, managers or science communicators. They should perform these tasks to the highest professional standards. With regard to their role as supervisors or mentors of researchers, senior researchers should build up a constructive and positive relationship with the early-stage researchers, in order to set the conditions for efficient transfer of knowledge and for the further successful development of the researchers' careers.

Current situation:

The Regulations on Study and Examination of the University of Ostrava stipulate the duties of a doctoral student's supervisor and duties of a doctoral board which evaluates the course of study. The Regulations on Study specifies the rules of study in study programmes accredited at the University of Ostrava and effectuated by its faculties, as well as the rules for a state rigorosum (post-master's) examination (which does not terminate a study programme) and lifelong learning programmes.

The Regulations originate from the Act no. 111/1998 Coll., on Higher Education Institutions and on Amendments and Supplements to Some Other Acts (The Higher Education Act), and also from the Statute of the University of Ostrava.

Duties of the university and faculty managers arise from the Higher Education Act and they are also specified (together with the duties of the heads of the departments and research institutes and centres) in the Statute of the University of Ostrava and the statutes of the faculties.

GAP:
- The absence of a systemic approach to managers' training in management, human resources management and pedagogical skills.
- New postdocs have clearly assigned supervisor (usually the head of the workplace). Nevertheless, the survey results show that the senior researchers do not have enough time to supervise junior researchers (especially postdocs) or they are not asked to do it.

Action:
- Trainings of supervisors in managerial and pedagogical skills will be systemically included in UO employee training strategy and implemented in the form of individual development plans.

- Launching a mentoring system, including taking into account the mentoring and research team management in the evaluation of researchers.

Survey results:

Academics and researchers (76 respondents – only senior researchers)
- 55 % of respondents have time to supervise junior researchers. 20 % rather do not have time, 8 % do not have time at all and 17 % do not have supervision of junior researchers in their duties.
- Almost 60 % of respondents have time for university's community engagement (research team management, project management, popularization activities). 35 % do not have time for such activities and 5 % are not interested in them.
- 64 % assume that the university's community engagement is sufficiently taken into account when being evaluated by a superior.

Continuing Professional Development	+/-

Researchers at all career stages should seek to continually improve themselves by regularly updating and expanding their skills and competencies. This may be achieved by a variety of means including, but not restricted to, formal training, workshops, conferences and e-learning.

Current situation:

Continuous development of UO employees has the form of internal and external training (for example summer project schools, training on the methodology evaluating science and research, training on citation softwares and databases, soft-skills training). Nevertheless, it is not systemically treated nor linked to employee evaluation system (see principle Access to research training and continuous development). Within the preparations of the Knowledge and Technology Transfer Centre activities, the university has already defined educational and popularization events focusing on protection and treatment of intellectual property, communication with bodies from the applied sector, and on soft skills development.

GAP:
- Training in the development of key competencies of the employees (management courses, increasing pedagogical skills) is not systemically treated. The faculties treat the training systems independently, which is very ineffective and often encounters low interest and motivation.
- The survey results show that half of the employees are not sufficiently informed about the training opportunities.

Action:
- The creation of a centrally coordinated employee training system (UO employee training strategy) linked to the upcoming career system.
- Targeted and systematic training of researchers at all career levels.
- This principle will be systemically included in UO employee training system and implemented in the form of individual development plans.

Survey results:

UO (591 respondents)
- Over 80 % of the employees fully or rather assume that they are sufficiently encouraged by their superiors to participate in the activities developing their professional qualification (same percentage in case of academics and researchers).
- 50 % of respondents assume that the UO provides sufficient information about the offer of trainings which might deepen their professional qualification. 37 % of respondents think that the amount of provided information is not sufficient.
- In the past 3 years, 77 % of respondents have attended some training.
Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- 58 % of respondents assume that the UO provides sufficient information about the offer of trainings which might deepen their professional qualification. 32 % of respondents think that the amount of provided information is not sufficient. 10 % are not able to answer.
- In the past 3 years, 77 % of the respondents have attended some training.

UO (591 respondents)
- Only 32 % of employees have developed a strategy on further career development together with their superior.
- 72 % of employees fully or rather assume that they were provided with sufficient support from their superior while starting working on their current job position. 11 % of employees stated that the support was not sufficient.

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- Almost 44 % of respondents have developed a strategy of further career development together with their supervisor/superior.
- 79 % of employees fully or rather assume that they were given sufficient support from their superior while starting working on their current job position. 7 % of employees stated that the support was not sufficient.

General Principles and Requirements applicable to Employers and Funders

Recognition of the profession	+/+

All researchers engaged in a research career should be recognised as professionals and be treated accordingly. This should commence at the beginning of their careers, namely at postgraduate level, and should include all levels, regardless of their classification at national level (e.g. employee, postgraduate student, doctoral candidate, postdoctoral fellow, civil servants).

Current situation:

One of the key principles of the UO philosophy is the recognition of the profession. All UO researchers at all career stages are recognized as professionals, i.e. including research, science and teaching. No matter what career stage or job title, all employees can take part in a (international) mobility programme or further training. They also have access to information about the changes in legislation related to their work or about other important news related to the university environment.

GAP:

- The recognition of the profession will be specified in the career system, which will be linked to the UO employee training strategy.

Non-discrimination	+/-

Employers and/or funders of researchers will not discriminate against researchers in any way on the basis of gender, age, ethnic, national or social origin, religion or belief, sexual orientation, language, disability, political opinion, social or economic condition.

Current situation:

The topic of non-discrimination is included in the Code of Ethics of the UO, and in legal terms the Labour Code and the anti-discrimination law. According to the survey results, the majority of the UO employees, including researchers, have not faced any kind of discrimination at the UO.
The fundamental principles of non-discrimination behaviour in the recruitment processes are not internally further described and will be integrated into the amended Regulations on Recruitment Procedures at the University of Ostrava.
In compliance with the national legislation and the Charter and Code, the UO will prepare new Regulations on Recruitment Procedures to ensure that the potential and current employees will be guaranteed equal opportunities (among others). The UO has already started to take adequate steps to identify and remove illegal direct or indirect and systematic discrimination. The UO affirms the right of all employees and students to work and study in the environment without any harassment, bullying, mobbing, staffing, bossing and other social conflicts. Simultaneously, an internal regulation will define a prohibition of discrimination of disabled persons, i.e. to provide non-discriminatory treatment of disabled persons.

GAP:

- The survey results show that 18 % of the employees and researchers faced some kind of impertinent behaviour at the UO, which is not in compliance with the Charter and Code, the Labour Code, the Code of Ethics nor the anti-discrimination law.

Action:

- The UO will not propose any actions regarding this principle, nevertheless, the situation will be monitored.

Survey results:

UO (591 respondents)
- More than 81 % of respondents have not faced any impertinent behaviour in the workplace. The remaining 19 % faced some kind of impertinent behaviour from their superior or other employee. Among the most frequently mentioned were verbal assault, emotional blackmail and discrimination.
- 75 % of respondents assume that the UO has sufficient means to solve impertinent behaviour (a very similar percentage in case of academics and researchers).

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- More than 82 % of respondents have not faced any impertinent behaviour.
- The remaining 18 % faced some kind of impertinent behaviour from their superior or other employee. Among the most frequently mentioned were verbal assault and discrimination.

Research environment	+/+

Employers and/or funders of researchers should ensure that the most stimulating research or research training environment is created which offers appropriate equipment, facilities and opportunities, including for remote collaboration over research networks, and that the national or sectoral regulations concerning health and safety in research are observed. Funders should ensure that adequate resources are provided in support of the agreed work programme.

Current situation:

The Strategic Plan of the UO clearly defines the support of the development of research and research-educational environment. Within the main directions of research set in the prior period, the university proposed mechanisms for the sustainability of research in key areas in the form of funds to promote science; the development of the part dedicated to the main directions of research was supported by the internal grant competition to help the stabilization and internationalization of teams. The university recently started to support emerging researches with good prospects financed by the institutional development programmes. Every research employee regardless their career stage has at their disposal all the necessary equipment – IT, laboratory equipment, the possibility to use the library, which offers a wide range of professional literature to borrow, or alternatively it arranges orders and distribution of professional periodicals. The employees are trained in OHS and Fire Safety, work in the labs, handling biological material, etc. They are acquainted with the workflow, internal regulations and legislation related to their job.

GAP:
- The UO is fully in compliance with this principle.

Action:
- The UO will not propose any actions regarding this principle.

Survey results:

UO (591 respondents)
- 87 % of respondents have adequate working conditions ensuring good job performance. Nearly 4 % are dissatisfied with their working conditions.

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- 83 % of respondents have adequate working conditions ensuring their good job performance. Nearly 6 % are dissatisfied with their working conditions.
- Almost 90 % of respondents are satisfied with the support of research/development/creative activities (60 % of them are rather satisfied). Only 2 % are not satisfied with the support.

Working conditions	+/+

Employers and/or funders should ensure that the working conditions for researchers, including for disabled researchers, provide where appropriate the flexibility deemed essential for successful research performance in accordance with existing national legislation and with national or sectoral collective-bargaining agreements. They should aim to provide working

conditions which allow both women and men researchers to combine family and work, children and career. Particular attention should be paid, inter alia, to flexible working hours, part-time working, tele-working and sabbatical leave, as well as to the necessary financial and administrative provisions governing such arrangements.

Current situation:

The Labour Code as the fundamental legal source, together with the collective agreement and internal regulation on working time records, define working hours, maximum number of working hours per week, taking leave or sick days. Currently, the UO starts to introduce new benefits, for instance home office. The UO employees may take advantage of flexible working hours, sabbatical leave, part-time job, alternatively of a cooperation in the form of agreements to perform work/a job. The sabbatical leave is guaranteed by the Higher Education Act. The Internal Wage Regulations of the UO describe the details and conditions related to the sabbatical leave.

Czech legal system enables to combine maternity or parental leave with work, i.e. women can take care of the child(ren) and cooperate with the employer at the same time, for instance in the form of a part-time employment or in the form of agreements outside the employment relationship.

In compliance with the Labour Code, the employee can ask for shorter working hours, i.e. for a short-time employment. If the employer's operational capacity allows, the UO accommodates the employees with such requirements.

The UO gives employment to persons with a reduced working capacity, it is responsive to students and doctoral students with specific needs, i.e. health or sensory impairment. The study assistance provided by the Pyramid Centre is a key service, which helps students with special needs with a successful course of study at the UO and facilitates their integration in the academic environment.

The survey results show that the employees are in general satisfied with the working conditions, which enable to combine work and family life.

GAP:

- The UO is fully in compliance with this principle.

Action:

- The UO will not propose any actions regarding this principle.

Survey results:

UO (591 respondents)
- Over 88 % of respondents assume that the UO allows to suitably combine work life and family life. Only 3 % think that the UO does not allow to suitably combine work and family life.

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- 86 % of respondents assume that the UO allows to suitably combine work life and family life.
- Only 4 % think that the UO does not allow to suitably combine work and family life.

Stability and permanence of employment	-/+

Employers and/or funders should ensure that the performance of researchers is not undermined by instability of employment contracts, and should therefore commit themselves as far as possible to improving the stability of employment conditions for researchers, thus implementing and abiding by the principles and terms laid down in the EU Directive on Fixed-Term Work.

Current situation:

The employees with the fixed-term contract are treated in the same way as the employees with the permanent contract. It means that these employees have the same benefits regardless the type of these two contracts.

The majority of researchers have concluded a fixed-term contract with the UO. If we took into consideration all the UO employees, then almost half of them have concluded a fixed-term contract. The Labour Code clearly defines the conditions, under which the employer can conclude a fixed-term contract, i.e. maximum of three times for three years. If the university draws funds for employee wages from a project/grant/subsidy etc., then the fixed-term contract can be repeated more than three times. This is stipulated both in the Labour Code and the Collective Agreement. The disadvantage of the fixed-term contracts may be employee's demotivation or lack of stability. The UO is aware of the fact that the permanent employment contracts contribute to the quality of life of the employees and to their

performance. With respect to the activities and projects realized at the UO, the employment conditions are defined in the frameworks stipulated by the law, which, among others, provide more flexibility for all parties of the employment relationship.

GAP:

- Half of the employees have concluded a fixed-term contract, partially because of the fact that the wages are paid from the research projects money.
- The fixed-term employees are not aware of the spectre of benefits offered by the university.

Action:

- Current Action Plan includes preparation of a career system, internal wage regulations (increasing the basic wage component) and evaluation system. The aim is also to set adequate working conditions from the very beginning of the employment – financial, career, benefit, so that despite the fixed-term contract, the employees may be satisfied and motivated.
- To integrate the information on offered benefits and employment relations into the onboarding system.

Documents:

- Act no. 262/2006 Coll., the Labour Code
- Collective Agreement

Survey results:

UO (591 respondents)
- Nearly half of respondents (49 %) have concluded a fixed-term contracted with the UO.
Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- 53 % of respondents have concluded a fixed-term contract with the UO.

Funding and salaries	-/+

Employers and/or funders of researchers should ensure that researchers enjoy fair and attractive conditions of funding and/or salaries with adequate and equitable social security provisions (including sickness and parental benefits, pension rights and unemployment benefits) in accordance with existing national legislation and with national or sectoral collective bargaining agreements. This must include researchers at all career stages including early-stage researchers, commensurate with their legal status, performance and level of qualifications and/or responsibilities.

Current situation:

The UO, as a public institution, works with funding allocated from the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports and also from grants, funds and thanks to the projects also from the EU funds. The remuneration system in the public sector is hardly camparable with the remuneration in the corporate or business sector. Generally speaking, we can say that all public institutions across the Czech Republic struggle with low base pays.

The remuneration system at the UO is based on the Internal Wage Regulations and also, in case of the projects, on conditions and possibilities of the project. Czech legislation also stipulates the minimum guaranteed interprofessional salary.

The remuneration system of the employees will be linked not only to the Internal Wage Regulations but also to the Regulations on the Career System and other internal documents.

The social aspects (such as the length of the leave, providing meal vouchers, sick days, maternity and parental leave, sabbatical, state social assistance, etc.) are guaranteed by the Collective Agreement as a follow-up to the Labour Code, the Higher Education Act and other legal regulations.

The right to a pension is defined by the law and the age limit for going into retirement is set for 65 years of age. The period of studies (university or doctoral) as a follow-up study after secondary education is not counted into pensionable service.

GAP:

- Only 45 % of respondents assume that they are or rather are sufficiently paid for their work.

Action:

- The situation will be partially solved by new Internal Wage Regulations and Regulations on the Career System. Of the University of Ostrava.

Survey results:

UO (591 respondents)
- 45 % of respondents assume that they are or rather are sufficiently paid for the work at the university. Nearly 29 % of respondents assume that they are not sufficiently paid (a very similar percentage is in case of academics and researchers).
- Almost 87 % of respondents are satisfied with non-financial benefits. Only 5 % are very dissatisfied.

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- Almost 64 % of respondents assume that they receive sufficient financial share for research/development results. 13 % assume that they do not receive sufficient financial share.
- Over 77 % of respondents assume that this share is based on clearly set rules.
- Almost 82 % of respondents are satisfied with non-financial benefits. Only 6 % are very dissatisfied.

Gender balance	+/-

Employers and/or funders should aim for a representative gender balance at all levels of staff, including at supervisory and managerial level. This should be achieved on the basis of an equal opportunity policy at recruitment and at the subsequent career stages without, however, taking precedence over quality and competence criteria. To ensure equal treatment, selection and evaluation committees should have an adequate gender balance.

Current situation:

The university does not make any difference between the employees. There is neither negative nor positive discrimination. This principle is generally described in the Code of Ethics. When recruiting an employee, the university takes into consideration quality, work results, potential benefit for the university. In the Czech Republic, there is no legal document which would treat the gender diversity. The Labour Code and the Antidiscrimination Act clearly forbids any discrimination at the workplace.
The UO supports the employees in individual approach and possibility of choosing new colleagues. This is very beneficial for the team and increases the performance and creativity.
The UO fully accepts statutory provision, which defines a list of activities (jobs) that cannot be performed by women, because of the health risks. Therefore, the women employed at the UO perform such types of work that do not threaten their health, nor potential pregnancy.
The survey results did not show any considerable gender differences in satisfaction of the employees regarding working conditions or discrimination.

GAP:

- The UO acts in compliance with the national legislation, i.e. Labour Code and Anti-Discrimination Act; moreover, the UO covers the principle in the Ethical Code of the UO.

Action:

- The UO will not propose any actions regarding this principle.

Career development	-/+

Employers and/or funders of researchers should draw up, preferably within the framework of their human resources management, a specific career development strategy for researchers at all stages of their career, regardless of their contractual situation, including for researchers on fixed-term contracts. It should include the availability of mentors involved in providing support and guidance for the personal and professional development of researchers, thus motivating them and contributing to reducing any insecurity in their professional future. All researchers should be made familiar with such provisions and arrangements.

Current situation:

The UO support career in research among others in the form of internal and external trainings, when the employees can themselves influence their career development with the support of their employer (active searching for trainings).

Currently, the study applicants, students and alumni can take advantage of the help of the university counselling centre, which offers services of a psychologist, sociologist, and career advice. For the future, the UO considers providing these services also for the UO employees.

GAP:

- The principles of career development are not enshrined in any internal document (only conditions for granting habilitation or professorship).
- The UO does not systematically treat career counselling. The doctoral students and postdocs should be also provided with the counselling about a career outside the academic environment (in companies, government sector, non-profit sector, etc.).
- Only one third of the employees have developed a strategy of further career development together with their superior.

Action:

- Professional development will be stipulated in a new internal regulation on the career system.
- The counselling and mentoring for personal and professional development will be a part of the onboarding system.
- The researchers will be trained in general and portable skills, which increase their own career opportunities.

Survey results:

UO (591 respondents)
- Only 32 % of employees have developed a strategy of further career development together with their superior.
- 72 % of employees fully or rather assume that they were given sufficient support from their superior while starting working on their current job position. 11 % of employees stated that the support was not sufficient. A similar percentage occurred also in case of academics and researchers.

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- Almost 44 % of respondents have developed a strategy of further career development together with their supervisor/superior.

Value of mobility	+/-

Employers and/or funders must recognise the value of geographical, intersectoral, inter- and trans-disciplinary and virtual 12 mobility as well as mobility between the public and private sector as an important means of enhancing scientific knowledge and professional development at any stage of a researcher's career. Consequently, they should build such options into the specific career development strategy and fully value and acknowledge any mobility experience within their career progression/appraisal system. This also requires that the necessary administrative instruments be put in place to allow the portability of both grants and social security provisions, in accordance with national legislation.

Current situation:

Geographical mobilities of students and employees are currently monitored as it is a partial criterion of the university evaluation and as it is linked to the allocation of funds to universities by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports. Therefore, the UO established a mobility system, which allows employees to take part in the internships in the EU (Erasmus) as well as in the countries outside the EU (Erasmus Plus, Via). Within the institutional development programme supporting postdocs, the mobility (especially international mobility) is one of the main criteria when employing a postdoc. The complex internal system monitoring mobilities is currently being modified (we are working on an electronic version). Researchers mobilities are also integrated into the evaluation criteria of the internal research evaluation system at the UO.

- Inter- and trans-disciplinary and virtual mobilities, as well as mobility between the public and private sector are not monitored.

Action:

- In the future, the university will need to modify the mobility´factor in the internal regulations related to the upcoming career system. With respect to the current trend and use of modern technology, the university will need to take into consideration also virtual mobility.

Survey results:

UO (591 respondents)
- 45 % of respondents take advantage of international mobility for their further career development. 45 % do not take advantage of the mobility offers and the remaining 10 % assume that mobility is not important for their career development.

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- 60 % of respondents take advantage of international mobilty programmes for their further career development. 32 % do not take advantage of the mobility offers and the remaining 8 % assume that the mobility is not important for their career development.

Access to research training and continuous development	-/+

Employers and/or funders should ensure that all researchers at any stage of their career, regardless of their contractual situation, are given the opportunity for professional development and for improving their employability through access to measures for the continuing development of skills and competencies. Such measures should be regularly assessed for their accessibility, takeup and effectiveness in improving competencies, skills and employability.

Current situation:

The Strategic Plan of the UO clearly declares the need for more intense training programme of research employees (especially early-stage researchers). Based on this need, the UO offers trainings for employees, but the number of such events differs every year. The UO supports development in research via internal and external trainings and the employees can influence their career development together with the support of the employer (active searching for trainings). To create training systems and electronic courses on the internet, the university uses software Moodle.

Newly created "Doctoral school of the UO" is an innovative support training system for students of accredited doctoral programmes at the UO. The objective of the doctoral school is to create an environment which would educate young and good researchers via trainings focusing on sharing of good practice and networking.

GAP:

- The career development and other training is not systemically treated. For this reason, the interest of researchers in training and continuous development is often low.
- The trainings at the UO are not centrally coordinated. Therefore, there might be some collisions and the efficiency lowers.
- The immediate superior decides on the appropriateness of a training for his/her subordinate, the assessment of the appropriateness is not systemically treated.
- There are no central records of trainings, courses, or workshops.

Action:

- This principle will be systemically included in UO employee training strategy and implemented in the form of individual development plans, which will increase career opportunities of researchers.
- To define a list of obligatory trainings for researchers.
- To suggest mechanisms/principles for the assessment of the training relevance and record keeping for individual employees.

Survey results:

UO (591 respondents)
- Over 80 % of employees fully or rather assume that they are sufficiently encouraged by their superior in activities developing their professional qualification (similar percentage in case of academics and researchers).
- 50 % of respondents assume that the UO provides sufficient information about training offers increasing their professional qualification. 37 % think that they are not sufficiently informed. 13 % are not able to decide.
- In the past three years, 77 % of respondents have attended a training activity.

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- 58 % of respondents assume that the UO provides sufficient information about training offers increasing their professional qualification. 32 % think that they are not sufficiently informed. 10 % are not able to decide.
- In the past three years, 77 % have attended a training activity.

UO (591 respondents)
- Only 32 % of employees have developed a strategy of further career development together with their superior.
- 72 % of employees fully or rather assume that they were given sufficient support from their superior while starting working on their current job position. 11 % of employees stated that the support was not sufficient (same percentage in case of academics and researchers).

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- Almost 44 % of respondents have developed a strategy of further career development together with their superior.

Access to career advice	+/-

Employers and/or funders should ensure that career advice and job placement assistance, either in the institutions concerned, or through collaboration with other structures, is offered to researchers at all stages of their careers, regardless of their contractual situation.

Current situation:

This year, the UO founded a counselling and advice centre. The objective of this centre is to provide a complex offer of services relating to study, career, psychological, welfare and legal counselling in the form of individual consultations and educational activities. The centre helps all above-mentioned groups with career planning, preparing a CVs and motivation letters, job interviews, etc. The centre can help those who are in unfavourable life situation or those who want to grow personally or professionally.

GAP:
- The counselling centre focuses on bachelor, master and doctoral students. Similar service for postdocs or alternatively also other researchers does not exist at the UO.

Action:
- The UO will not propose any actions regarding this principle.

Survey results:

UO (591 respondents)
- Only 17 % of respondents stated that they have at their disposal a counsellor/mentor/instructor.
- Almost half of those who answered that they do not have at their disposal a counsellor/mentor/ instructor assume that it would be beneficial to have such a person at the UO.

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- Only 21 % of respondents stated that they have at their disposal a counsellor/mentor/instructor.
- 50 % of those who answered that they do not have at their disposal a counsellor/mentor/instructor assume that it would be beneficial to have such a person at the UO.

Intellectual Property Rights   +/-

Employers and/or funders should ensure that researchers at all career stages reap the benefits of the exploitation (if any) of their R&D results through legal protection and, in particular, through appropriate protection of Intellectual Property Rights, including copyrights. Policies and practices should specify what rights belong to researchers and/or, where applicable, to their employers or other parties, including external commercial or industrial organisations, as possibly provided for under specific collaboration agreements or other types of agreement.

Current situation:

Fundamental principles of intellectual property treatment at the UO are described in the Rector's directive on intellectual property protection. With regard to the fact that the applied results within national evaluation of science and research results are considered as very important, the UO used to receive some financial remuneration for these results. These finances were then distributed to corresponding faculties according to the evaluation system. A part from it was allocated to corresponding researchers for excellence in science and research according to the evaluation system.

GAP:

- Changes in national evaluation system of research and development results, i.e. in the Methodology for Evaluating Research Organizations and Research, Development and Innovation Purpose-tied Aid Programmes, complicate the existing evaluation system of researchers and profit from using the results of our own research and development.

  The Methodology for Evaluating Research Organizations and Research, Development and Innovation Purpose-tied Aid Programmes:
  https://www.vyzkum.cz/FrontClanek.aspx?idsekce=799796&ad=1&attid=851442

Action:

- Newly created Knowledge and Technology Transfer Centre will define a clear policy related to intellectual property, specifying for instance what rights have researchers and/or alternatively their employers or other parties, including external business or industrial organizations, as it is stipulated in specific cooperation agreements or other agreements and contracts.
- The UO will suggest a new remuneration system for results in applied research.
- From next year, the UO will support projects "Proof of concepts" which facilitate the transfer of development results into practice.

Survey results:

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- Almost 64 % of respondents assume that they receive sufficient financial share for the research/development results. 13 % assume that they do not receive sufficient financial share.
- Over 77 % of respondents assume that this share is based on clearly set up rules.

Co-authorship   +/-

Co-authorship should be viewed positively by institutions when evaluating staff, as evidence of a constructive approach to the conduct of research. Employers and/or funders should therefore develop strategies, practices and procedures to provide researchers, including those at the beginning of their research careers, with the necessary framework conditions so that they can enjoy the right to be recognised and listed and/or quoted, in the context of their actual contributions, as co-authors of papers, patents, etc, or to publish their own research results independently from their supervisor(s).

Current situation:

Currently, the topic of the recognition of the co-authorship is included in the Code of Ethics of the UO, nevertheless, detailed rules are missing.
In the future, the university will need to focus more on licensing arrangements regarding the university pieces of work, especially theses, which result from the cooperation with the applied sector. The survey results show that even though the university does not have a described and defined process of the co-authorship, the majority of the researchers have not witnessed any form of copyright infringement.

Despite this positive finding, there is a number of UO researchers who witnessed some unspecified misconduct related to co-authorship.

GAP:

- The UO does not have clearly set rules for co-authorship.
- The results of an internal survey among students show that in some cases, the results of students' creative activity (the theses) are disseminated without being quoted or listed as co-authors.

Action:

- The UO is aware of the need to clearly describe, define and integrate this principle in the internal regulations. Therefore, the university will create the Good Practice in Research Guideline, which will, among others, define the principles of the co-authorship, and update the internal regulation on intellectual property protection.
- The Knowledge and Technology Transfer Centre will define the recognition of co-authorship, copyright and intellectual property for applied results.

Survey results:
Academics and researchers (366 respondents)

- 85 % of respondents have not witnessed any form of copyright infringement from other employees at their workplace. The remaining 15 % have experienced such misconduct.

Supervision	+/-

Employers and/or funders should ensure that a person is clearly identified to whom early-stage researchers can refer for the performance of their professional duties, and should inform the researchers accordingly. Such arrangements should clearly define that the proposed supervisors are sufficiently expert in supervising research, have the time, knowledge, experience, expertise and commitment to be able to offer the research trainee appropriate support and provide for the necessary progress and review procedures, as well as the necessary feedback mechanisms.

Current situation:

The UO has a hierarchic structure system for the supervision of researchers. The Head of the Development Centre of the Head of the Department is responsible for the supervision of the employees, therefore he/she annually controls the work of individual researchers, evaluates it and develops a new action plan of the researcher.
Doctoral students have at their disposal an assigned supervisor and their study activities are controlled by the Doctoral Board.
Besides the controls of the annual plans, the employees are supposed to be supervised by the Head of the Department or by senior colleagues.

GAP:

- Based on the survey results we can say that mentoring and professional supervision of the doctoral students is sufficient. Therefore, this principle is fulfilled from the R1 point of view. Nevertheless, we see the imperfections in the supervision/mentoring of R2 researchers, i.e. postdocs, which was also visible from the survey results. The majority of the researchers have not experienced official mentoring, even though half of them consider mentoring as a beneficial service.

Action:

- The principle of mentoring/supervision, especially for junior researchers (R2), will be integrated into the internal regulations.

Survey results:

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)

- Only 21 % of respondents stated that they have at their disposal a counsellor/mentor/instructor.
- 50 % of those who answered that they do not have a counsellor/mentor assume that it would be beneficial to have such a person at the UO.

Teaching   +/-

Teaching is an essential means for the structuring and dissemination of knowledge and should therefore be considered a valuable option within the researchers' career paths. However, teaching responsibilities should not be excessive and should not prevent researchers, particularly at the beginning of their careers, from carrying out their research activities. Employers and/or funders should ensure that teaching duties are adequately remunerated and taken into account in the evaluation/appraisal systems, and that time devoted by senior members of staff to the training of early stage researchers should be counted as part of their teaching commitment. Suitable training should be provided for teaching and coaching activities as part of the professional development of researchers.

Current situation:

Teaching is considered as an integral part of a researcher's professional development. Thus, it is reflected in their evaluation. On the other hand, the researchers also expect that their pedagogical duties will not overshadow their research performance.
The doctoral students are expected to get involved in teaching or consultations, alternatively to laboratory supervising.

GAP:

- Neither researchers nor doctoral students are offered trainings to develop their pedagogical skills.
- Leaders do not motivate their employees to attend external trainings that could enhance their pedagogical skills.

Action:

- To integrate the development of pedagogical skills into a complex system of development of UO employees' competencies.

Survey results:

Academics (366 respondents)
- Over 56 % of respondents stated that they devote more than 50 % of their FTE (full-time equivalent) to the pedagogical activities. Moreover, 31 % of them claim that their pedagogical activities take more than 75 % of their FTE. Only 12 % of respondents devote less than 25 % of their FTE to pedagogical activities.
- 51 % of respondents assume that their pedagogical duties do not/rather do not limit them in their research activities. Nearly 18 % assume that their pedagogical activities limit them in their research activities quite a lot.
- 80 % of respondents assume that their pedagogical activity is /is rather sufficiently taken into account during their evaluation. Nearly 6 % assume that their pedagogical activity is not sufficiently taken into account by their superior.

Evaluation/appraisal systems   -/+

Employers and/or funders should introduce for all researchers, including senior researchers, evaluation/appraisal systems for assessing their professional performance on a regular basis and in a transparent manner by an independent (and, in the case of senior researchers, preferably international) committee. Such evaluation and appraisal procedures should take due account of their overall research creativity and research results, e.g. publications, patents, management of research, teaching/lecturing, supervision, mentoring, national or international collaboration, administrative duties, public awareness activities and mobility, and should be taken into consideration in the context of career progression.

Current situation:

The UO currently uses two electronic tools enabling the employee evaluation. The first one is a database of performance indicators including the parameters from teaching and research activities.
The second tool are annual plans, which are evaluated by the leaders every year in January, and based on the evaluation results, new goals and tasks for the upcoming evaluation period are set up. To set up

the parameters, the university uses performance standards for the researchers, which are specific for each field and take into account various activities of researchers, including international mobilities.

The quality of research results at the University of Ostrava is evaluated in particular via some scientometric parameters gained from the databases Web of Science and Scopus (number of citations, impact factor, journal ranking in given category).

The university also uses an external evaluation tool - a system evaluating results of research institutions in the Czech Republic, which is currently revised and based on bibliometric analyses and on assessment of research results by independent foreign reviewers. As the current system introduces new parameters, the current evaluation system of researchers at the UO must be modified.

The information about the quality of research results at the UO is disseminated at the Rector's Collegia, whereas the faculty leadership organizes meetings with the departments. Current use of employee evaluation system differs depending on the faculty. Our current objective is to link the evaluation system to the Career System of the UO, which is being prepared.

GAP:

- Lack of a career system. The evaluation systems do not take into account all the aspects and duties of a researcher.
- The employee performance is currently evaluated only by their immediate superior.

Action:

- We need to revise the current evaluation systems for the individuals, especially the parts related to research, teaching and university community's engagement, and to develop an evaluation system of research teams.

Survey results:

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)
- Only 60 % of respondents assume that the UO sufficiently takes into account their field specifications when evaluating the results of their research/development activities.

The answers to the question "In which way are you evaluated by your superior?" were the following:

- 33,8 % - informal, irregular evaluation
- 33,5 % - personal interview at least once a year
- 15,2 % - my superior does not evaluate my work (alternatively – I have not been evaluated yet)
- 7,4 % - written evaluation at least once a year
- 4,7 % - personal interview or written evaluation in longer intervals than a year
- 5,2 % - other, unspecified form of evaluation

Complaints/appeals	-/+

Employers and/or funders of researchers should establish, in compliance with national rules and regulations, appropriate procedures, possibly in the form of an impartial (ombudsman-type) person to deal with complaints/appeals of researchers, including those concerning conflicts between supervisor(s) and early-stage researchers. Such procedures should provide all research staff with confidential and informal assistance in resolving work-related conflicts, disputes and grievances, with the aim of promoting fair and equitable treatment within the institution and improving the overall quality of the working environment.

Current situation:

In case of a complaint, the employees can contact a trade union, their superior – immediate superior, the Head of the Human Resources Department, The Head of the Department, the Dean of the Faculty, or the Rector (e.g. in case of ethical issues). The doctoral students may take advantage of the Counselling Centre (see principle Access to Career Advice).

The UO deals with every received complaint. The complaints are resolved in compliance with the principles of natural justice and with the aim of maintaining a good working environment at the workplaces.

GAP:

- The UO does not have an impartial person to deal with complaints (an ombudsman).

Action:

- With regard to the survey results, the UO does not consider appointing an impartial person to solve the complaints as a key issue. The UO will try to resolve the situation in the long term, nevertheless, this task will not be included in the Action Plan.

Survey results:

UO (591 respondents)

- 40 % of respondents assume that the UO offers sufficient means to solve the complaints.
- 46,5 % of respondents are not able to say whether the means to solve the complaints are sufficient or not.
- 13,5 % of respondents assume that the UO does not have sufficient means/measures to solve complaints or imepertinent behaviour.

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)

- 44 % of respondents assume that the UO offers sufficient means to solve the complaints or impertinent behaviour.
- 43,7 % of respondents are not able to assume whether the UO offers sufficient means to solve the complaints.
- 4 % of respondents assume that the UO does not have sufficient means to solve complaints or impertinent behaviour.

Participation in decision-making bodies	+/+

Employers and/or funders of researchers should recognise it as wholly legitimate, and indeed desirable, that researchers be represented in the relevant information, consultation and decision-making bodies of the institutions for which they work, so as to protect and promote their individual and collective interests as professionals and to actively contribute to the workings of the institution.

Current situation:

Researchers take part in the decision-making bodies at various levels. For instance, some of them are members of the managing authorities of the UO, Academic Council, Academic Senate, Ethics Committee, etc. The representation of the academics in the Academic Senate emerges from the Higher Education Act.

GAP:

- The UO is fully in compliance with this principle.

Action:

- The UO will not propose any actions regarding this principle.

Survey results:

UO (233 respondents who were evaluated by their superior and who are members of a decision-making/advisory body)

- The majority (54 %) of respondents assume that their activity in a decision-making body is taken into account by the superior in the evaluation. 18 % assume that this activity is not taken into account at all by their superior in their evaluation.

Academics and researchers (188 respondents who were evaluated by their superior and who are members of a decision-making/advisory body)

- The majority (59 %) of respondents assume that their activity in a decision-making/advisory body is taken into account during the evaluation. 13 % assume that this activity is not taken into account at all during the regular annual evaluation.

Academics and researchers (366 respondents)

- Almost 65 % of respondents take part in the university community's engagement. 66 % of them devote max. 10 % of their FTE to this activity.

- Only 51 % of those who take part in the university community's engagement assume that this activity is sufficiently taken into account by the superior in the evaluation.

Recruitment	-/-

Employers and/or funders should ensure that the entry and admission standards for researchers, particularly at the beginning at their careers, are clearly specified and should also facilitate access for disadvantaged groups or for researchers returning to a research career, including teachers (of any level) returning to a research career. Employers and/or funders of researchers should adhere to the principles set out in the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers when appointing or recruiting researchers.

Current situation:

The recruitment of researchers has a continuous progress, even though the Regulations on Recruitment Procedures at the University of Ostrava describe the recruitment procedures in a very general way. Despite the absence of details, which are specified in the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers, the UO guarantees transparency and equal opportunities to all the employees.

The university environment takes into account the needs of disabled employees – the majority of the rooms in UO buildings have Braille indications, we also have wheelchair accessible access to the buildings. The PYRAMID Centre deals with students with specific needs - see The European Union Disability Strategy. The UO has an active policy of approach towards disabled people.

Thanks to friendly conditions of working hours, the university is ready to please the requirements of mothers coming back to work from maternity or parental leaves. The same approach is provided to the researchers who interrupted their career in research and worked for instance in the business sector for some time.

GAP:

- The UO does not have sufficiently described either the recruitment procedures nor the possibilities of career development.

Action:

- The Regulations on Recruitment Procedures at the University of Ostrava will be revised to be in compliance with (among others) the regulations of the European Commission.
- The UO will develop a career system, which will treat the position and the perspective of the professional development of employees who take part in educational, research and development activities, on the basis of their personal professional development and enhancement of their qualification.

The Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers

General Principles and Requirements for the Code of Conduct

Recruitment	-/-

Employers and/or funders should establish recruitment procedures which are open 14, efficient, transparent, supportive and internationally comparable, as well as tailored to the type of positions advertised. Advertisements should give a broad description of knowledge and competencies required, and should not be so specialised as to discourage suitable applicants. Employers should include a description of the working conditions and entitlements, including career development prospects. Moreover, the time allowed between the advertisement of the vacancy or the call for applications and the deadline for reply should be realistic.

Current situation:

The job offers include detailed descriptions of the duties, education requirements, required work experience, qualification, offered benefits as well as the specification whether the contract would be fixed-term or permanent. The advertisements are published for a period of 15 – 30 days (alternatively longer), regardless of whether it is published on the UO web page or some job portal. The university does not have a rule which would ensure the transparency, career development, or possibilities (alternatively requirements) of mobility, etc.
As already mentioned in principle 12, the current Regulations on Recruitment Procedures at the University of Ostrava need to be revised. The Regulations need to be modified to be in compliance with the GDPR rules (up to 6 months storage of personal data of the applicants after the recruitment procedure). New Regulations on Recruitment will include the principles of the Code of Conduct.

Except for few university workplaces, the UO does not publish vacant positions for researchers on the Euraxess or other portals for researchers (e.g. ResearchGate). This is regarded as a key imperfection that needs to be changed.

GAP:
- The absence of a description of the Code's fundamental principles in the Regulations on Recruitment Procedures at the University of Ostrava.
- The university does not publish research vacancies on the web pages dedicated to researchers - EURAXESS, Research Gate, etc.

Action:
- To define the fundamental principles of researchers' recruitment in the Regulations on Recruitment Procedure at the University of Ostrava, i.e. fundamental principles of the Code of Conduct, and also the information on the personal data processing according to the GDPR.
- To publish the vacancies for researchers on web pages such as EURAXESS and other portals and web pages dedicated to researchers.

Selection	-/+

Selection committees should bring together diverse expertise and competences and should have an adequate gender balance and, where appropriate and feasible, include members from different sectors (public and private) and disciplines, including from other countries and with relevant experience to assess the candidate. Whenever possible, a wide range of selection practices should be used, such as external expert assessment and face-to-face interviews. Members of selection panels should be adequately trained.

Current situation:

The system used for selection of new employees works, even though the Regulations on Recruitment Procedures do not include a detailed specification of the recruitment or selection procedures. The principle of gender or age diversity in the selection committees is respected at the UO, even though it is

not stipulated in any internal document of the university. The UO uses a wide range of selection practices – interviews, tests; the selection committee takes into consideration the evaluation of mobility or achieved research results, alternatively experience with project management. New research employees are primarily employed to work on a project where the required competencies are set by the project owner (in case of the university, the selection is multicriterial with the emphasis on complex knowledge, results, publications, etc.).

GAP:

- The Regulations on Recruitment Procedures do not include any criteria for the selection of a new employee, nor conditions for the creation of the selection committees.
- Members of the selection committees are not trained in recruitment and selection procedures.

Action:

- To revise the Regulations on Recruitment Procedures – not only the part relating to the recruitment but also the part relating to the conditions for the selection of a new employee.
- To train the employees – members of the selection committees – in the employee selection.

Transparency	-/+

Candidates should be informed, prior to the selection, about the recruitment process and the selection criteria, the number of available positions and the career development prospects. They should also be informed after the sele ction process about the strengths and weaknesses of their applications.

Current situation:

All vacant positions are published on the web page of the UO or on a job portal, alternatively on the web page of the Labour Office of the Czech Republic. The advertisements include the following information:
a) name of the position;
b) job requirements;
c) expected starting date;
d) job description;
e) deadline for reply to the job offer;
f) alternatively required documents.

The applicants invited for an interview are provided details on the career development if they ask for it. If the applicant is not invited for an interview, he receives a general electronic rejection letter. If a rejected applicant asks for a feedback, we provide it, i.e. we inform them about the strong and weak aspects of their application.

GAP:

- The applicant responding to a published advertisement is not informed about the number of vacant positions, career development, nor about the strong and weak sides of their application.

Action:

- Revision of the Regulations on Recruitment Procedures in compliance with the OTM-R.

Judging merit	-/+

The selection process should take into consideration the whole range of experience of the candidates. While focusing on their overall potential as researchers, their creativity and level of independence should also be considered. This means that merit should be judged qualitatively as well as quantitatively, focusing on outstanding results within a diversified career path and not only on the number of publications. Consequently, the importance of bibliometric indices should be properly balanced within a wider range of evaluation criteria, such as teaching, supervision, teamwork, knowledge transfer, management of research and innovation and public awareness activities. For candidates from an industrial background, particular attention should be paid to any contributions to patents, development or inventions.

Current situation:

The key factor for judging merit is a combination of achieved qualification, results and practical skills in given field. The selection committee takes into account researchers' outputs, experience with management of research groups, supervision of doctoral students, knowledge of specific methodology, etc. Partial requirements on the applicants are subject to every published vacancy.

The UO does not make differences between the applicants who respond to a published vacancy – regardless of whether they apply from a public or private sector.

GAP:

- The majority of the UO faculties lack detailed principles of judging merit stipulated in the internal regulations.

Action:

- To revise the current Regulations on Recruitment Procedures and link them to the OTM-R policy.

Variations in the chronological order of CVs	+/+

Career breaks or variations in the chronological order of CVs should not be penalised, but regarded as an evolution of a career, and consequently, as a potentially valuable contribution to the professional development of researchers towards a multidimensional career track. Candidates should therefore be allowed to submit evidence-based CVs, reflecting a representative array of achievements and qualifications appropriate to the post for which application is being made.

Current situation:

The selection of the applicants is based on all criteria aspects of the offered position, on his competencies and on the fulfilment of all parts of the recruitment procedure. The Regulations on Recruitment Procedures define that the applicant is obliged to provide a CV, cover letter, alternatively a copy of required documents (in case of professors and associate professors). With regards to the GDPR, we require the signature of the Consent to personal data processing. As a part of the selection procedure, the applicant may be asked to present himself/herself in a presentation or to present his/her publications, etc. The selection committee takes into account not only researchers' outputs but also experience with management of research groups, supervision of doctoral students, mobility or knowledge of specific methodology. Either previous career interruption or a non-standard career development (maternity, working in a corporate environment, etc.) does not influence the assessment of an applicant during the selection procedure.

GAP:

- The UO is fully in compliance with this principle.

Action:

- To update the Regulations on Recruitment Procedures at the University of Ostrava.
- To publish the Regulations on the Career System.

Recognition of mobility experience	-/+

Any mobility experience, e.g. a stay in another country/region or in another research setting (public or private) or a change from one discipline or sector to another, whether as part of the initial research training or at a later stage of the research career, or virtual mobility experience, should be considered as a valuable contribution to the professional development of a researcher.

Current situation:

Ranking of the applicants and their selection is based on a multicriterial approach and the mobilities (especially the international mobilities) are in case of researchers one of very important parameters. Nevertheless, the importance of this parameter depends on the type of the position in question and also on the requirements of the project owner – if the offered vacancy is for a work on a project. In case of

internal development projects supporting postdocs, the admission of an applicant is contingent upon his/her mobility experience. The mobility (international, institutional – national, intersectoral – academic versus private sector, interdisciplinary, or any other combination) is beneficial for many reasons – it increases the quality of the research and development, and potentially, it leads to a more intense contribution to society.

GAP:

- Current Regulations on Recruitment Procedures does not emphasize taking into consideration the mobilities during the selection procedure.

Action:

- To revise current Regulations on Recruitment Procedures at the UO and link them to the OTM-R policy.

Recognition of qualifications	+/+

Employers and/or funders should provide for appropriate assessment and evaluation of the academic and professional qualifications, including nonformal qualifications, of all researchers, in particular within the context of 27 international and professional mobility. They should inform themselves and gain a full understanding of rules, procedures and standards governing the recognition of such qualifications and, consequently, explore existing national law, conventions and specific rules on the recognition of these qualifications through all available channels.

Current situation:

The recognition of qualifications of researchers is based on the Higher Education Act and the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the Europe Region. Academic degrees (doctor, associate professor, professor) is possible to obtain at the universities, which provide accredited doctoral studies, conferment of habilitations and professorships. These titles are valid at all the institutions in the Czech Republic. The recognition of qualifications of the employees coming from abroad is stipulated in the regulation of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports.
The UO limits this system by a systemization of workplaces, which allows to reassess the position of an employee according to their results and to change the systemized position. In practice, it means that if an employee working as an assistant completes his associate professorship, he/she does not automatically move up to the position of an associate professor. The employees are acquainted with this approach in the Regulations on the Career System and in the Rector's Directive on Systemization of Workplaces.

GAP:

- The UO lacks an explicit regulation on recognition of informal qualification within professional mobility.

Action:

- To amend the Regulations on Recruitment Procedures and include the recognition of qualifications.
- To publish the Regulations on the Career System.

Seniority	+/+

The levels of qualifications required should be in line with the needs of the position and not be set as a barrier to entry. Recognition and evaluation of qualifications should focus on judging the achievements of the person rather than his/her circumstances or the reputation of the institution where the qualifications were gained. As professional qualifications may be gained at an early stage of a long career, the pattern of lifelong professional development should also be recognised.

Current situation:

The level of required qualifications of the job applicants is in line with the needs of the position and is clearly specified in the job advertisement. The ranking and selection of the applicants are based on all

criteria aspects, i.e. depending on the work position, required competencies, education, etc. Current Regulations on Recruitment Procedures at the UO does not define the seniority, nevertheless, it is taken into account in practice.

The UO takes the lifelong learning as a continual process of gaining and developing knowledge, intellectual and practical skills, and that even in excess of the initial training. The UO supports and prefers employees' interest in deepening and increasing their knowledge/education. Llifelong learning is one of the decisive factors of competitiveness in the labour market.

GAP:

- The UO is fully in compliance with this principle of the Charter and Code.

Action:

- The UO will not propose any actions regarding this principle.

Postdoctoral appointments	-/-

Clear rules and explicit guidelines for the recruitment and appointment of postdoctoral researchers, including the maximum duration and the objectives of such appointments, should be established by the institutions appointing postdoctoral researchers. Such guidelines should take into account time spent in prior postdoctoral appointments at other institutions and take into consideration that the postdoctoral status should be transitional, with the primary purpose of providing additional professional development opportunities for a research career in the context of longterm career prospects.

Current situation:

Current systemization of researchers at the UO does not clearly differentiate the position of postdocs and independent researchers.

As opposed to the targeted systematic development of doctoral students, the awareness of the postdocs about their duties and rights, possibilities of career development, outputs requirements, is rather low and non-systemic. The information is disseminated by the heads of the faculties or departments and depends on their sense of responsibility.

GAP:

- The UO lacks the definition of the career stage into which belong postdocs; including the setting of their competencies related to this position.
- Except for the postdocs who are employed within EU projects or institutional development programmes, the UO lacks clearly defined requirements on postdocs, including their duties and a plan of their professional development.

Action:

- To implement the career stages of the researchers according to the Euraxess (including R2 – "recognised researcher", which corresponds to the position of a postdoc at the UO) to the Internal Wage Regulations and related documents.
- The internal regulations (systemization) will include general requirements on postdocs and clear principles for their professional development (onboarding, adaptation plans, career system).