

FILOSOFICKÝ ÚSTAV AV ČR V.V.I.

ORGANISATION'S CONTACT DETAILS: JILSKÁ 1, PRAHA 1, 110 00, CZECH REPUBLIC

SUBMISSION DATE: MARCH 31, 2021

GAP Analysis



EUROPEAN UNION
European Structural and Investment Funds
Operational Programme Research,
Development and Education



CONTENT

1	Self-assessment process	3
1.1	PARTICIPATION OF EMPLOYEES IN THE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS	3
1.2	APPOINTMENT OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE	4
1.2.1	A list of members of the Steering Committee:	4
1.3	APPOINTMENT OF THE WORKING GROUP	4
1.3.1	A list of members of the Working Group for HRS4R:	5
2	Self-assessment methodology	5
2.1	STARTING POINTS:.....	5
2.2	GOALS OF COLLECTION OF DATA FOR GAP ANALYSIS:.....	6
2.3	METHODS APPLIED TO COLLECTION OF DATA FOR GAP ANALYSIS:	6
2.3.1	Questionnaire survey ‘Ethical and professional aspects of research’	6
2.3.2	Mini-questionnaire ‘Recruitment’	7
2.3.3	Focus groups	8
2.3.4	Nonstructured interviews	8
3	GAP analysis	9
3.1	CONCLUSION	32

1. Self-assessment process

1.1 PARTICIPATION OF EMPLOYEES IN THE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS

During the self-assessment phase, the main ambition of the HRS4R implementation team was (and will continue to be) involvement of the widest possible range of employees of the Institute of Philosophy (henceforth 'Institute of Philosophy' or 'institute'). Thus a representative community of researchers ranging from R1 to R4, including administrative staff, editors, publishers, librarians, etc. as well as a Steering Committee and Working Group contributed to the GAP analysis.

The following groups of stakeholders were involved:

- All researchers ranging from R1 to R4, editors, publishers, and librarians - were involved in consultations through online questionnaire - survey on 'Ethical and professional aspects of the research work' (for more details see point 2.3.1 below Questionnaire survey 'Ethical and professional aspects of research');
- Heads of departments – were involved in a quick survey on recruitment of researchers (for more details see point 2.3.2. Mini-questionnaire 'Recruitment');
- Researchers ranging from R1 to R4 – were involved through discussions during focus groups on topics related to recruitment, working conditions and training & development in the institute (for more details see point 2.3.3. Focus Groups);
- Researchers ranging from R2 to R4, Heads of Departments, members of Working Group HRS4R, administrative staff - engaged in consultations in the framework of individual interviews, in order to gain a deeper insight in selected areas (see further point 2.3.4. Nonstructured interviews);

Specifically:

Ethical and professional aspects: Juraj Hvorecký – transfer of experience, expertise on ethical aspects, consultation of survey questions;

Recruitment: Laura Bonneau, Petr Kitzler – sharing experience with recruitment of researchers;

International cooperation, mobility: Tereza Šímová - transfer of administrative experience, deeper understanding of gaps;

Public engagement: Jana Říhová - insight into the current state of PR activities and opportunities for development.

Attestation & selection committees; mobility: Tomáš Marvan, Jiří Chotaš - sharing practice and experience, suggestions for improvements;

Stability of employment, salaries, research environment: Ondřej Ševeček, Lenka Rybáková - discussion about the current situation and opportunities for further development of the working environment;

Dissemination and exploitation of results: Tereza Šímová - discussion about the current situation in Open Access and opportunities for development.

Access to research training and continuous development: Jana Říhová - insight into the relationship between PR activities and opportunities for development; Simona Chlumská - training needs from the librarian's perspective;

- Institute Council - discussed and approved the content of GAP analysis and action plan in February 2021, confirming its consistency with the Institute's strategy papers, internal procedures and regulations.

1.2 APPOINTMENT OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

The Steering Committee was appointed by the Director of the Institute of Philosophy on 1 April 2020. The Steering Committee consists of eight members representing the Institute's management, administration staff, and researchers. On 26 May 2020, the Steering Committee had a ZOOM meeting with the HR Award project team. Members of the Steering Committee were informed about the HR Award procedure, about the overview of the process, and goals for the assessment phase. Another general meeting of the Steering Committee and HR Award team was organised online on 15 October 2020. During this session, the main outcomes of focus group discussions were presented together with an overview of conclusions for the GAP analysis. Furthermore, the meeting discussed suggestions for priorities of the Action Plan. In January 2021, the Steering Committee provided comments and advice on the process of implementation of the Action Plan and supervised timely finalisation of the GAP analysis. Apart from remote collaboration, three meetings took place during the abovementioned period to oversee the progress and quality of outputs.

1.2.1 A list of members of the Steering Committee:

PhDr. Ondřej Ševeček, Ph.D.	Director of the Institute
PhDr. Petr Kitzler, Ph.D., DSc.	Deputy Director
Mgr. Julie Černá, Ph.D.	Scientific Secretary
PhDr. Vladimír Urbánek, Ph.D.	Director of the Institute Council /Head of Department
RNDr. Alice Koubová, Ph.D. et Ph.D.	Member of the Attestation Committee
RNDr. Ondřej Majer, CSc.	Deputy Director of the Supervisory Board
Ing. Lenka Rybáková	Head of Financial Department
Mgr. Magdalena Krajewska	HR Manager

1.3 APPOINTMENT OF THE WORKING GROUP

The Working Group (WG) was created and its members appointed by a Director's decision dated 1 April 2020. It has 18 members: one representative of each of the Institute's 12 research departments, three members of the HR team, and one representative of the editorial section, libraries, and economic department each. The WG operates based on a two-speed concept: it has a 'power core' consisting of the HR team, which has the executive role, and then there is the broad WG, which functions an expert team whose task is to examine and suggest ways to address specific issues (e.g. concerning the GAP analysis or Action Plan). WG members were nominated by their respective departments.

The initial meeting of the WG was held on 14 May 2020. The HR manager presented the key elements of the HR Award process: main goals and phases, GAP analysis sections and subjects, the self-assessment procedure, bottom-up approach, etc. WG members contributed their proposals and comments on the content of the EPA questionnaire. The WG has also played an active role in convening focus groups and group discussions. Individual interviews with WG members took place in November; their aim was to identify and address particular gaps. WG members participated via cloud cooperation and brainwriting on formulation of the Action Plan.

1.3.1 A list of members of the Working Group for HRS4R:

Mgr. Magdalena Krajewska	HR Manager
Petra Cabalová	HR Generalist
Bc. Marie Kolářová	Learning & Development Specialist
doc. Tomáš Marvan, Ph.D.	Head of Department
Mgr. Martin Ritter, Ph.D.	Researcher
Mgr. Pavel Arazim, Ph.D.	Researcher
PhDr. Ing. Jiří Chotaš, Ph.D.	Head of Department
Mgr. Marcela Slavíková, Ph.D.	Researcher
Dr. Lara Bonneau	Researcher
Dr. Phil. Pavel Blažek	Deputy Head of Department
Mgr. Alena Sarkissian, Ph.D.	Researcher
Mgr. Jan Balon, Ph.D.	Head of Department
Mgr. Jan Frei, Ph.D. et Ph.D.	Head of Department
Mgr. Ing. Martin Brabec, Ph.D.	Postdoc Researcher
Mgr. Pavlína Cermanová, Ph.D.	Researcher
Mgr. Simona Chlumská	Head of Department
PhDr. Olga Baranová, CSc.	Editor
Ing. Hana Gazdová	Head of Department
Ing. Tereza Šímová	Specialist Open Access

2. Self-assessment methodology

2.1 STARTING POINT:

The Institute of Philosophy conducted self-assessment with respect to the 40 principles of the European Charter and Code of Conduct. The content of each of these principles was for the needs of the GAP analysis interpreted as a description of desired final state. In setting the procedures and methods, we took into account particular demands stated and implied in the Draft guidelines to the implementation of the 'strengthened' Human Resources Strategy for Researchers (HRS4R) as well as evaluation criteria for the GAP analysis and the Action Plan. We also took into account recommendations presented by HRS4R evaluators during their series of webinars 'The HRS4R Online Workshop For Institutions', organised in April 2020 by HR Manager Mary Kate O'Regan of the University College Cork, and at the HR Strategy for Researchers - Virtual Info Day, which took place on 17 November 2020. The assessment was conducted by a three-person team

in charge of the HR agenda at the Institute of Philosophy (with support from the HRS4R Working Group) which is involved in project Enhancing professional development at the Institute of Philosophy.

2.2 GOALS OF COLLECTION OF DATA FOR GAP ANALYSIS:

- To determine differences between the current state and the state described in the principles of the European Charter and Code of Conduct;
- To ascertain employees' views of the current state of the institution;
- To formulate proposals of ways in which the desired state could be achieved (or ways of rectifying/removing shortcomings perceived by employees);
- To involve researchers belonging to academic levels R1–R4 in the process of organisation's self-assessment.

2.3 METHODS APPLIED TO COLLECTION OF DATA FOR GAP ANALYSIS:

The assessment was based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods: In addition to data collection methods recommended by HRS4R evaluators, such as questionnaire surveys and focus groups, we also conducted nonstructured interviews. Self-assessment of the institution was realised by the team responsible for HR agenda. Description of the current state of affairs for the needs of the GAP analysis is based on an analysis of internal documents, observation of currently implemented institutional procedures, and reflections of researchers expressed during the focus groups. Formulation of the GAP analysis also took into account conclusions of a survey conducted among employees of the Institute of Philosophy in November 2019 by the Basic Unions of the Institute of Philosophy. To determine differences between the current and the target state (according to the European Charter and the Code of Conduct), we applied data gathering methods specified below. Proposals of variants for reaching the target state captured in the GAP analysis (as 'suggestions for improvements/challenges') are also based on the views of employees of the Institute of Philosophy which were voiced during the assessment process.

2.3.1 Questionnaire survey 'Ethical and professional aspects of research'

The first thematic area, namely "Ethical and professional aspects of research", was addressed in the form of a survey. To this purpose, we prepared a bilingual, Czech and English, online questionnaire containing 27 questions. The target group were primarily researchers, including employees of the editing departments and libraries of the Institute of Philosophy. The aim of the survey was to identify differences (gaps) between the current state and the state of affairs described by the principles and recommendations of the European Charter and Code of Conduct and to find out researchers' views regarding various concrete aspects of their work at the Institute of Philosophy. The survey took place on 8–24 June 2020. Of the 202 respondents we addressed, 94 had responded, meaning the survey return rate was 46.5%. The collection of data took place in the form of questionnaire on the platform of Google Forms. Greatest interest in terms of impulses for discussion was attracted by search for suitable forms of popularisation, methods for discovering plagiarism, Open Access, and internal communication.

The method of evaluation of the questionnaire survey respected the nature of questions it included, whereby some took the form of open questions of qualitative nature, where respondents could present their answers in the form of commentary/long answer. For most questions, however, respondents would only indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement. They were thus choosing from a 5-point scale of a) strongly agree; b) agree, c) neither agree nor disagree, d) disagree, e) strongly disagree, eventually a) definitely yes, b) yes, c) neither yes nor no, d) no, e) definitely not. The questionnaire also included several questions where respondents could choose more than one answer, e.g., in relation to instruments supporting professional development, examples of morally unacceptable forms of behaviour, or observance of contractual obligations. The questionnaire contained several factual questions regarding professional rank, duration of employment at the Institute of Philosophy, and responder's gender. Evaluation of key findings was conducted under expert supervision of Dr. Ondřej Lánský. Responses were statistically evaluated using instruments of Google Forms (graphs, pie charts) and comments on content-oriented questions were coded in Excel in agreement with accepted methodology of sociological research. The results were then presented, with additional commentary of Dr. Lánský, to the institute management during its meeting on 3 September 2020 and at a meeting of the HR Award Team and the Steering Committee on 15 October 2020. The resulting presentation of questionnaire survey 'Ethical and professional aspects of research' was sent to all institute employees and published at [internal web pages of the Institute of Philosophy](#) in a section dedicated to HR Excellence. The conclusions were integrated into the GAP analysis and the Action Plan. The survey is accessible upon request. Results of questionnaire survey 'Ethical and professional aspects of research' are summarised in Supplement 1 of this document.

2.3.2 Mini-questionnaire 'Recruitment'

Initial collection of information on recruitment of new staff was conducted using the method of a mini-questionnaire consisting of six questions inspired by principles rooted in the OTM-R policy. The questionnaire focused on mapping the current situation, experiences, and needs of persons responsible for realisation of selection procedures at the Institute of Philosophy, especially senior personnel. The Recruitment mini-questionnaire was sent on 4 May 2020 in an electronic form to 15 heads of units, with deadline for submission of completed questionnaires on 15 May 2020. Response rate was 81.25%. Conclusions of this small-scale survey served as entry information for specification of areas of subjects and preparation of subsequent focus group dedicated to the recruitment process.

Overview of results of the mini survey:

- A. Relatively little experience with organisation of international selection procedures
 - 69% had no such experience, 31% do advertise vacancies (proposals: academia.edu, researchgate.net, Philos L, and philjobs.org)
- B. Satisfaction with platforms for online communication with candidates (ZOOM, Skype)
 - 46% satisfied with Skype and ZOOM (would welcome also other communication instruments and/or corresponding IT equipment); 54% does not use online communication with candidates

C. Advertising at EURAXESS (<https://www.philjobs.org>, <https://www.academia.edu>, <https://www.researchgate.net>)

- 54% would welcome it, 46% do not know or would not use

D. Further training of selection committees

- 69% not interested, 31% would welcome it (an A4 handout with tips and recommended procedures, definition of the role of HR department, greater involvement of HR assistants)

2.3.3 Focus groups

The first focus group, dedicated to the subject of recruitment, took place on 24 June 2020 online. One week in advance, participants received by mail the relevant questions which were based on the content of principles of the European Charter and the Code of Conduct. The questions dealt with partial aspects of the recruitment process. The focus group was attended by 14 employees belonging to all researcher levels, i.e., R1–R4.

Another three focus groups on the subject of working conditions took place on 15 September, 17 September, and 23 September 2020, whereby the middle one was intended for international staff and was conducted in English. All meetings took place online. All in all, 20 members of staff of the Institute of Philosophy (across scientific levels R1–R4) took part in the focus groups. In all cases, participants received an overview of questions to indicate the subjects that would be discussed. Focus groups took place in blocks of 2.5 hours and brought important impulses for preparing the third part of the GAP analysis.

The last focus group, dedicated to training and development at the Institute of Philosophy, took place also online, on 26 November 2020. It took two hours and was attended by 12 institute staff (across scientific ranks R1–R4). The format of preparation was preserved, i.e., one week in advance, members of the focus group received a list of questions which they could use to consider the subjects to be discussed.

Outputs from all focus groups were processed and integrated into the preparation of the GAP analysis and Action Plan of the HR Award. The focus groups were recorded in the ZOOM and subsequently transcribed into a text form. Answers were coded into phrases depending on the frequency of occurrence of particular statements, repeated use of content-wise similar expressions, eventually participants' expressions of agreement.

2.3.4 Nonstructured interviews

Individual nonstructured interviews took place mostly online in November 2020, primarily in connection with preparation of the second and third part of the GAP analysis. Individual interviews focused on one or more issues related to a particular principle under consideration. Conclusions stemming from these interviews were used for further specification of proposed measures for the needs of the Action Plan.

3. GAP analysis

EUROPEAN CHARTER FOR RESEARCHERS AND CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE RECRUITMENT OF RESEARCHERS: GAP ANALYSIS OVERVIEW			
STATUS: to what extent does this organisation meet the following principles?	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	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN: Freedom of research is dealt with and guaranteed by legal regulations of the Czech Academy of Sciences (henceforth ‘CAS’) as well as by internal directives of the Institute of Philosophy of the Czech Academy of Sciences (henceforth ‘Institute of Philosophy’ or ‘institute’), in particular by the Act on Czech Academy of Sciences , Statutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences , Code of Ethics for Researchers of the Czech Academy of Sciences and by Strategy of the Institute of Philosophy of CAS . Results of a questionnaire survey ‘Ethical and professional aspects of research’ conducted by a Working group for HRS4R among the staff of Institute of Philosophy on 8–24 June 2020 indicate that researchers are of the view that the Institute of Philosophy has in place sufficient instruments to protect the freedom of research. Results of the questionnaire survey are available on the institute's website .
2. ETHICAL PRINCIPLES	+/- = ALMOST BUT NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED	General ethical principles, practices, and standards are observed in accordance with the Code of Ethics for Researchers of the Czech Academy of Sciences . This document of the CAS does not, however, suit the specific demands of our institute: it is too general, insufficiently pro-active, and lacks a clear definition of values of core importance for research in	INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN: Creation of an action group to prepare a draft of a Code of Ethics of the Institute of Philosophy. SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Creation of an ethics committee of the Institute of Philosophy and of a new Code of Ethics of the Institute of Philosophy within the context of existing documents of the CAS. Subsequent implementation

		<p>humanities. 57 % of respondents of questionnaire survey 'Ethical and professional aspects of research' stated that they are not familiar with the particulars of the Code of Ethics for Researchers of the CAS. One can thus state that most researchers of the Institute of Philosophy are not well-acquainted with it. The main shortcoming of the existing situation is that the Institute of Philosophy does not have its own Code of Ethics.</p>	<p>of this key document at the Institute of Philosophy, including familiarisation of all of its staff with it. The Code of Ethics will be integrated into the system of internal regulations of the Institute of Philosophy, thereby becoming a key document of the institute.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Code of Ethics of the Institute of Philosophy should emphasise examples of good practice both in science and on a personal level in accordance with the <u>European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for Their Recruitment</u>. It will define the rules of various processes, including rules for creating an Ethics Committee, control of its activities, submission and processing of complaints (see point 34, Complaints/appeals), responsibility of particular organs of the Institute of Philosophy and their powers. It should also address areas such as rules of correct publication, prevention of bullying, life-work balance, and equal opportunities (including gender balance, on which more in point 27: Gender balance). <p>This is further developed in measures A1 and A16 of the Action Plan (henceforth AP).</p>
<p>3. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY</p>	<p>+/- = ALMOST BUT NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED</p>	<p>Almost 63% of respondents of the questionnaire survey 'Ethical and professional aspects of research' agree that the Institute of Philosophy provides sufficient support to research which targets current societal needs. Principles of professional responsibility, adherence to principles of intellectual property and inadmissibility of plagiarism, including relevant measures, are treated in the basic documents of the CAS (e.g. the <u>Code of Ethics of Researchers at the Czech Academy of Sciences</u>). Within the Institute of Philosophy, these principles are upheld and emphasised already during training of early career researchers. What is missing on the level of the Institute of Philosophy is a definition of a transparent procedure in case plagiarism is discovered, which is to some extent linked to the absence of a Code of Ethics of the Institute of Philosophy.</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Standard procedures of evaluation of all areas of professional responsibility have been implemented into the process of international evaluation in the CAS and into the attestation procedures. These evaluations emphasise the principles of professional responsibility and regularly test their functionality within the institute. Professional responsibility is also accentuated in the action group established to prepare a draft of the Code of Ethics of the Institute of Philosophy. Additionally, the Institute of Philosophy introduced a systematic way of dealing with predatory journals.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures against plagiarism will be explicitly mentioned in the planned Code of Ethics of the Institute of Philosophy, including a definition of relevant procedures. • Prepare and realise a range of training programmes in broader aspects of professional responsibility (e.g. falsification of research results, research

			<p>relevance and effectiveness, transparency and sharing of results). See also point 39: Access to research training and continuous development).</p> <p>This subject is further developed in measures A1 and A19 in the AP.</p>
4. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE	-/+ = PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED	<p>Over three quarters of respondents to the questionnaire survey 'Ethical and professional aspects of research' indicated that they would welcome more information about research plans of other scientific units within the Institute of Philosophy. Comments by staff of the Institute of Philosophy suggest that on the level of internal communication within the Institute, it would be advisable to widen the range of information shared and to use a greater variety of communication instruments (e.g. intranet, newsletter, organisation of informal events for employees, creation of a space for informal meeting of staff).</p> <p>Occasionally, the flow of information stops on some level of organisational structure of the institute: we ought to identify such bottlenecks and obstacles to internal communication and work towards their removal.</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>For scientific units of the Institute of Philosophy strategic targets in the area of research are set in the form of five-year research plans which define research projects and their anticipated outputs. The extent to which these targets are met is regularly evaluated both by the management of the Institute of Philosophy and by organs of the CAS. Conceptual framework of the five-year research plans, which are moreover connected to the cycle of regular international evaluations of institutions of the CAS, is defined in the long-term scientific <u>Strategy of the Institute of Philosophy</u>, which can be accessed from the institute website. Researchers are informed about it also by their superiors. Records of regular meetings of Director's College (attended in addition to management of the institute also by representatives of all of its units, including service and economic departments) are accessible from the institute's intranet.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <p>Improvements in internal communication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increased use of intranet, development of a new solution to an institute newsletter, and an effective balance between these two instruments. ● Internal communication should improve also within individual research teams, especially in terms of regular information sharing and updating of heads of units and management of the Institute of Philosophy. ● To improve communication between units, it is necessary to find out what information are the staff primarily interested in and what instrument would be sufficiently succinct while effective enough to mediate information for instance from the meetings of Director's College (where e.g. heads of units present information about their activities). ● Support informal forms of communication.

			This subject is further developed in measure A2 of the AP.
5. CONTRACTUAL AND LEGAL OBLIGATIONS	+/- = ALMOST BUT NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED	<p>Of the national, sectoral, and institutional regulations which have an impact on the work and working conditions of researchers, copyright and intellectual property is the area which, given the type of output our researchers produce, deserves special attention.</p> <p>Legislative measures linked to copyright evolve. Training programmes organised by the CAS, which are used by our researchers, have a limited capacity and sometimes workshops are fully booked out. Our researchers then acquire further information on this subject informally and share their knowledge with colleagues as needed. It would be desirable to train more staff of the Institute of Philosophy and to maintain and improve their knowledge of implementation and interpretation of the copyright law. This could be further facilitated by simplification of interpretation of the relevant directive of the Institute of Philosophy, whose current version moreover does not cover the entire range of common publication practice in science. 50% of respondents of the questionnaire survey 'Ethical and professional aspects of research' stated that they would like to have more information regarding the directives and rules of adherence to principles of intellectual property.</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN: Relevant legislation is communicated to staff of the Institute of Philosophy via internal directives accessible from the intranet (e.g. Labour Code of the Institute of Philosophy, Collective Agreement, Directives for Provision of Travel Allowance). Some pieces of legislation pertaining to science and research are accessible from the <u>website of the CAS</u>. The area of legislation on copyright is treated in Director's Directive no. 2/2018 (Směrnice ředitele č. 2/2018) for handling work produced by employees of the Institute of Philosophy. Researchers also receive support from the relevant service departments (e.g. the project department and its support in the area of adherence to requisite rules on the part of providers).</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop a procedure for training researchers of the institute of Philosophy in areas of importance to their research activities. That includes especially intellectual property, changes in the relevant directives and measures on both national or institutional level, or rules applying to grants for their research projects. ● Introduce new forms of clearer and better organised communication of rules guiding the implementation of copyright at the Institute of Philosophy and on the national level (e.g. in the form of a brief practical explanation of relevant internal directives). ● Awareness of application of copyright should be supported by regular training for a broader group of employees (see point 39: Access to research training and continuous development). Development of awareness in the area of copyright naturally corresponds with the expansion of open access publishing (see point 8: Dissemination, exploitation of results). <p>This is further developed in measures A7, A8, and A19 in the AP.</p>
6. ACCOUNTABILITY	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN: Due to the character of the Institute of Philosophy, which is a public research institution, both its employees and the public</p>

			<p>are transparently informed about all economic activities and other important contexts of institute's activities. The Institute of Philosophy annually publishes a comprehensive Annual report on activity and economic management (in Czech) (see also Annual report 2015-2018 (in English)) and makes sure that financial resources are spent effectively and in accordance with principles of due care. This is verified by independent audits. Budget proposals (in Czech) including a budget outlook for the following two years are published on website of the Institute of Philosophy, where they are also accessible to the general public. Staff of the institute can, on intranet, access the Rules for Economic Management of the Institute of Philosophy (in Czech), including supplements, records from sessions of the Board of Institute of Philosophy, and other documents. All relevant scientific output of the Institute of Philosophy is registered in publicly accessible databases (ASEP, RIV).</p>
<p>7. GOOD PRACTICE IN RESEARCH</p>	<p>++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED</p>		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>At the Institute of Philosophy, safe working practices are applied in accordance with the Labour Code of the Czech Republic, Act no. 309/2006 Coll., on OSH, Act no. 133/1985 Coll., on fire protection, and other relevant legislation of the Czech Republic (directives, government decrees). Working spaces of the Institute of Philosophy consist – with the exception of e.g. the library – mainly of offices, which do not require implementation of any additional safety measures. In 2020, the Institute of Philosophy created a three-person team of OSH guarantors responsible for updating OSH documentation and efficient setting of all introductory and regular training on these subjects.</p> <p>Care of the area of GDPR is entrusted to a specifically appointed staff member and implemented in accordance with Act no. 110/2019 Coll. on personal data processing and by Director's internal regulation on the protection of personal data.</p> <p>The nature of research work at the Institute of Philosophy does not, due to the nature of data being stored, require heightened security. Administration of data protected by copyright follows current legislation. Protected data are published in the form of publications. With respect to data protection, the Institute of Philosophy</p>

			introduced an optimised standard, where all data is stored at servers and in a local network separate from the public network. This data is property protected (local network is protected by firewall, servers are located in a DMZ), and access to databases secured by password or certificate. In case of cyberattack, we activate standard protective procedures.
8. DISSEMINATION, EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS	+/- = ALMOST BUT NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED	<p>Respondents of our questionnaire survey 'Ethical and professional aspects of research' expressed positive evaluation regarding the support of publication activities. On the other hand, they also noted that especially the area of language editing and translation of academic texts would profit from a greater amount of institutional support. Especially new and international researchers emphasised the need for better insight into publication possibilities and the process of publication.</p> <p>The Institute of Philosophy lacks a comprehensive strategy of open access to scientific information as well as partial methodical guidelines addressing the subject of open access and open science in daily practice. Based on respondents' answers, we identified shortcomings in the area of knowledge, financial backing, and especially the position of open access (i.e. open science) in the area of science evaluation. The number of interesting views expressed by responders to our survey 'Ethical and professional aspects of research' indicates that we could hold at the institute a discussion about the extent of use of the open science approach. The main general drawback is that national strategic documents, that is, the Czech National Strategy for Open Access to Research Information for 2017-2020 (in Czech) and Action Plan (in Czech) do not provide sufficient methodical guidance for the specific needs of humanities.</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>At the Institute of Philosophy, concrete research outputs take the form of publications registered in the ASEP database. Such documented results form the foundation for evaluation of research units and annual export of records into the RIV database. Via the intranet, staff of the Institute of Philosophy can access a Directive for handling output created by employees no. 2/2018 (in Czech) including its practical interpretation. Editorial activities of the Institute of Philosophy aimed at the general public are mentioned already in its Foundation Charter (in Czech). Part of the institute is the Filosofia publication house and Oikoymenh editorial department. The Institute of Philosophy publishes nine academic journals, which are included in prestigious international citation databases. Some of these journals meet the standards of open access publishing. Management of the Institute of Philosophy supports transition towards open access to scientific information in accordance with the Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities. Development of publication activities is one of the goals defined in the Strategy of the Institute of Philosophy.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Creation of a comprehensive strategy aimed at systematic implementation of principles of open science. It should include recommendations on the creation of data plans and data licencing policy. Draft of the open access policy document would be consulted with staff of the institute. ● Researchers should receive training on open access, on good practice in data administration, and accessibility of information on support of publication ought to be improved. ● New staff of the Institute should be informed about possibilities of support of publication offered by the Institute of Philosophy and by the CAS, including

			<p>existing and most up-to-date publication platforms.</p> <p>This subject is further developed in measures of A3, A4, and A5 of the AP.</p>
<p>9. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT</p>	<p>+/- = ALMOST BUT NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED</p>	<p>According to most respondents to our survey 'Ethical and professional aspects of research' popularisation is important, but 34% of respondents note that it is at present insufficient. The main weakness of current popularisation activities is their limited ability to present to the general public research conducted at the Institute of Philosophy and explain the importance of research in philosophy in a readily understandable form. Respondents had also remarked on absence of a comprehensive communication strategy related to popularisation. Experiences of researchers at our institute also indicate that popularisation activities are not in all cases sufficiently taken into account in evaluation of their achievements, that is, in the attestation process.</p> <p>Over 60% of respondents to our survey 'Ethical and professional aspects of research' commented on the issue of suitable methods for engaging the public. Such large number of responses indicates that the subject of engaging the public has a great potential for initiating a discussion within the institute and involvement of researchers in search for suitable forms of popularisation of philosophy and other areas represented at the Institute of Philosophy.</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Management of the Institute of Philosophy systematically tries to improve communication with professional and general public, and to promote activities of the institute. To this purpose, it created a Popularisation Board (including its executive committee) consisting of representatives of all scientific units of the Institute of Philosophy. Popularisation Board is a permanent advisory organ of Director of the Institute of Philosophy on promotion of institute's activities and popularisation of science, especially in connection with organising larger national popularisation events (Philosophy Festival, Open Day, Week of Science and Technology, Science Fair, or the Book World fair). Based on nominations by the Popularisation Board, researchers of the institute each year receive a Prize for Popularisation. In April 2020, the institute hired a PR specialist whose work should contribute to a more systematic promotion of the Institute of Philosophy and its scientific results.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Updating and subsequent implementation of a popularisation strategy of the Institute of Philosophy. ● Configuration of the extent and processes of collaboration between the research units and the appointed PR specialist. ● Identification of adequate and effective forms of popularisation based on a dialogue with institute staff. ● Development of researchers' ability to communicate with the public and to popularise their area of research (as part of further professional training). ● To find out in practice whether popularisation activities are sufficiently prioritised within the attestation process. During preparation of attestations, there should be an emphasis on attestation committees' awareness of the importance of popularisation activities and their adequate appreciation in the evaluation process.

			This subject is further developed in measures A6 and A19 of the AP.
10. NON-DISCRIMINATION	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Manifestations of employer/funders discrimination have not been observed at the Institute of Philosophy. Our survey 'Ethical and professional aspects of research' shows that employees of the institute do not feel they have encountered any kind of systemic discrimination and eventual problematic behaviour is merely of an individual nature. In our recruitment policy, we observe the principle of equal access in accordance with the legislative framework laid down by the Labour Code and Act no. 198/2009 Coll. (Anti-Discrimination Act). The subject of non-discrimination is also treated in the <u>Code of Ethics of Researchers at the Czech Academy of Sciences</u> and will be addressed in the planned Code of Ethics of the Institute of Philosophy. Prohibition of any direct or indirect discrimination in labour relations is moreover stated in Article 6 of the Collective Agreement of the Institute of Philosophy.</p>
11. EVALUATION/ APPRAISAL SYSTEMS	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Over the past number of years, both the CAS and the Institute of Philosophy managed to establish a sufficiently robust system of research evaluation. Researchers are regularly evaluated in the form of attestations. All researchers undergo attestation at least once every five years. International evaluation of research, focused on evaluation of teams, is also conducted in regular five-year cycles within the CAS and now supplemented by detailed internal evaluation mechanisms specified in the Attestation Code of the Institute of Philosophy, including a supplement and <u>Rules of Procedure for Attestation Committees</u> of the Institute of Philosophy, accessible via the institute intranet. In both cases, evaluation is based on approaches that respect differences among fields and aim at a qualitative professional evaluation of research output. The Institute of Philosophy has also established an <u>International Advisory Board</u>, which provides feedback on the system of evaluation and scientific strategy of the institute.</p>
RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION			

12. RECRUITMENT	+/- = ALMOST BUT NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED	<p>In the area of recruitment, the Institute of Philosophy established a well-functioning process, which, however, will need to be supplemented by a normative document. Such document should formally define standard recommended procedures that would help especially the senior staff to select and recruit new members of research teams and departments more efficiently.</p> <p>We found that new, incoming staff members and their superiors find especially the organisational aspect of adaptation of new employees rather challenging. This points to a need to implement unified, planned, and clearly managed procedures for adaptation of new staff (so-called onboarding). Such guidelines should facilitate and speed up the demanding process of integration of new researchers into their department and teams.</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>The basic demands on recruitment of university-educated employees at the Institute of Philosophy are defined in the <u>Statutes of the CAS</u> (Article 51). In the process of recruitment, selection, and hiring of staff, the institute follows the principle of non-discrimination in accordance with the <u>Labour Code</u> and <u>Act no. 198/2009 Coll. (Anti-Discrimination Act)</u>. Given existing Czech legislation, we cannot apply positive discrimination. Access of disadvantaged groups is supported especially by part-time employment and the option of working from home. The Institute of Philosophy also offers its employees childcare in the form of child groups. Descriptions of vacancies are advertised for both genders.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recruitment process will be standardised in the form of staff recruitment guidelines, which should include an overview of all stages of the selection process all the way to adaptation of new employees, that is, introduction of a planned and managed adaptation process for incoming employees. Heads of selection committees and heads of units will be able to use these guidelines as an overview of recommended procedures (see pt. 13: Recruitment). <p>This subject is further developed in measures A9, A10 and A11 of the AP.</p>
13. RECRUITMENT (CODE)	-/+ = PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED	<p>The Institute of Philosophy announces selection for vacant research positions in accordance with the <u>Act on the Czech Academy of Sciences</u>, <u>Statutes of the CAS</u>, and with the internal <u>Organisation Rules</u> (in Czech). Selection process must be announced at least three weeks before the deadline for submission of applications, some positions are advertised longer.</p> <p>The Institute of Philosophy has no set and generally valid recruitment standard in the sense of a unified procedure for selection and adaptation of staff. In practice, although the institute still does not have its own OTM-R policy, what</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Recruitment to research positions is usually managed by the relevant units or project leaders. At the beginning of the selection process, future direct superior specifies the job description and requirements which candidates must meet. Descriptions of knowledge and skills required are in most cases sufficiently comprehensive and adequate for employer's needs.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation and implementation of institute's OTM-R policy (see pt. 12: Recruitment and 14: Selection). • Creation of a standardised form of advertising of vacancies, including job description, working conditions, and

		<p>works well are open, effective, transparent, favourable, and internationally comparable recruitment procedures adequately adapted to the type of position advertised.</p> <p>Advertisements of research positions do not always contain a full list of benefits. The situation is similar with respect to descriptions of working conditions or information regarding career development.</p>	<p>opportunities for career development (see pt. 15: Transparency).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We plan to newly define the role of the HR team in the individual phases of the selection process, starting with administrative support during initial communication with applicants, through the HR team's involvement during the interview phase, all the way to its participation in the adaptation process (see pt. 14: Selection). <p>This subject is further developed in A9 and A11 of the AP.</p>
14. SELECTION (CODE)	+/- = ALMOST BUT NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED	<p>Institute of Philosophy exerts maximum effort to ensure that the composition of selection committees is balanced and diverse. Composition of selection committees reflects the gender balance at the Institute of Philosophy but also the fact that men tend to have much greater interest in philosophy research than women do. Representation of women at the Institute of Philosophy varies among departments and units. In the recruitment process, the principle of equal opportunity between the genders is observed.</p> <p>There is some room for improvement in terms of training of employees who function as heads of selection committees.</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Selection committees are appointed by management of the Institute of Philosophy so as to take into account the need for varied expertise and professional competence. In their evaluation of applications, selection committees take as their starting point the documents received, i.e. candidate's professional CV, copies of documents related to education, letters of recommendation, a sample of text written by the candidate and/or a list of publications, as well as research plans for the future. Selected applicants are then invited for a face-to-face interview, whereby the main criterion for the final selection are candidate's professional qualities described in the materials submitted by him/her and confirmed during a personal meeting.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We plan to produce guidelines for heads of selection committees (a handout one A4 page long). • Make sure that each selection committee includes at least one woman (see pts. 12 and 13: Recruitment). • When necessary, the selection process will include external experts. • Preparation and realisation of training programmes for heads of teams and project leaders on the subject of staff recruitment (see pt. 37: Supervision and managerial duties). <p>This subject is further developed in measures A9, A19, and A20 of the AP.</p>
15. TRANSPARENCY (CODE)	-/+ = PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED	<p>Selection criteria are adequate, and they correspond to the defined criteria for ideal candidates. There is</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Formulation of particular requirements expected of candidates corresponds with the</p>

		<p>room for improvement in terms of creating a formal and standardised description of what is expected of applicants. Advertisements do not always mention career development, although it is specified in the <u>Career Development Rules for CAS Employees</u> and in the Rules of Attestation Procedure of the Institute of Philosophy. Information about career development is usually provided during interviews with candidates. Feedback on strong and weak elements of the process is provided by candidates upon request.</p>	<p>importance and necessary conditions of criteria to be met.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In advertising open positions, requirements expected of candidates will be ranked according to their importance. Where relevant, advertisement will also include information about career development or the option of extending/expanding the work contract. Selection process should place a greater emphasis on providing candidates with feedback regarding their strengths and weaknesses (see pt. 13: Recruitment) ● Consider the option of introducing a point system (ranking of candidates' applications). <p>This subject is further developed in measure A9 of the AP.</p>
16. JUDGING MERIT (CODE)	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>The selection process takes into account the general level of experience of applicants: it always considers the stage at which they find themselves in their careers. What is evaluated is not only the quality and number of publications but also the experience acquired during their professional career. The committee considers applicants' ability to approach research independently, with a requisite degree of creativity and objectivity. Taken into account are the demands in terms of time needed to achieve the results characteristic for various areas of humanities. What is also taken into consideration is organisation of scientific events, participation in conferences, membership in professional and editorial boards, and activity in popularisation, eventually implementation of scientific results in practice. Researchers at the Institute of Philosophy tend to perceive and prefer quality as opposed to mere quantity.</p>
17. VARIATIONS IN THE CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF CVS (CODE)	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Career breaks or variations in the chronological order of applicants' CV are taken into account and generally perceived as a natural part of researchers' professional growth. This aspect is also reflected in the internal Rules of Attestation of the Institute of Philosophy when evaluating the quality and quantity of scientific output. In all cases,</p>

			what is considered is candidate's overall professional experience.
18. RECOGNITION OF MOBILITY EXPERIENCE (CODE)	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Mobility is viewed as a clearly positive contribution to each researcher's professional development. Support of researchers' mobility is clearly stated for instance in the <u>Strategy of the Institute of Philosophy</u>. Thanks to individual internships and research stays abroad, especially early career researchers have the opportunity to acquire desirable working habits in international settings. Highly valued is also experience from other fields or other scientific institutions. The Institute of Philosophy has been successful in grant competitions to support researchers' mobility.</p> <p>Although one might expect that international internships and research stays are accessible and relatively easy to achieve, there also exist real and substantial reasons why some candidates lack international experience (e.g. existing work obligations in the Czech Republic, financial demands of such undertaking, or less than optimal experience with the Erasmus+ programme). When evaluating applicants' experience with mobility, it turned out to be best to always ask them about concrete reasons why they have no experience of international internships and/or to assess the kind of experience they had and professional contacts they acquired.</p>
19. RECOGNITION OF QUALIFICATIONS (CODE)	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>The Institute of Philosophy recognises candidates' qualification acquired in other states. To fully take into account the model of lifelong professional development is, within the context of selection criteria, somewhat challenging, especially due to the variety of forms of further education in the area of philosophy and related fields.</p>
20. SENIORITY (CODE)	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Requirements regarding qualification listed in advertisements of vacancies are adequate and correspond to what is really required of new staff of the Institute of Philosophy. Evaluation of candidates takes into account not only the academic grade achieved but</p>

			also, and especially, the results of their scientific work, including their attitude to lifelong learning and development.
21. POSTDOCTORAL APPOINTMENTS (CODE)	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN: Institute of Philosophy follows clear rules regarding the recruitments and appointment of postdoctoral researchers. The process is codified in an internal regulation 'Criteria for assigning qualification grades and tariff classes to university-educated staff in research and development', which is a supplement to the Rules of Attestation at the Institute of Philosophy. This internal regulation defines the individual qualification grades and conditions required to achieve them. The Institute of Philosophy regularly participates in the Programme of Support of Promising Human Resources – Postdoctoral Researchers of the Czech Academy of Sciences in accordance with the internal Directive for Evaluating Proposal for Granting Salary Support to Postdoctoral Researchers in the Czech Academy of Sciences. A researcher remains in the position of postdoctoral staff for at most five years.
WORKING CONDITIONS AND SOCIAL SECURITY			
22. RECOGNITION OF THE PROFESSION	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN: The Institute of Philosophy provides for all researchers regardless of their career stage the same working conditions and assigns them the same status. Senior and junior researchers alike are treated with respect. All researchers are recognised as members of one professional group regardless of their level of qualification. The importance of collaboration between senior researchers and the incoming generation of researchers is clearly spelled out in the <u>Strategy of the Institute of Philosophy</u> .
23. RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT	+/- = ALMOST BUT NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED	Expanding research activities (in the form of new research projects) and increasing number of research staff of the Institute of Philosophy creates pressure on the existing capacity of its buildings, which cannot be changed and is at its very limit. Lack of space is addressed for instance by renting of further capacities, but it creates pressure on the management and could, in	INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN: The Institute of Philosophy provides researchers with an environment that enables them to fully focus on research. This includes offices with standard equipment, appropriate IT facilities, suitable access to internet and intranet, including remote access enabling work from home or contact with international colleagues as part of international collaboration. The institute also offers an excellent level of librarian and

		<p>the future, pose a threat to further development of the Institute of Philosophy. Despite general satisfaction, staff of the institute miss some communal spaces for informal meetings and a place designated for food consumption.</p>	<p>information services: library of the institute holds over 55,000 volumes and library of the Centre for Classical Studies another over 60,000 volumes. Informal events such as the Book Club or Philosophy Cafe are an opportunity for informal meetings among our staff; Philosophy Cafe also offers programme for our international staff.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Find locations for creation of informal zones for employees and identify other possible ways of supporting greater information exchange and sharing of ideas. ● Management of the institute is trying to find additional spaces but there is a number of external factors beyond its control. If we manage to improve the situation with shortage of space, setting apart some communal spaces will be one of our priorities. ● Support various kinds of off-site meetings. <p>This subject is further developed in measure A12 of the AP.</p>
<p>24. WORKING CONDITIONS</p>	<p>+/- = ALMOST BUT NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED</p>	<p>With respect to knowledge of working conditions and internal regulations, the level of knowledge among institute staff varies. Heads of units, as well as personal interest of individuals, play a key role in sharing information about internal procedures of the institute. What is missing is a clear online list of all employee benefits.</p> <p>In the case of international staff, their access to information about internal directives and workings of the Institute of Philosophy is further complicated by a language barrier, lack of knowledge of various aspects of life in the Czech Republic, and limited use of intranet, which is at the moment available for the most part only in Czech.</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Working conditions in general are addressed in institute's Labour Code; various particulars are dealt with in the Collective Agreement.</p> <p>Working conditions at the institute support life-work balance. Employees appreciate the flexibility of work, possibility of part-time contracts, and the option of working from home. Employee benefits include up to 5 weeks of paid vacation and 8 sick days a year, lunch vouchers (100 CZK each), baby-friendly culture (child groups), yoga at workplace, individual and group training, language courses, advantageous mobile phone tariff, etc. Employees can rent apartments offered by CAS Housing Committee and receive employee loans. Fulltime employees receive subsidy for cultural, recreational, and sport activities. Sabbatical leave is not relevant for our institute.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve the presentation and range of employee benefits. ● Translate key information on this subject into English to aid international

			<p>colleagues' awareness of working conditions and employee benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support measures supporting institute's bilingual nature, especially those leading to removal of the language barrier. ● Convert some administrative agenda into an electronic form (e.g. registration of vacations) as part of a new information system of the economic department. <p>This subject is further developed in measures A2, A7, A11, and A13 v AP.</p>
25. STABILITY AND PERMANENCE OF EMPLOYMENT	-/+ = PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED	<p>Important factors which lead to fixed-term employment at the Institute of Philosophy are the following: a) part of salaries is financed from grant projects which are, naturally, fixed term; b) financial insecurity stemming from the fact that budget is adopted always only for one year; c) a narrow definition of reasons which may lead to termination of employment by the employer as specified in the Labour Code of the Czech Republic.</p> <p>The subject of extension of employment by consecutive employment contracts is addressed by the <u>Labour Code of the Czech Republic</u>, which gives the employer the option of taking into consideration reasons based on a specific nature of work performed based on a written agreement with a union organisation. The Collective Agreement of the Institute of Philosophy then also specifies conditions under which fixed-term employment contracts may be concluded.</p> <p>The perception of employment stability, or rather lack thereof, is influenced by the lengthy process of evaluation of grant applications. This leaves researchers for a long time uncertain as to whether they would be able to continue in their research as planned. Employment instability is perceived most acutely by postdoctoral and especially international researchers, in whose case the beginning and end of employment in the Czech Republic</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>A survey conducted in November 2019 by the Basic Organisation of Unions of Scientific and Research Staff of the Institute of Philosophy (henceforth 'unions') among institute's employees shows that over 70% of respondents view long-term security of contract as an important aspect of employment stability. This was discussed in a focus group, which confirmed the importance of employment stability for institute's employees.</p> <p>At present, negotiations are held with the unions regarding a revision of the Collective agreement. Conditions for conclusion of fixed-term contracts is one of the issues under discussion also in relation to support of early career researchers and postdoctoral researchers, as well as people who work on projects and grants, including external collaborators of research teams.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Work towards a comprehensive solution of employment stability and, in connection with the outcome of negotiations with the union, implement an action plan consisting in gradual increase in the number of indefinite-term contracts for university-educated members of scientific teams (especially in category V5). This should also lead to a rationalisation of systemisation of working positions within research units. <p>This subject is further developed in measure A14 of the AP.</p>

		has a crucial impact on their life (visa situation, long-term stay, accommodation etc.).	
26. FUNDING AND SALARIES	-/+ = PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED	<p>Funding and salaries of staff of the Institute of Philosophy are dispensed in accordance with institute's <u>Internal Salary Regulations (in Czech)</u>, which are currently accessible to all institute employees on the intranet of the Institute of Philosophy (an English version is being prepared). Given the transparency of salary determination, this form of financial rewards can be considered just. Institute employees do, however, perceive it as less attractive than financial conditions offered at other institutes of the CAS or on the job market in the Czech Republic in general.</p> <p>Salaries at the Institute of Philosophy are markedly below the average of salaries in the CAS. This is mainly due to the fact that grant competitions assign less resources to humanities and research institutions working in humanities are unable to acquire financial resources from their own sources (e.g. from commercialisation of their research results).</p> <p>Where researchers are unable to secure additional financial sources from grants, their salaries remain on a low institutional level. This situation may result in emphasis on whatever subject offers a higher chance of acquiring a grant rather than one's own research.</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>A survey conducted in November 2019 by the unions showed that over 40% of respondents were unhappy with their salary. The subject was discussed in focus groups. These findings reflect general underfinancing of humanities in the Czech Republic and the fact that humanities cannot profit from commercialisation of research results. We are trying to increase project financing from EU programmes (e.g. ERC or MSCA grants) and other domestic/international providers by expanding our grant department (junior financial manager and senior grant specialist financed from <u>Enhancing professional development at the Institute of Philosophy</u>). If feasible given our economic situation – determined by support from public funds – the management would like to increase tariff salaries by regular updating of the lower tariff range (see Supplement 1 of Internal Salary Regulation).</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve support to grant applications and work on grant projects that aid researchers' salary stabilisation. ● Emphasise growth of tariff salaries and transparency of awarding personal bonuses or bonuses for extraordinary work achievements. ● Train senior staff in personnel valuation (including salaries) and labour law (see pt. 37: Supervision and managerial duties). <p>This subject is further developed in measure A15 of the AP.</p>
27. GENDER BALANCE	-/+ = PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED	<p>Although the principle of equal opportunity is at the Institute of Philosophy applied to its full extent, employee structure manifests gender disbalance, especially in senior positions. At the institute, women are less represented in research positions (22% of women vs. 78% of men). This disbalance is even more marked on the level of team leaders (12% of women vs. 88% of men). Institute management</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>The institute tries to provide working conditions enabling a sustainable life–work balance e.g. by part-time contracts, work flexibility, or due consideration of career gaps (e.g. maternity/paternity leave) during attestations (see Attestation Regulations of the institute). The management emphasises women's representation in scientific committees: during attestations, women sit in all attestation committees (and chair two). The institute supports women's participation</p>

		<p>as well as team and unit leaders do strive for gender balance but their efforts are complicated by the fact that women are significantly less represented among applicants for research positions that form the core of activities of the Institute of Philosophy.</p>	<p>in conferences and seminars (while not compromising on professional requirements). In its project <u>Enhancing professional development at the Institute of Philosophy</u>, the institute emphasises popularisation activities that would attract more women to philosophy research.</p> <p>Gender equality in salaries is guaranteed by Internal Salary Directive, which states that employees on the same professional level have the right to equal salary.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Promote women’s representation in science via systematic collaboration with secondary schools and universities. ● Institute’s management should act proactively to achieve gender balance and appoint a researcher who would focus on this agenda in collaboration with institute’s Ethics Committee. ● Consider instruments facilitating a change of the current situation: encourage female researchers to aspire to leading positions, systematically support their career development. <p>This subject is developed in measures A1 and A16 of the AP.</p>
<p>28. CAREER DEVELOPMENT</p>	<p>-/+ = PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED</p>	<p>Principles and criteria of career development are defined in the <u>Career Development Rules of the CAS</u>, in the internal Attestation Regulations of the Institute of Philosophy, its supplements, and other internal documents of the institute. What is missing is a material that would summarise the opportunities for career development on both horizontal and vertical level for all career stages of research staff.</p> <p>The Institute of Philosophy lacks a systemic instrument to support career development in the form of a mentoring programme that would enable junior researchers to avail themselves informally of advice, support, and recommendations regarding the ‘functioning of science’ from more experienced</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Part of the project of <u>Enhancing professional development at the Institute of Philosophy</u> is a definition and implementation of a strategy of education of staff of the Institute of Philosophy aimed at promoting their career development.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create a document that would describe the full extent of career development possibilities at the Institute of Philosophy. ● Prepare and implement an internal mentoring programme as an instrument of support of career development based on voluntary individual collaboration between senior and junior researchers. Such programme should use not only the knowhow of the CAS but also reflect the experiences, visions, and needs of employees of the Institute of Philosophy. ● Prepare and implement a range of training workshops aimed at informing especially the junior research staff about

		<p>colleagues, thus facilitating their further career development.</p> <p>For researchers, early career stages are complicated by a number of factors, but especially by work on temporally limited grant projects, by part-time contracts, and low salaries; junior researchers thus often lack a clear perspective of their future in science.</p> <p>Although the <u>Career Development Rules of the CAS</u> declare the importance of systematic development of knowledge and skills, staff of the Institute of Philosophy had until 2020 only a handful of opportunities to systematically develop their so-called soft skills.</p>	<p>the rules and possibilities of career development (see pt. 39: Access to research training and continuous development).</p> <p>This subject is further developed in measures A18 and A21 of the AP.</p>
<p>29. VALUE OF MOBILITY</p>	<p>+/- = ALMOST BUT NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED</p>	<p>Mobility enjoys at the Institute of Philosophy full support. The institute recognises all forms of mobility and we have not detected any tendency to prefer one form over another.</p> <p>It is important to take into account the reasons for and overall contribution of, for instance, geographical mobility, which can become excessive. In our day and age, virtual mobility is coming to the fore and this form of mobility oftentimes offers a suitable solution during work on research projects. Nevertheless, it cannot fully replace personal contact and establishment of working relationships during joint international scientific events.</p> <p>Importance is also ascribed to interdisciplinary mobility. Greater interdisciplinarity of research is, however, hampered by difficulties attendant upon evaluation of such projects: it is hard to find universal criteria that would take into account the specific features of different disciplines.</p> <p>Researchers at the Institute of Philosophy speak about lack of financial resources intended for support of mobility that would not be linked to ongoing projects. That, however, is a systemic feature of the</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>The institute supports mobility by guaranteeing a position after return from international working stay. The institute facilitates mobility by integrating researchers' international stays into their job description so that despite temporary absence, international experience becomes a valuable contribution to the institute. Depending on current financial situation, the institute also supports mobility for incoming researchers by its programme of three-months long stays for international researchers.</p> <p>The personnel agenda team provides information service on current regulations regarding labour law (using EURAXESS and other sources).</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Establish whether the level of mobility support at the institute is satisfactory. To this purpose, enquire what worked well for other CAS institutions (this is the role of the new coordinator of international collaboration). ● Provide assistance and administrative support to preparation of applications for international stipends and grants involving mobility. ● Systematically track sources of support for individual mobile stipends and grants for researchers, including support from operational programmes.

		<p>way science and research are financed.</p> <p>Information about mobility opportunities is published primarily in Czech, which makes it less accessible to international staff of the institute.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check to what extent mobility is taken into account during attestations. • Add practical information on mobility to the Guide for New Employees (incl. its English version). <p>This subject is further developed in measure A17 in the AP.</p>
30. ACCESS TO CAREER ADVICE	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Career advice and job placement assistance are, in the Czech Republic, intended mainly for graduates from secondary schools and universities. The Institute of Philosophy is not a teaching institution, which is why as an employer, it does not engage in career advice or job placement assistance for its employees. They can use offers advertised in the career section of CAS website in CAS selection procedures. The CAS also manages the agenda of job fairs for science. Systematic assistance in job placement in European research is provided by the EURAXESS information and consulting office. Researchers also often find information about vacancies in science informally, via their own networking.</p>
31. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>The area of intellectual property rights is in the Czech Republic regulated by Act no. 121/2000 Coll. on Copyright. Protection of intellectual property rights is also addressed in</p> <p>Directive of the Academic Board of the CAS no. 3 of 19 June 2018 on the registration of items protected by intellectual property rights and their use (in Czech) and internal directive of Director of the Institute of Philosophy no. 2/2018 for handling the results of employee's work. The institute makes sure that research results are dedicated to the institution at which they were written. This prevents double registration of the same research outputs. The Institute of Philosophy does not produce applied research, so the issue of patent protection is not relevant. In the context of intellectual property rights, what is relevant to researchers at the Institute of Philosophy is especially the issue of co-authorship and links between research and teaching done by institute's researchers (see pt. 32: Co-authorship).</p>

32. CO-AUTHORSHIP	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>At the Institute of Philosophy, most works have a single author. Co-authorship is pertinent only to some published works and this area is addressed by valid internal directive of Director of the Institute of Philosophy no. 2/2018 for handling works produced by employees. The Institute of Philosophy makes sure that all authors and co-authors are listed in the <u>RIV database</u> (in Czech), which is a national system of registration of research, development, and innovation supported from public resources of the Czech Republic. Publications and other research output are also registered in the <u>ASEP database</u> (Registration of results of scientific work in the CAS). By taking these steps, management of the Institute of Philosophy makes sure that no particular scientific output is counted twice and that all output is dedicated to the institution where it was created. Management of the Institute of Philosophy is also considering the option of defining general conditions of co-authorship (see below, pt. 31: Intellectual Property Rights). Effectivity of mechanisms which are already in place will be further strengthened by creation of a Code of Ethics of the Institute of Philosophy (see pt. 2: Ethical principles).</p>
33. TEACHING	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>The Institute of Philosophy is not a university-type institution, although it collaborates with partnered universities on seven accredited doctoral study programmes. Management of the institute views teaching as a natural and important part of research activities of its staff, but what is preferred is teaching of specialised courses with emphasis on doctoral-level curriculum. If staff of the Institute of Philosophy teach bachelor and master courses, they do so outside their employment at the Institute of Philosophy, whereby according to the <u>Code of Ethics for Researchers of the Czech Academy of Sciences</u>, the total sum of their contracts may not exceed 1.5times of a full-time contract. Project <u>Enhancing professional development at the Institute of Philosophy</u> includes implementation of educational activities contributing to development of teaching skills of staff of the Institute of Philosophy.</p>

<p>34. COMPLAINTS/ APPEALS</p>	<p>+/- = ALMOST BUT NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED</p>	<p>The Institute of Philosophy deals with all complaints submitted to it. At the moment, all such complaints and appeals are dealt with by management of the Institute of Philosophy. The institute does not as yet have a clear procedure that would enable the submission of complaint to a person other than statutory representatives of the Institute of Philosophy.</p>	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN: The manner in which complaints and grievances are addressed is regulated by Articles 18 and 19 of the Collective Agreement of the Institute of Philosophy. At this point, the contact person in such cases is Director of the Institute of Philosophy.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Inclusion of a procedure for dealing with complaints and grievances into a future procedural code of the Ethics Committee of the Institute of Philosophy (anticipated no. of members 3–5; predominantly reactive function). ● Creation of a process that would enable submission of complaints and grievances to a person other than a statutory representative of the Institute of Philosophy and delegation of these powers ideally to some organ of academic self-governance of the institute (see pt. 2: Ethical principles). <p>This subject is further developed in measure A1 of the AP.</p>
<p>35. PARTICIPATION IN DECISION- MAKING BODIES</p>	<p>++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED</p>		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN: Institute’s decision-making bodies its director, its Board, and its Supervisory Board. Director appoints his/her permanent or temporary consultation bodies: Director’s College, International Advisory Board, Attestation Committee, Editorial Board of Filosofia Publishers, Editorial Board of Oikoymenh, Popularisation Board, Committee for Damages and Liquidation, Inventory Committee, and other ad hoc committees. Members of the Board of the Institute of Philosophy are elected and recalled by an assembly of institute’s researchers. The board decides about institute’s conception and directions of development and adopts internal regulations and institute budget. The number of board members, their election, and ways of recalling them are defined in <u>Act no. 341/2005 Coll. on public research institutions</u> and by <u>Statutes of the CAS</u>. Particulars are spelled out in the Code of Elections of the Institute of Philosophy. Members of the Supervisory Board are appointed and recalled by the Academic Board of the CAS. Supervisory Board supervises activities and economic management of the Institute of Philosophy. General conditions pertaining to</p>

			researchers' representation in these decision-making bodies defined in internal regulations of the Institute of Philosophy, especially its internal <u>Organisation Rules</u> (in Czech) and in the Foundation Charter of the Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, P.R.I.
TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT			
36. RELATION WITH SUPERVISORS	+/- = ALMOST BUT NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED	Researchers in the doctoral or postdoctoral stage of their training are integrated into teams. For advice regarding professional or organisational aspects of their work, they can turn to the heads of their units/teams and other senior employees. Relations between doctoral students and their supervisors from the Institute of Philosophy are defined by rules of the cooperating universities and based on agreements between the university institutions and the Institute of Philosophy. What is absent is targeted training of early career researchers aimed at their 'academic socialisation' and development of their own skills and abilities needed in scientific work.	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN: All researchers at the Institute of Philosophy have the opportunity to receive feedback during regular attestations, which have a both retrospective and future-oriented character and alongside an evaluative function (see pt. 11: Evaluation/appraisal systems) also help manage work performance. This includes communication with researchers about their plans, expectations, and goals. Additionally, researchers each year submit a report about their scientific activity to heads of units and enter the outputs of their research into the <u>ASEP database</u>.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prepare and implement a range of training and development courses for doctoral and postdoctoral researchers that would help them acquire and improve the skills they need to prepare grant applications, plan project work, identify their strengths, etc. (see pt. 39: Access to research training and continuous development). <p>This subject is further developed in measure A21 of the AP.</p>
37. SUPERVISION AND MANAGERIAL DUTIES	-/+ = PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED	Responsibilities and description of functions of heads of units are defined by internal <u>Organisation Rules</u> (in Czech), which, among other things, define the processes of appointment to and recall from positions, relations of superiority/subordination, and basic work activities of heads of units. This document does not address the interpersonal level of work of heads of departments (such as support of mutual collaboration and good interpersonal relations within a unit, professional development of unit members, transfer of knowledge acquired, etc.). The institute has no explicitly defined standards of	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN: A basic definition of the function of team leaders and their responsibilities for meeting the targets of their unit's research plan and for evaluation of their unit by an international board is provided in the <u>Strategy of the Institute of Philosophy of CAS</u> adopted in 2020.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create a document 'Concept of job description of team leaders at the Institute of Philosophy'. This document should include recommended standards for successful execution of this leading role and a list of competencies (skills and knowledge) of key importance for performance of this role. This concept of

		managerial work and no definition of skills and knowledge needed for successful performance of a leading role. Institute employees receive no systematic training for leading or managerial roles in the Institute of Philosophy.	<p>job description should function as a starting point for planning of training courses and development of competencies of senior staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prepare and introduce a range of education and development workshops for team leaders, heads of units, supervisors, mentors, etc. <p>This subject is further developed in measure A20 of the AP.</p>
38. CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	++ = FULLY IMPLEMENTED		<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Researchers at the Institute of Philosophy are used to continuing education; what is dominant is education focused on development of professional skills by various forms and methods (independent study, lectures, seminars, conferences, etc.).</p>
39. ACCESS TO RESEARCH TRAINING AND CONTINUOUS DEVELOPMENT	-/+ = PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED	The Institute of Philosophy has no strategy that would express its need to develop skills and competencies of its researchers and serve as a starting point of further training. Until 2020, training and development of researchers of the Institute of Philosophy tended to be rather sporadic, occasional, and uncoordinated.	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Within the framework of <u>Strategy of the Institute of Philosophy of CAS</u>, the Institute of Philosophy created a position of specialist in training and development. Its purpose is, among other things, to facilitate researchers' access to further professional training. The institute had also created an internal webpage http://vzdelavani.flu.cas.cz/en/ to coordinate training. This website should enable the staff of the Institute of Philosophy to follow current offer of training, register, download materials, and watch recordings of previous workshops. The institute is also preparing new training courses and the knowhow acquired in this process will be used in preparing our institute's training strategy.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create a strategy of development and training of employees of the Institute of Philosophy that would incorporate standards of the system of employee training including definitions of the extent, level, and quality of the service. ● Implementation of the newly created strategy. <p>This subject is further developed in measures A6, A7, A8, A16, A17, A19 and A21 in the AP.</p>
40. SUPERVISION	+/- = ALMOST BUT NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED	Doctoral and postdoctoral students and researchers turn for advice regarding professional subjects as well as organisational issues to the	<p>INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN:</p> <p>Thanks to the project <u>Strategy of the Institute of Philosophy of CAS</u> we are gradually professionalising the support provided to</p>

		<p>heads of their units; their position within the organisation is always clearly determined. Heads of units are often in their roles overburdened and do not have the capacity to focus on their key role, which is to lead the research activities of teams entrusted to them, including professional development of early career researchers.</p>	<p>researchers in key areas, such as project and grant support, popularisation, international collaboration, mobility, open access to scientific information, and HR management. This should enable the head of units to focus on the scientific development of teams and especially junior researchers entrusted to them.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS/CHALLENGES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To prepare and implement a range of training and development workshops and sessions intended for team leaders, heads of units, supervisors, mentors, etc. (see pt. 37: Supervision and managerial duties). ● Prepare and implement an internal mentoring programme as an instrument of support of junior researchers (see pt. 28: Career development). ● Introduce regular info days that would help junior researchers orient themselves in their career development and provide them with expert advice and information service (this is connected with pt. 4: Professional attitude). <p>This subject is further developed in measures A18 and A20 of the AP.</p>
--	--	--	---

3.1 CONCLUSION

Following the GAP analysis, a document entitled "Action Plan" was created. Its content includes a scope of actions addressing the identified shortcomings of the existing internal processes and working conditions in the Institute of Philosophy. A gradual implementation of set goals and related activities will take place in the period of 2021 and 2022.

The application for the HR Excellence in Research Award was submitted on 31 March 2021. An official statement from the European Commission will hopefully soon follow on whether the Institute of Philosophy will obtain the HR Award. Up-to-date information on the progress of the HR Award process at the Institute of Philosophy can be found on our website in the HR Excellence section [HERE](#).



EUROPEAN UNION
European Structural and Investment Funds
Operational Programme Research,
Development and Education

