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**GAP analysis**

The Charter and Code provides the basis for the Gap analysis. In order to aid cohesion, the 40 articles have been renumbered under the following headings. Please provide the outcome of your organisation’s GAP analysis below. If your organisation currently does not fully meet the criteria, please list whether national or organisational legislation may be limiting the Charter’s implementation, initiatives that have already been taken to improve the situation or new proposals that could remedy the current situation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers: GAP analysis overview** | | | |
| Status: to what extent does this organisation meet the following principles? | Implementation:  ++ = **fully** implemented  +/- = **almost but not fully** implemented  -/+ = **partially** implemented  -- = **insufficiently** implemented | In case of --, -/+, or +/-, please **indicate the actual “gap**” between the principle and the current practice in your organisation.  If relevant, list any national/regional legislation or organisational regulation currently impeding implementation | Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for  improvement: |
| **Ethical and Professional Aspects** | | | |
| **1. 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. | ++ | Researchers at IVB do not feel limited in their research interests and ideas at all. The internal regulations of IVB are derived directly from *Labour Code of the Czech Republic* and Code of Ethics for Researchers of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. The internal regulations of IVB, in particular the Code of Ethics, fully agrees with all general principles and requirements for researchers related to research freedom. | No immediate action is needed. Research freedom at IVB will be continuously pursued and its principles will be strengthened in future. |
| **2. 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE:  For instant we are using the Code of Ethics of the CAS at IVB. This Code is available on the Intranet, accessible for all IVB employees, however only in Czech language. The online survey evaluated the awareness of application of research ethics presented in available Code of Ethics at IVB to be about 50 %; scientists commented that they were not very familiar with the Code of Ethics of the Czech Academy of Science, or that they had not encountered any ethical issues themselves so far, especially in the category of R1-R3.  Ethical principles are generally passed from supervisors to students and young researchers obtain first awareness of ethical principles during university studies. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:  Code of ethics will be translated into English and will become the part of the “**Employee Manual**” (See ACTION 2\_B). We also plan to organize several seminars concerning different topics included in the Code of Ethics e.g. intellectual property, plagiarism, authorships rules, etc…  See ACTION 4\_A\_B\_C. |
| **3. 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. 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE:  This point is tightly linked to the previous one as professional responsibility plays fundamental role in scientific ethics.  Institute Board of IVB strategically manages the scientific direction of realized projects, including their relevancy for society. All project proposals must be approved before the application.  *IVB follows the Code of Ethics of the CAS. This Code is available on the Intranet accessible for all IVB employees, however only in Czech language. The online survey evaluated the awareness of application of research ethics presented in available Code of Ethics at IVB to be about 50 %; scientists commented that they were not very familiar with the Code of Ethics of the Czech Academy of Sciences, or that they had not encountered any ethical issues themselves so far.*  *There are several internal regulations provided by the director relating to this subject:*  *Director's Directive No. 5-15: proof-of-concept where are described fundamental responsibilities of researchers regarding the applicable results and their potential commercialization.*  *Director's Directive No. 6-15 Evaluation Criteria for Commercialization Projects*  *Director's Directive No. 2-15 Organizational Rules of the Knowledge Management Centre*  *Director's Directive No. 3-15 Statute of the Council for the Commercialization of Results* | SUGGESTION FOR IMPROVEMENT:  Code of ethics will be translated into the English. It will be presented in the “**Employee Manual**” (See ACTION 2\_B). Also, we plan to run several seminars concerning different topics included in the Code of Ethics e.g. intellectual property rights, plagiarism, authorships, etc…  See ACTION 4\_A\_C.  We plan to prepare a supplement to the IVB Code of Ethics: “**Good research practice**”, where we would like to summarize relevant recommendations concerning intellectual property rights, plagiarism, authorships for our field of research.  See ACTION 4\_B. |
| **4. 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE:  Since 2020 researchers at our institute can profit from newly established project manager team, helping with project administration and searching for new funding and scholarship opportunities. In our questionnaire, more than 50% of IVB scientists showed interest to get advice concerning professional attitude through seminars or discussions organized by IVB, especially from R2 and R3. There is high demand for such seminars but presented in person, which was not possible in the recent past due to Covid-19. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:  We plan to run several seminars and open discussions concerning different topics regarding professional attitude, included in the Code of Ethics e.g. intellectual property rights, plagiarism, authorships and also give scientists advices regarding preparation of project proposals.  See ACTION 4\_C.  The position of project managers in scientific activities will be also clarified in “**Employee Manual**”.  See ACTION 2\_B |
| **5. 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE:  The general regulatory framework is provided by the IVB Labour Code. However, 34% of scientists were not aware that such a document exists or where to find it. More than 85% would appreciate to have these regulations clearly specified and have information on where to find them. Individual interviews showed that some scientists have insufficient familiarity with the area of wages, knowledge of the IVB Labour Code, and the internal regulations of IVB. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:    IVB labour code and Code of ethics will be translated into the English. Both will be presented in the “**Employee Manual**” (See Action 2\_B\_C).  We plan to organize internal seminars dealing with this subject.  See ACTION 4\_C |
| **6. 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. | -/+ | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  The evaluation of this criterion shows that researchers at IVB have no idea what to imagine as Accountability and how to define it.  Unfamiliarity with the field of financial management and lack of interest in such information, which, from the scientists’ point of view, has only marginal impact on their work. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:  We plan to organize seminars concerning this subject to highlight its significance. And we plan to establish a concept of know-how sharing and guide for open access.  See ACTION 4\_C\_E. |
| **7. 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Labour Code No. 262/2006 Coll. specifies basic requirements for safe working conditions, which are implemented in the IVB Labour Code, including the requirement for regular health and safety instructions. All IVB employees have to fill online training (available both in Czech and English) on taking up employment and every 2-3 years thereafter.  *The GDPR is signed by each employee on boarding, but this is not enshrined in any regulation.* | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:  We plan to prepare English version of the relevant documents. Formulation and implementation of data backup strategies. And preparation of “**Good research practice**” brochure. We also plan to organize seminars regarding this topic.  See ACTION 4\_A\_B\_C. |
| **8. 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 are either exploited commercially or made accessible to the public (or both) whenever the opportunity arises. | -/+ | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Scientific publications are the most common form of research dissemination at IVB. 68% of IVB researchers are aware of commercialization potential of their research. 58% of researchers (especially from R1-R3) would appreciate to have possibility to develop their skills in some kind of a training course regarding all available dissemination options.  *IVB has established Centre of knowledge transfer and the Board for commercialization from 2015. Their activities are regulated by several Director's Directives:*  *Director's Directive No. Evaluation Criteria for Commercialization Projects*  *Director's Directive No. 2-15 Organizational Rules of the Knowledge Management Centre*  *Director's Directive No. 3-15 Statute of the Council for the Commercialization of Results*  *Director's Directive No. 4-15 Proof-of-concept sustainability plan.* | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:  We plan to develop a scientific communication training programme that would combine the following two basic areas - strategies for the successful writing of scientific publications (including sharing best practice examples from more experienced colleagues) and verbal communication and presentation skills.  See ACTION 4\_C. |
| **9. 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 nonspecialists, 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Communication of science is supported at IVB by the Centre for Public Relations (CPR), which helps scientists to compose press release and disseminate their results toward non- specialists (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, IVB website news and diverse media – TV, Radio, press). Since 2019, when CPR was established at IVB, many scientists use its services. Unfortunately, some scientists do not have any experience with the topic and do not participate in such activities. Individual interviews have shown that they are usually the same researchers who are involved in this type of communication activity (this often includes additional work in the evenings, requires preparation and it limits the time for their own scientific work in a way). Although these activities are part of the scientist's scope of work, there should be a clear strategy at the level of the department, stating how workers are rewarded for these above standard activities (the comment on unfamiliarity with the strategies of reward provision and their amount). | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:  We will prepare educational seminars dealing with scientific communication, especially for younger researchers from R1-R3 (e.g. how to write press release, online communication with media, presenting research in couple of minutes, scientific photos and videos etc...).  See ACTION 4\_C.  Activities related with CPR will be presented in the “**Employee Manual**”.  See ACTION\_2\_B.  All extra research activities (popularization, teaching, supervision, mentoring, etc.) will be part of awarded personal evaluation.  See ACTION\_3\_C. |
| **10. 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Almost 12% of respondents have experience with discrimination at our institute (especially from R4). This discrimination concerns ageism, language barrier and gender. However, in the last years no complaints were recorded or noticed by the head of the Institute.  *Discrimination issue is addressed in the Code of Ethics and IVB labour code. At the CAS there is an Institute dealing with discrimination called NKC gender and science which provide useful information related to different kinds of discrimination at the workplace https://genderaveda.cz/en/gender-and-science/* | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:  We plan to organize seminars led by external experts dealing with discrimination and equal opportunity with the support from NKC gender and science of CAS.  See ACTION 4\_C.  All information where to address complaints will be included in the “**Employee Manual**”.  See ACTION 2\_B. |
| **11. 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 inter-national) 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. | -/+ | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  In general, there is lack of appraisal rules and clear feedback at IVB. Evaluation is considered as not transparent. Scientists are not aware of which activities are evaluated and assessed (especially from R1-R3). 35% is satisfied with evaluation system, however more than 40 % have no experience or are not aware at all of any evaluation system at IVB (especially from R1 and R2).  45% scientists wish to have regular meetings with their supervisors within their laboratory groups, especially in R1 and R2.  Some researchers confused attestation with every year evaluation and bonus distribution. Main questions raised were “*Who is evaluated, when and how?*”  *Attestation rules at IVB are clearly defined by IVB labour code – every 3 years for R3 and R4.* | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  We plan an open discussion about evaluation system within next IVB meeting, additionally with regard to new Lab groups. Transparent evaluation system is the crucial aim of our institute and the actual evaluation system need to be revised. Evaluation should reflect different professional categories and rules should be clearly set up. Key actions are precise: IVB labour code arrangement or setting new internal regulations, improve communication from the head of the Institute, e.g. necessity of feedback at the end.  Lab groups will be encouraged to set a regular discussion. Some of the discussions will be organised for different research categories by the institute.  See ACTION 3\_A\_C. |
| **Recruitment and Selection** | | | |
| **12. 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. | -/+ | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  IVB, as one of the CAS institutes, is governed by Act No. 341/2005 Coll. on Public Research Institutions, which includes a provision concerning the recruitment of new researchers. We currently follow Institute of Vertebrate Biology of CAS Selection Procedure Regulations which complete the rules specified by the law. The document is available in Czech on the Intranet (accessible only for IVB employees) in the Working rules (“Pracovní řád”). Nowadays, it contains some OTM-R principles, but not all of them. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Update the CAS Selection Procedure Regulations in accord with principles defined in the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers, especially to advertise vacancies on international web sites, translate important documents into English (e.g. template for advertising positions, all regulations, working rules, Code of Ethics), provide feedback if asked at the end of the recruitment process. Selection committee will be gender balanced, well trained and completed by external members.  We plan to update OTM-R policy in accord with the principles set out in the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers, discuss these changes with CAS headquarters and when approved, publish them online.  See ACTION 1. |
| **13. Recruitment (Code)**  Employers and/or funders should establish recruitment procedures which are open, 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. | -/+ | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  The respondents of our questionnaire were not satisfied with the last recruitment process (especially from R1-R3); employees (former candidates) expressed their feeling that they had not been satisfactorily informed of the position and did not get sufficient information regarding the position offered in advance (lack of information about number of offered positions and salary, the position was not clearly specified, lack of feedback, selection criteria not specified, not realistic timing of the process). | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Update the CAS Selection Procedure Regulations in accord with principles defined in the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers. (See above)  During the selection procedure, the committee members should fill out a list of positives and negatives for each candidate (proforma prepared in advance: “**OTM-R Checklist**”) so that after the selection process adequate feedback could be provided.  See ACTION 1. |
| **14. Selection (Code)**  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. | -/+ | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Members of selection committees are selected by the director as described in the IVB Selection Procedure Regulations in the Working rules. The rules are defined in a way to allow as much flexibility as possible to have opportunity to select candidates for different types of positions we have at our Institute. However, gender balance of selection committee is not specified in recent rules. What more, there is no demand for external members and adequate training of the selection committee right now. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  The training of the recruitment committee shall be applied as well as selection of the committee with the respect to the gender balance and transparency (external members). Committee should be selected according to different type of recruitment process and specific rules for different types of recruitment with respect to position e.g. grants employee, postdocs, institutional researchers.  See ACTION 1\_C\_D. |
| **15. Transparency (Code)**  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 selection process about the strengths and weaknesses of their applications. | -- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  According to our respondents most of the rules defined in the Code regarding transparency were not applied during last IVB recruitment process. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Implement transparency rules into the IVB Selection Procedure Regulations within the Working rules.  See ACTION 1. |
| **16. Judging merit (Code)**  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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  The analysis showed that the employees lacked qualitative approach during last recruitment process.  The selection committee at IVB is usually considering all the experience and skills acquired during the previous career path of each applicant when selecting a candidate for a particular position. However, the most important factors are always the number of the first or last author publications and the number of their own projects. Ability to obtain own project is extremely important for the institutional budget as up to 40 % of IVB budget is covered from projects. As IVB is highly dependent on the projects, it is difficult to omit these factors when considering a good candidate. Additionally, candidates with a high number of high-quality publications and own research projects are those showing the highest creativity and independency, two skills very important in the scientific world. Analysis also showed that researchers miss clear specification of value of different research activities. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Value of different research activities will be more intensively discussed and better communicated.  See ACTION 3\_A. |
| **17. Variations in the chronological order of CVs (Code)**  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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Career breaks or variations in the chronological order of CVs are still penalised during selection process at IVB because the selection process judges candidates mostly quantitatively (see above why). Standard chronological order is valued the most. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  To be prepared: Human resources development strategy and career consulting by mentors.  See ACTION 2\_D\_E. |
| **18. Recognition of mobility experience (Code)**  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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  International experience is evaluated at our Institute during the selection procedure. Employees are supported and sent out on scholarships around the world within mobility projects managed by the Institute, which they consider as positive and helpful for their professional development. However, some of the employees (especially from R1 and R2) still do not know about different possibilities and options at our Institute. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  We need to support and improve communication within the project teams = seminars about lab leading.  See ACTION 4\_C. |
| **19. Recognition of qualifications (Code)**  Employers and/or funders should provide for appropriate assessment and evaluation of the academic and professional qualifications, including non - formal qualifications, of all researchers, in particular within the context of 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Recognition of qualification is regulated by the IVB Working rules and Attestation rules. However, some of the positions (especially postdoctoral position, see below) should be reformulated or actualized. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  To update definition of positions and clarify career progression: e.g. clarification of the definition of postdoc, but also other positions in the Attestation Rules account is not listed (e.g. due to parenthood).  See ACTION 2\_E. |
| **20. Seniority (Code)**  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. | ++ | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  As already mentioned under point 16., ability to obtain own project and number of first/last authored publications are the main criteria for candidate selection for research position. Not age, but abilities are recognized. Professional development of each researcher is thus mainly in his/her own hands. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Not selected for the implementation in the Action plan. |
| **21. Postdoctoral appointments (Code)**  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 consider 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 long- term career prospects. | -/+ | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  The definition of postdoctoral position in Attestation rules is obsolete and dysfunctional and often not followed. Right now, the postdoc is defined as a researcher within 5 years after obtaining PhD. Career break consideration is not specified for this period. Moreover, it is not clear what would happen after the period of 5 years in particular cases. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  To update definition of positions and clarification of career progression: e.g. clarification of the definition of postdoc, but also other positions in the Attestation Rules.  See ACTION 2\_E.  To be prepared: Human resources development strategy and career consulting by mentors and through seminars for PhD students and postdocs.  See ACTION 2\_D. |
| **Working Conditions and Social Security** | | | |
| **22. 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). | ++ | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  We adhere to the qualification levels of university-educated employees. Newly arrived colleagues are accepted with professional respect at all qualification levels. Any negative feedback or complaint has not been reported in this area yet. The institute will continue to strive to maintain a positive response, from doctoral students to senior researchers. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  No action is needed. The institute will continue to strive to maintain a positive response, from doctoral students to senior researchers. |
| **23. 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  The needs of new equipment, technology, devices, opportunities, and remote cooperation through research networks are constantly monitored and continuously processed with regard to the financial possibilities of the Institute.  Within IVB, there are three research facilities (Brno, Studenec and Valtice), that provide a great environment for research at all levels. Field work is an essential element of research at IVB and there is no limitation in this regard. All health and safety regulations are monitored. All employees undergo appropriate training regularly.  However, 16% of respondents were not satisfied with administration support at our Institute. Researchers ask for reduction of administration burden and more help with project administration. The role and competencies of administrative workers and project managers is not clearly defined yet. There is also a lack of support for the technicians that are necessary for scientific work, regardless of whether the grant was obtained or not, especially in breeding facilities and laboratories. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Definition of the role and competencies of project managers and technical support workers will be specified in the “**Employee Manual**”. Support of technicians is more dependent on the institute budget which is often tied. Right now, only a limited number of technicians is funded from the Institute, most of them are funded from projects.  We will also focus on the communication skills of administrative workers. Communication training will be offered to them. The aim of our Institute is that administrative department and other supportive departments (Project team, CPR, Centrum of Transfer and Technology, …) and its staff should be as helpful as possible to researchers and their work.  See ACTION 2\_B and 4\_C. |
| **24. 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, teleworking and sabbatical leave, as well as to the necessary financial and administrative provisions governing such arrangements. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Despite overall satisfaction (97%) with the working conditions offered by the Institute (especially high working flexibility – flexible working hours, part-time working, home office), some researchers have expressed suggestions for further improvement:  1) support during sabbatical leave, which is now not defined or regulated at IVB or within CAS  2) demand for informal meetings to discuss current information about events at the Institute  3) setting guidelines for computer updates  4) parenting support – babysitting, institutional kindergarten  5) have the opportunity to profit from employee benefits | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  We plan to use our Cultural and Social Needs Fund to support extra activities (for example sports, cultural or wellness activities) via employee account. Also, we would like to support team building activities which were in the last two years limited due to the COVID restrictions. We also plan to support parents during important meetings and seminars by providing babysitting, also educational activities, and summer camps for employee’s children.  See ACTION 3\_D.  Current support provided to new scientists is sufficient, but shall be standardized, formalized and published on the OTM-R webpage.  See ACTION 2\_A. |
| **25. 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. | -/+ | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  83% respondents were fully or partially satisfied with stability and permanence of employment. Our Institutes try to maximally support the stability and permanence; however, its desire is limited by the budget situation. Nobody at our institute have permanent position right now. Contracts are set for 3-year period with the possibility of extension. However, this is in general the problem of research sector, most positions are provided temporarily, and it is not easy to change this setting. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Not selected for the implementation in the Action plan. |
| **26. 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. | -/+ | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Only 56% of respondents were fully or partially satisfied with their salary and funding.  Salary in academic environment is rather below average for most employees. At IVB there are no bonuses linked to the pensions, parenthood or unemployment.  Our respondents consider their salaries as low (for example in comparison with the commercial sector) and are disappointed how their wages are composed (tariff wage vs. personal surcharge). Also, they request an adjustment of the range of tariff classes, where now for example the senior researchers have wider salary range then postdoc in both directions.  Only bonuses, which are fully in the competition of the director are paid at the end of the year (and sometimes in the middle of the year) according to researcher publication success, which favours senior researchers and team leaders. In general distribution of bonuses is not considered as transparent and fair by our respondents (in general they do not know which research activities are considered and evaluated). There is also lack of feedback from the head, which should accompany the award of the bonus.  In addition to salary and bonuses, there is support through so-called internal funds, which are distributed according to the number of researchers in a particular research group, without consideration of scientific outputs. These internal funds should support pilot studies of research groups. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Most of the problems regarding working conditions raised from absence of clear communication from headquarters. E.g. ignorance of the attestation rules, uncertainty about how wages are composed and how bonuses are distributed. The feedback and clear communication should be incorporated at IVB. Regular meetings with the director and other departments should be organized.  To make composition of salaries clear and transparent. Adjust existing rules accordingly.  Management of tariff classes in Attestation rules and internal wage regulation.  See ACTION 3\_A\_B \_C. |
| **27. 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Respondents prefer status quo and no changes with the respect to gender balance policy. Majority is concerned about the introduction of any quotas, which, according to them, could lower the quality of candidates.  However, there is a considerable gender disbalance among senior researchers’ staff (R4, only 11% are woman) and within institutional board in favour of men. Research categories R1 and R2, show the opposite tendency (more than 60 % are woman).  The aim of our institute is to support diversity and equal opportunity. In practice, equal opportunities policy works in competitions for the above-mentioned positions, regardless of age and gender.  *Prevention of discrimination is addressed in the Code of Ethics and IVB labour code.* | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  We plan to organize seminars concerns gender balance and equal opportunity to better explain this problematic to our research stuff.  Lab leaders will be trained to prevent any gender discrimination in their research groups.  See ACTION 4\_C.  Institute will set gender balanced and trained evaluation committees whenever it would be possible.  See ACTION 1\_D. |
| **28. 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. | -- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  At the moment there is no strategy for career development at IVB. Almost 70% of respondents would appreciate to set a strategy which would facilitate career growth (especially from R1 and R2).  Researchers wish to have the opportunity to develop their skills with the help of different courses and seminars and informal discussion on the lab level. Some of them would also enjoy discussions and help of mentors. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  To be prepared: Human resources development strategy and career consulting by mentors and through seminars for PhD students and postdocs. Revision of postdoctoral position in Attestation rules.  See ACTION 2\_D\_E and 4\_C. |
| **29. Value of mobility**  Employers and/or funders must recognise the value of geographical, intersectoral, inter- and trans-disciplinary and virtual 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  There were certain partial comments regarding the recognition of cross-sector mobility, which, in some respondent’s opinion, is generally less valued than international mobility within the research sector.  International mobility is supported at IVB by managing mobility projects which support R3 and R4 (Operational Programme Research, Development and Education). | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  No action needed. |
| **30. 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. | -/+ | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Some of PhD students and postdocs (R1 and R2) wish to have opportunity to discuss their career development with some mentors out of their research group. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  To be prepared: Human resources development strategy and career consulting by mentors and through seminars for PhD and postdoc and lab leaders.  See ACTION 2\_D\_E and 4\_C. |
| **31. 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Currently we are using the Code of Ethics of the CAS at IVB. This Code is available on the Intranet accessible for all IVB employees, however only in Czech language. The online survey evaluated the awareness of application of research ethics presented in IVB Code of Ethics to be about 50 %; scientists commented that they were not very familiar with the Code of Ethics of the Czech Academy of Sciences (especially from R1 and R2), or that they had not encountered any ethical issues themselves so far.  *Legal protection of research results is ensured by the Copyright Act, on Rights Related to Copyright and on the Amendment of Certain Acts No. 121/2000 Coll. This Copyright Act and 33 other provisions are fully implemented together with EU legislation. The Statutes of the CAS also apply, which provide further information on this issue of protection of intellectual property rights, management of research results and technology transfer.* | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Employee manual, seminars, discussions, on-line course, presentation on Valid Code of ethics.  Code of ethics will be translated into English and will become the part of the “**Employee Manual**”.  See ACTION 2\_B  We also plan to organize several seminars concerning different topics included in the Code of Ethics e.g. intellectual property, plagiarism, authorships rules, etc…  See ACTION 4\_A\_B\_C\_D. |
| **32. 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 supervisors. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Currently we are using the Code of Ethics of the CAS at IVB. This Code is available on the Intranet accessible for all IVB employees, however only in Czech language. The online survey evaluated the awareness of application of research ethics presented in IVB Code of Ethics to be about 50 %; scientists commented that they were not very familiar with the Code of Ethics of the Czech Academy of Sciences (especially from R1 and R2), or that they had not encountered any ethical issues themselves so far.  Ethical principles are generally passed from supervisors to students and young researchers obtain first awareness of ethical principles during university studies. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Code of ethics will be translated into English and will become the part of the “**Employee Manual**” (See Action 2\_B). We also plan to organize several seminars concerning different topics included in the Code of Ethics e.g. intellectual property, plagiarism, authorships rules, etc…  See ACTION 4\_A\_B\_C. |
| **33. 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 considered 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Teaching is considered among the important activities even though IVB is purely research institution with no own educational programs. Nevertheless, IVB employees are very active in lecturing at universities around the country and abroad. Many graduate students are also  involved in IVB research programs. The Institute’s researchers are supervising many Bachelor, Master and PhD  students.  However, R2 and R3 researchers are not sure how they can get involved in these activities.  Teaching is also part of the attestation evaluation. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Strategy regarding teaching will be implemented into the “**Employee Manual**” and “**Good research practice**”.  See Action 2\_B\_D and 4\_B. |
| **34. Complains/ 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  40% of IVB researchers would appreciate to have an institutional ombudsman (especially researchers from R3), however it is because of lack of knowledge of other options we already have at IVB.  Complaints concerning human resources e.g. discrimination in the workplace, violation of the IVB Code of Ethics, disputes in teams - are dealt with in the IVB Code of Ethics where all disputes should be resolved one level higher than they arose and in the Labour rules – where employees can turn to any board members or in Organization rules, where it is specified that disputes between individual teams are resolved by their leaders by mutual agreement. If no agreement is reached, the director decides.  *The CAS has established an Ethical Commission, which is the highest authority in resolving scientific disputes (https://1url.cz/Qzhjv)* | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Guidelines on what to do in the case of any conflict will be implemented into the “**Employee Manual**”.  See Action 2\_B. |
| **35. 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  75 % of researchers are satisfied with the structure of decision-making bodies at IVB. Negative comments concern transparency of decision making and lack of information provided. 25 % of researchers do not feel to be part of decision-making body.  All researchers with more than 50% work time capacity are automatically part of the Assembly of Researchers. The Assembly of Researchers elect the Institutional board (Board) every five years.  *Precise conditions are specified in Organizational rules: The number of members of the Council, the election of members of the Board and their dismissal are regulated by Act No. 341/2005 Coll., on Public Research Organizations and the Statutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences. The Board consist of a Chairman and other members. The chairman is elected or dismissed by the Board itself. The Board in particular:*  *a) ensures the maintenance of the purpose for which the workplace was established, the application of the public interest and its proper management,*  *b) determines the directions of the workplace's activities in accordance with the concept of the CAS and the charter of incorporation and decides on the concept of its development,*  *c) discusses proposals for research plans, proposals for research and development projects of the workplace and other matters submitted to it for discussion,*  *d) approves the budget of the workplace, its changes and the medium-term perspective of its financing,*  *e) approves the annual report of the workplace,*  *f) discusses proposals for changes to the founding charter of the workplace,*  *g) gives prior consent, or proposes to the Academic Assembly the merger, amalgamation or division of the workplace,*  *(h) approve the following internal regulations:*  *- attestation rules,*  *- election rules of the IVB board,*  *- the rules of procedure of the IVB board,*  *- organizational rules,*  *- internal wage regulation,*  *- rules for the management of funds,*  *- working rules,*  *i) discusses draft agreements on cooperation with domestic and foreign entities,*  *j) announces a selection procedure, on the basis of the result of which it proposes to the President of the CAS the appointment of a selected candidate as the director of the workplace,*  *k) proposes the dismissal of the director, or approves the dismissal of the director,*  *(l) establish its advisory bodies.*  *5. The procedure of the workplace council is determined by the Rules of Procedure of the IVB Board* | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Organizational rules will be translated into English. We will also lay stress on better communication during regular IVB meetings about different decisions and future plans and activities.  The new strategy in communication will be set. It will involve greater frequency of institute meetings, regular anonymous questionnaires related to find out actual problems at the institute (twice a year), researchers will be informed about important decisions made by Institutional board. After each meeting of head and Institutional Board, report will be regularly published to inform research community at IVB about outcomes from these meetings. The scientific community will be also informed in advance of the date of the Institutional Board and Head meetings to have the opportunity to send their remarks and questions.  See Action 2\_C and 3\_A. |
| **Training and Development** | | | |
| **36. 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 feed- back and working in accordance with agreed schedules, milestones, deliv- erables and/or research outputs. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  At IVB there is no support of activities which would support or monitor relationships between supervisors and their students. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Courses regarding general leadership, lab leading and communication with students will be offered for researchers and lab leaders.  See Action 4\_C. |
| **37. Supervision and managerial duties**  Senior researchers should devote particular attention to their multifaceted 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  At IVB there is no support of activities which would deal with relationships between supervisors and their students. No rules specifying duties of supervisors or mentors to their students are set and vice versa. Also, the level of mentors and their managerial skills are variable. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Courses regarding lab leading and communication with students will be offered for researchers and lab leaders.  See Action 4\_C. |
| **38. 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 eLearning. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  76 % of respondents are satisfied with the support of continuous professional development at IVB.  Lack of the support of self-education is seen as a weak point (support the participation on external courses and workshops, and courses organized directly by IVB, etc..).  However, many of participants (especially from R1 and R2) did not know about the possibility to use internal funds for self-development activities. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  We plan to offer different activities – course, seminars, discussions, and workshops to enable continuous development of researchers at all levels.  See Action 4\_C. |
| **39. 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 employ- ability through access to measures for the continuing development of skills and competencies. Such measures should be regularly assessed for their accessibility, take up and effectiveness in improving competencies, skills and employability. | -- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  At the moment, only limited support for its employees is available at IVB, regarding various trainings – for example English course, or specialise training for the support sector (PR team and Project managers), which is the indirect support for researchers.  However, many participants (especially from R1 and R2) did not know about the possibility to use internal funds for self-development activities. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  We plan to offer different activities – courses, seminars, discussions to enable continuous development of researchers at all levels.  See Action 4\_C. |
| **40. 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. | +/- | REGULATORY FRAMEWORK / EXISTING PRACTICE  Supervision is not clearly defined at IVB.  Managers and other executives are not encouraged to develop their skills in supporting early-stage researchers.  The process is not formalized, and the responsible staff is not always clearly identified.  Laboratory leaders now provide the necessary support for the personal and professional development of young researchers. Doctoral students are supported by their supervisors. | SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT  Supervision will be addressed within Human resources development strategy and career consulting by mentors and through seminars for PhD, postdoc and lab leaders.  See Action 2\_D and 4\_C. |