



GAP Analysis of Silesian Univerzity in Opava



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



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



European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers: GAP analysis overview			
<p>Status: to what extent does this organisation meet the following principles?</p>	<p>Implementation: ++ = fully implemented +/- = almost but not fully implemented -/+ = partially implemented -- = insufficiently implemented</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Initiatives undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement:</p>
Ethical and Professional Aspects			
<p>1. Research freedom</p>	<p>+/+</p>	<p>Freedom of research at universities in the Czech Republic is stipulated by the Higher Education Act. The law is followed by the SU Statute, which declares freedom of science, research and artistic expression. The Ethical Principles for all SU employees and students are entered into the Code of Ethics, revised and valid as of 30th October 2017. The Rules of Procedure of the Ethics Committee, which address possible violations of the Code of Ethics, also date from the same time.</p> <p>Since its inception, SU has strived to build an inspiring and supportive environment for all its employees, including researchers.</p> <p>SU does not limit research activities. However, priority research</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Process translations of relevant documents into English <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 92% of respondents state that they pay attention or rather pay attention to expanding the boundaries of scientific knowledge in their research activities ● 84% of respondents believe that their

		<p>directions that are set at SU are built on tradition and resources (research teams, technology, know-how, etc.). The focus of scientific, research, development and innovative, artistic and other creative activities and areas is described and specified in the SU Statute, which was last updated in 2019. Each part of the Statute defines priority directions and research topics in various internal regulations and standards.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of translated documents (e.g.: Code of Ethics into English) - No major shortcomings that would be in conflict with this principle have been identified but there is a possibility for further improvement. 	<p>freedom of thought and expression in research is not or rather not restricted.</p>
2. Ethical principles	+/-	<p>Ethical principles and basic ethical procedures are set out in the SU Code of Ethics (hereinafter referred to as the "CE"). Any unethical conduct, including the issue of research ethics, is discussed by the SU Ethics Committee which is governed by the Rules of Procedure of the Ethics Committee. These are documents that fully or partially incorporate a specific principle of the Charter and the Code. The Rules of Procedure enshrine the obligation of all employees and students to comply with this EC.</p> <p>The Faculty of Public Policy has the CE SU supplemented by its own CE, on which it is based, and focuses primarily on the ethical aspects of</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create a Good Research Practice Guideline summarising the rules for co-authorship, intellectual property protection, GDPR, confidentiality in contract research ● Include training in research ethics ● Extend / Emphasise the role of the Ethics Committee also to ethical issues related to the nature of R&D activities. (e.g. health research).



		<p>creative activities carried out by external entities.</p> <p>The general obligation of confidentiality arises from the employment contract, applies to all SU employees and is also enshrined in the Rector's Directive on intellectual property (No. 8/2018, Art. 12).</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CE lacks procedure in the case of CE breach (precisely defined procedure, whom employees can seek advice from) ● Document translation is missing ● The role and authority of the university ombudsman is not defined ● The role of the Ethics Committee for some specific areas of R&D activities is not defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Authorise personnel to deal with possible violations of CE principles <p>Results of the questionnaire survey: Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 94% of respondents state that they know or rather know the ethical principles that they must follow in their research. ● As many as 95% of respondents believe that they follow these principles
3. Professional responsibility	+/-	<p>The principle of professional responsibility is set out in the CE. The issue of handling and protection of intellectual property is currently addressed by the Rector's Directive no. 8/2018 which corresponds to the current legislative requirements.</p> <p>According to the employment contract, all employees are obliged to become acquainted and comply with all applicable internal standards and regulations, however, this fact is not further "verified". According to the Workplace Rules, the employee's superior is responsible for his</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Systematise the whole process of induction (list of documents that an employee needs to be acquainted with, plan of the first working week, etc.) ● Add some specifics of the given principle to the Code of Ethics ● Create a guideline/formalised procedure for the monitoring of final theses and for



		<p>acquaintance with internal regulations and standards, especially with the Workplace Rules, the Collective Agreement, the Statute of the Silesian University in Opava and other internal regulations and standards or legal regulations necessary for work.</p> <p>Since 2019, SU has been using the Information System developed by Masaryk University (IS). The IS also includes the Theses software, which records and monitors the plagiarism of final theses. The result of the inspection is recorded within the system correlated with the final thesis in question and is available to both the lecturer and the entire examination committee. If a match is found, the student has the opportunity to justify the details within his defence of the thesis.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some departments lack coordinated and systematic procedure for familiarising employees with relevant documents - There is no induction process, which will include familiarisation with internal standards and regulations - The CE lacks some specifics of the principle - There is no guideline for performing an inspection and finding plagiarisms in final theses (however, the SU is already performing this inspection). 	<p>the case of finding plagiarism</p> <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 68% of respondents believe that SU has clearly defined rules regarding the protection of intellectual property. 28% could not answer the question. ● 72% of respondents state that they are familiar with these rules, 18% state the opposite. ● 72% of respondents state that in the last 3 years they have not encountered a violation of copyright or co-authorship at SU. On the contrary, 12% stated that they had encountered this. ● 68% of respondents believe that partial tasks in research are entrusted to persons with sufficient qualifications, 8% state the opposite. ● 6% of doctoral students state that the results of their work were used without being quoted or mentioned in the acknowledgment.
--	--	---	---



<p>4. Professional attitude</p>	<p>+/+</p>	<p>The research and development strategy is enshrined in the Long-Term Plan. The strategic sub-objectives of the research are defined in accordance with the professional focus of the departments by the lecturers or the main project contributors. The funds are redistributed to the individual departments on the basis of criteria set by the Rector of SU and approved by the Deans of the faculties and the Heads of the institutes.</p> <p>The beneficiary of a project is legislated to provide information on its progress, even in the case of internal SU projects (interim and final reports, or public defence of internal and external projects). Other conditions for reporting depend on the provider of financial support and are set out in a legal act or the project documentation.</p> <p>The strategy as well as all guidelines are published on the SU website (intranet). In the event of a new standard, regulation or revision of existing ones, all employees are informed by email.</p> <p>The staff of the individual departments are acquainted with the possibilities and procedures for the preparation of external applications for grant funds through a designated unit, usually the Department of Science and International Relations or the Administrative Office, or during regular joint meetings.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a lack of a coordinated and systematic procedure for familiarising employees with relevant documents 	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systematise the whole process of induction Support internal communication tools across the entire SU No major shortcomings have been identified that would run counter to this principle, but there is a possibility for further improvement. <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>SU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 75.3% of respondents state that they are or rather are familiar with the Long-Term Plan for the period 2016-2020 and the vision of SU (definitely not 6%, rather not 9.5%). 69.4% of respondents state that they identify with the Long-Term Plan and the Vision of SU (definitely not 1.8%, rather not 6%). 56.6% of respondents believe that Long-Term Plan, Strategies and Vision of SU are well communicated (definitely not 6.6%, rather not 16.4%).
---------------------------------	------------	---	---



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no induction process, which includes familiarisation with internal standards and regulations • According to the questionnaire survey, 23% of respondents believe that the Long-Term Plan and the Vision of SU are not or rather not well communicated. • Furthermore, no major shortcomings have been identified that would be in conflict with this principle, but there is a possibility for further improvement. 	<p>Academic and research staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 74% of respondents state that they are or rather are familiar with the Long-Term Plan and Vision of SU, 14% stated the opposite. • 70% of respondents state that they identify with the Long-Term Plan and the Vision of SU, 8% state the opposite. • 57% of respondents believe that the Long-Term Plan, Strategies and the Vision of SU are well communicated (22% believe the opposite). • The strategic focus of its department is reflected or rather reflected in its research by 82% of respondents, the opposite is claimed by 5%.
5. Contractual and legal obligations	+/-	<p>All researchers are acquainted with the basic regulations that apply to both their study and work (e.g. Workplace Rules, Organisational Rules). They are trained in Occupational health and safety (OHS) and Fire protection, or safe practices in laboratories, how to provide first aid, etc.</p> <p>The management of intellectual property is covered by the current Rector's Directive No. 8/2018. In practice, the departments proceed in accordance with the Directive or rules of the grant programme within</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure translations of relevant documents into English: employment contract, timesheets, job description, wage assessment, OHS training, request for a medical examination, consent to a deduction from wages (meal vouchers), performance surcharge.



		<p>which the outputs of the R&D activity arose.</p> <p>The Collective Agreement and the Workplace Rules were updated as of 1st January 2020.</p> <p>According to the Workplace Rules, the employee's direct superior is responsible for acquainting him with internal regulations and standards, especially with the Workplace Rules, the Collective Agreement, the Statute of the Silesian University in Opava and other internal regulations and standards or legal regulations necessary for work. In common practice, a manager or a human resources representative informs the employee or the information is sent via email or shared electronically.</p> <p>GAP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are no translations of relevant documents into English - There is no induction process (including acquaintance with legal and university regulations, university processes) - There is no comprehensive system of commercialisation and technology transfer, which would also include comprehensive rules for dealing with the results of R&D activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create a system to support the commercialisation and transfer of technology, including organisational enshrinement ● Provide training for employees in the field of intellectual property, patent protection, etc. <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 72% of respondents believe that they are familiar with the rules on intellectual property protection, 18% state the opposite. ● 85% of respondents believe that they are familiar with safe research work practices in their field (definitely not 3%, rather not 3%) ● 89% of respondents believe that they ensure safe working practices in research (definitely not 1%, rather not 0%)
6. Accountability	+/-	Responsibility for the effective use of money towards investors or providers of funds is enshrined primarily in the documents Rules of	Proposals:



		<p>Management and Accounting (dated 28th March, 2018) and Rector's Directive no. 8/2019 on the Internal Financial Control System of the Silesian University in Opava.</p> <p>All SU managers are required to participate in the management of financial inspection as part of the internal financial monitoring system within the defined duties, powers and responsibilities. At SU, financial inspection of projects takes place in the form of internal and external audits as a normal part of project management and prevention of risks associated with sanctions. It is the duty of the collaborators of all projects to cooperate on possible inspections.</p> <p>The project support centre provides possible consultations for financial management, a number of consultations are also handled by employees of economic departments. This support is not systematised across SU.</p> <p>In accordance with Act No. 320/2001 Coll., on financial inspection in public administration and on amendments to certain acts, the internal financial inspection system is introduced and maintained within the SU. The obligation to cooperate with the inspecting authorities applies primarily to managers who, if necessary, instruct a subordinate to cooperate. At the same time, managers are obliged to provide their superiors with timely and reliable information on the results achieved in the performance of tasks, the emergence of significant risks, serious deficiencies in the activities of SU and measures taken and implemented to remedy them.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Add some specifics of the given principle to the Code of Ethics (e.g. : University employees or students in their scientific, artistic or other creative work are obliged to follow the principles of proper, transparent and effective financial management) ● Systematise project support across SU, including registration and transfer of information <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 63% of respondents (academic staff in senior positions and Ph.D. lecturers) believe that there are clearly defined rules for the distribution of funds and R&D activities at SU, 17% state the opposite.
--	--	---	---



		<p>The storage of data and methodological procedures is not provided at SU, however, the used methods of data collection and analysis are always listed in specific results of R&D activities, final reports, or in public databases of results and are accessible to financial providers. There is the Rector's Guideline No. 1/2016 to describe the data file intended for storage in the data archive at the Faculty of Public Policy SU in Opava at the Faculty of Public Policies.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective and efficient use of funds is regulated in the Code of Ethics only in general, see the proposal for amendments • Informing employees about the possibilities of external grant financing is not systematic • There is a lack of records showing previous mistakes of employees • Support for R&D projects is not systematised across SU. 	
7. Good practice in research	+/-	<p>All measures and safe working procedures are in accordance with the currently valid legal regulations regarding operational health and safety and fire protection. The protection of personal data is governed by the European regulation GDPR.</p> <p>The following are the particular documents:</p> <p>SU Workplace rules</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create a Good Research Practice Guideline, a document based on the Code of Ethics (the Good Research Practice Guides for SU employees / Good Practice in Research Guideline) - Systematise the induction process (acquaintance with work in shared



		<p>Rector's Directive no. 1/2015: To ensure operational health and safety at the Silesian University in Opava</p> <p>Rector's Directive no. 2 / 2015: To ensure operational health and safety at the Silesian University in Opava</p> <p>Rector's Directive no.10 / 2018: Protection and processing of personal data</p> <p>Rector's Directive no. 13 / 2011 Rules of using the computer network of the Silesian University</p> <p>Operational health and safety and Fire Protection training and the training of drivers using company vehicles are addressed centrally. The list of other mandatory training differs according to the focus of the individual workplaces, e.g.: training for ICT work, language skills, training for work in laboratories (for example for optical and radiation measurements), etc.</p> <p>Since 2019, SU has been using IS (HW developed by Masaryk University), which, among other things, also addresses data backup in the event of an information technology disaster so that the continuity and renewal of ICT is maintained. However, according to the questionnaire survey 42% of respondents are not familiar with the procedures for working with data in shared university repositories.</p> <p>GAP</p>	<p>university repositories)</p> <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 90% of respondents state that they are or rather are familiar with current work regulations and conditions, 6% state the opposite. ● 51% of respondents state that they are or rather are familiar with the rules and procedures of working with data in shared university repositories, 42% state the opposite. <p>Academic and research staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 85% of respondents state that they are or are rather familiar with safe working practices, 6% state the opposite. ● 89% of respondents state that they pay attention to following these procedures, 1% state the opposite. ● 90% of respondents state that they are or rather are familiar with current work regulations and conditions. ● 50% of respondents state that they are or rather are familiar with the rules and procedures of working with data in shared
--	--	---	--



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are no translations of the relevant documents into English - There are no rules for good research practice - No revision of the Rector's Directive no. 13 / 2011 has been performed in relation to the implementation of the IS system - There is no training focused on the process of working with data in university-wide repositories 	<p>university repositories, 42% state the opposite.</p>
8. Dissemination, exploitation of results	-/+	<p>The evaluation criteria for research staff include the number of published research results (scientific publications, presentations at conferences and workshops). Citation is one of the criteria of scientific works. All researchers at SU are therefore motivated to publish their results and their further use.</p> <p>The obligation to publish the results is given by the regulations and standards of the departments. Publications are financially acknowledged and therefore they are regulated also within the directives on employee remuneration. The results that are not ready for publication, are in secrecy mode or are awaiting publication are classed as unpublished results .</p> <p>The results of each researcher's work are published on the SU website but the publication is not centralised in any way. After the implementation of the IS SU system (2019), the results are also included in this system. Historical data is currently being added.</p> <p>The departments have priorities for publishing the results of R&D</p>	<p>Proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create a Handbook Good Research Practice Guideline ● Unify the procedure for publishing results in external databases (e.g.: university-wide use of Orcid id, Researcher id, Scopus id, etc.) ● Create a system to support the commercialisation and transfer of technology, including organisational enshrinement <p>Results of the questionnaire survey: Academic and research staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 58% of respondents believe that there are or rather are clearly defined procedures for dissemination and use of the obtained results at SU, 29% are unable to assess this.



		<p>activities (does not include popularisation) enshrined within internal standards and regulations . Employees are acquainted with these regulations through various channels (meetings, emails, etc.).</p> <p>The departments recommend publication on profiles such as Google Scholar, Research Gate, however it is used only individually. The departments also use IS SU, arxiv.org and the REPEC database. There is a formal motivational system within the individual departments supporting the publication of R&D results (rewards, prize competitions)</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no unified system of commercialisation and transfer of technologies at SU, including organisational enshrinement, the matter is marginally solved together with other R&D activities. • The questionnaire survey shows that workers are not sufficiently familiar with the procedures for the dissemination and use of research results. • There is no systematic training in the issue of dissemination of research results. • SU does not have a Guideline to recommend the publication of results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 78% of respondents state that they are or rather are familiar with the procedures for disseminating the results of science to the professional and lay public, 16% state the opposite. • 35% of respondents state that they strive or rather strive to commercialise the results, 40% state the opposite.
9. Public engagement	-/+	So far, there is no concept and support for the popularisation of science, research and other results of creative activity at SU. At present, everything depends on the activity of the departments, research teams	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate the strategy and system of support for the popularisation of results



	<p>or researchers.</p> <p>One of the priority strategic areas within the Long-Term Plan (2016-2020) is the Relations with the External Environment, which also includes activities aimed at supporting the popularisation of scientific and artistic results. Currently, individual key activities of several projects are also focused on the popularisation of science.</p> <p>The concept of the popularisation of science is recorded or is in preparation only in some departments. At present, it is mainly in the form of a presentation on a website, a newsletter or working papers. Individual activities are often tied to project funding, which limits their sustainability and further development.</p> <p>The popularisation of science is mainly the domain of the Institute of Physics (Unisphere, cooperation with the Union of Czech Mathematicians and Physicists, lectures for secondary schools) or the Institute of Mathematics (Brain Fitness).</p> <p>The Institute of Interdisciplinary Research (at The School of Business Administration) coordinates research activities in the field of small and medium-sized enterprises in cooperation with local companies and public administration. One of the objectives is to connect and apply research results in practical applications in the management of economic activities of specific entities.</p> <p>GAP:</p>	<p>and creative activities respecting the differences of individual departments and subject areas of the university into the Long-Term Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enshrine the evaluation of the popularisation activities of SU employees into the Career Code of SU ● Define key regional and/or societal topics to which the university will contribute <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and research staff:</p> <p>Mentioned forms of communication with the public:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 83% of respondents state contributions to a professional conference/proceedings ● 83% of respondents list articles in a professional journal ● 41% of respondents report events for the general public ● 20% of respondents list articles in popularisation media ● 17% of respondents state their own presentation on the Internet
--	---	---



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of a strategy for the popularisation of science and research at the university level • There is a lack of training for academic and research staff in the forms of popularisation of science and research (including presentation in the media) • Popularisation of science is the subject of evaluation of employees only in some departments (evaluation of popularisation of science - it is an activity that is difficult to quantify and therefore evaluate) • The popularisation of science is conceptually recorded only in some departments. • There is a lack of definition and commitment of the university to co-address important regional and/or societal issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15% of respondents report appearing in the media • "I do not communicate with the public," said 4% of respondents.
10. Non discrimination	+/-	<p>From a legal point of view, the issue of discrimination is dealt with in the Workplace Rules and the Anti-Discrimination Act. At SU, the regulations focus primarily on the prohibition of discrimination against disabled people (people with special needs - employees + students) within the CE. Regarding the recruitment of new employees during the selection procedure, although the basic principles of non-discriminatory behaviour are not described, in practice both existing and potential employees are treated in accordance with the principle of non-discrimination, regardless of their gender, age, ethnic, national or social origin, religion, sexual orientation, language, disability, political opinions, or other social and</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend the Code of Ethics according to the principle of non-discrimination • Update the Recruitment Policy • Systematise the induction process (acquaintance with relevant procedures) • Authorise personnel to deal with possible breaches of the principles of non-discrimination • Support internal communication tools



		<p>economic conditions.</p> <p>However, the results of the questionnaire survey pointed to the need for greater emphasis on non-discrimination on the basis of age and gender.</p> <p>The general procedure in case of violation of the above moral ethical standards is defined by the CE, the Collective Agreement and the guidelines for handling complaints, notifications, suggestions delivered to the Silesian University in Opava and the procedure for providing information on request (no. 4/2018).</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The basic principles of non-discriminatory behaviour in the area of recruitment are not described internally in the Recruitment Policy (dated 28th March, 2017) • There is a lack of a deeper enshrinement of the principle of non-discrimination in the CE • Although the complaint and dismissal procedures are defined, some employees are not sufficiently familiar with it according to the questionnaire survey 	<p>across the entire SU</p> <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>SU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 88% of respondents state that they have not encountered any form of discrimination in the workplace. 13% of respondents state discrimination based on gender (61%) and age (46%) as the most common form. <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 87% of respondents state that they have not encountered any form of discrimination in the workplace. 13% of respondents cite discrimination based on gender (64%) and age (46%) as the most common form. • Almost all respondents who encountered discrimination state that it has not been addressed in any way.
<p>11. Evaluation/ appraisal systems</p>	<p>-/+</p>	<p>The system for evaluating the results of research institutions in the Czech Republic is an external evaluation tool. At the level of university management, the results of the national evaluation according to this</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-evaluate the entire staff appraisal system using the example of good



		<p>Guideline 17+ are discussed every year. The Czech Republic adopted new principles for the evaluation of research organizations in 2017 and is gradually introducing them. The evaluation is based on bibliometric analysis and assessment of R&D results by independent foreign reviewers. The evaluation of workplace research activities according to the university "Rules of assurance and internal quality evaluation system" is then discussed at the Internal Evaluation Board meetings.</p> <p>The SU Career Code very generally and formally regulates the principles of employee evaluation (subject of evaluation, form, frequency, transparency, work with outputs). The specific form of employee evaluation is in the full competence of individual faculties and institutes. According to the Workplace Rules, academic and R&D staff are obliged to regularly submit the results of their creative activities for evaluation to their superior and to publish the results of their work. The departments evaluate employees using various formats (evaluation of activity statements or personal development plans, at regular meetings, etc.) and at various intervals. The scope of evaluation also varies, e.g. the inclusion of activity evaluation in projects.</p> <p>The quality of R&D results is discussed both at the levels of department management or research centres (meetings of departments, faculty management, Dean's college, scientific council of the faculty, board of guarantors, Committee for science and research, etc.). The School of Business Administration additionally implemented a system where the quality of creative activity of each department is evaluated by three</p>	<p>practice and focus in particular on enhancing transparency and objectification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ensure the connection of the appraisal system to career development plans (update of the SU Career Code) <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <p>The rating system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 64% of respondents consider it regular, ● 28% of respondents consider important for the evaluation of career advancement ● 26% of respondents considered sufficient ● 25% of respondents considered transparent ● 22% of respondents considered motivational ● 22% of respondents consider it unsystematic. ● Only 26% of respondents state that they regularly receive immediate feedback. <p>Proposed changes to the appraisal system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the need for greater objectivity and transparency
--	--	---	--



		<p>external experts.</p> <p>According to the SU Rules, the students evaluate the teaching in bachelor's and master's degree programmes, usually after each semester. According to the decision of the head of the department, it is organised either electronically using the information system of the university's study agenda, as a survey in paper form, or a combination of thereof. This evaluation of teaching is then taken into account when evaluating the employee's work performance.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Appraisal systems do not take sufficient account of all aspects and responsibilities of the researcher ● With the exception of Ph.D. students, the performance of an employee in some departments is currently evaluated only by a direct superior employee ● Only some departments work with Career and Personal Development Plans (Faculty of Public Policy, The School of Business Administration; Institute of Physics uses only where relevant). ● Employee self-evaluation is part of an appraisal only in some departments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the need to evaluate all work tasks and activities ● greater emphasis on pedagogical activities, not only research
<p>Recruitment and Selection</p>			



12. Recruitment	-/+	<p>The Candidate selection procedures are currently governed by the Recruitment Code pursuant to § 17 par. f) of Act No. 111/1998 Coll., on Higher Education. Although this Code describes recruitment in very general terms and there is no more detailed description of the principles as set out in the Code of Conduct, the candidate selection procedure is effective and transparent. Equal opportunities for all staff are guaranteed in practice. To recruit researchers for posts within individual projects a standard procedure is applied depending on the conditions of the project notice and an approved application.</p> <p>The Career Code (1st April, 2018) regulates both the position and the perspective of professional development of employees.</p> <p>According to the Career Code, employees are allowed to adjust their working conditions when returning from maternity or parental leave (part-time work, flexible working hours, the possibility of working from home, always solved according to individual needs). In practice, there is also a supportive approach for R&D workers who have worked in the private sector for part of their careers.</p> <p>The SU Counselling centre offers assistance in solving personal and study problems, various forms of counselling (psychological, special pedagogical, social, emotional, to support academic success) and counselling and professional services for students with specific needs.</p> <p>There is barrier-free access for students and staff with specific needs (lifts, access ramps, platforms, the possibility of assistance services) at</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop and implement an OTM-R policy ● Revise the Recruitment Code according to the principles of the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers ● Systematise the induction process ● Carry out an analysis of the possibilities to supplement aids or orientation elements for visually impaired or blind people according to the specifics and possibilities at individual departments and buildings <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and research staff working at SU up to 5 years (108 respondents) - cross-section for the entire recruitment topic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 81% of respondents state that they had enough information about the required skills before the recruitment procedure ● 73% of respondents state that they met with sufficient support from the manager, 43% encountered training at the workplace ● Less than 76% of respondents learned about the recruitment procedure through
-----------------	-----	---	--



		<p>each individual building of the Silesian University. A navigation system for the blind and partially sighted (braille labels, orientation boards, glass stickers) is built into some university buildings.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Recruitment Code applies only to academic R&D staff. To recruit researchers for posts within individual projects a standard procedure is applied depending on the conditions of the project notice and an approved application. • OTM-R policy is missing • The Recruitment Code does not contain detailed description of the principles set out in the Code of Conduct • There is a lack of a systematic induction process for new employees. Induction plans for new employees are currently used in some departments, and the formalization of the induction process is being prepared at the Institute of Physics and the School of Business Administration. 	<p>personal contact, 37% through websites, 7% through a job portal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 85% of respondents received job descriptions.
13. Recruitment (Code)	-/+	<p>The OTM - R policy has not yet been implemented at SU. The candidate selection procedure for academic staff is currently governed by the Recruitment Code pursuant to § 17 par. f) of Act No. 111/1998 Coll., on Higher Education. To recruit researchers for posts within individual projects a standard procedure is applied depending on the conditions of the project notice and an approved application.</p> <p>The notice of selection procedure for a particular position is published in</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create and implement an OTM-R policy • Revise the Recruitment Code for the Recruitment of Researchers according to the principles of the Code of Conduct (define the basic principles for the recruitment of R&D personnel)



		<p>the public part of the university's website and the relevant department at least 30 days before the application deadline.</p> <p>Samples of the notice of a vacant position are fully within the competence of the departments, they include: job title; requirements for the position to be filled; estimated commencement date; required documents (professional CV is always required); requirements for education, experience, expertise, details of employment, duration of employment contract, benefits, deadline and place for submitting the application; at least the approximate date of test, personal interview or lecture, if held. The recruitment system is in full compliance with the valid Act No. 110/2019 Coll., on the Processing of Personal Data. In case the applicant is not accepted, the documents are returned or shredded (they were collected only for the purposes of the candidate selection procedure). If the candidate is accepted, the documents are used to fulfill the legal obligations of the employer.</p> <p>Publication of vacant positions is in the full competence of the individual departments (in accordance with the Recruitment Code) and the relevant foreign networks are used, however, Euraxess so far only in one department (Institute of Physics)</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● OTM - R policy is missing ● Insufficient use of the Euraxess network and others ● The individual departments are usually set with a uniform style and form of advertisements, however, unification is lacking at 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Update and unify the mandatory style of the form to announce a Candidate Selection procedure ● Develop a model (standardised) procedure to carry out the Candidate Selection process
--	--	--	---



		<p>the university level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate selection procedures are open, however, when filling "postdoctoral" positions, graduates may be favoured. • There is no Recruitment Code for positions of researchers, scientific positions are filled based on recommendations, experience from cooperation or employees are searched for or addressed with an offer 	
14. Selection (Code)	-/-	<p>The selection of candidates for SU is governed by the valid Recruitment Code which sets out the conditions for establishing the selection committee and the course of the Candidate Selection procedure. The course of the selection procedure is, depending on its complexity, composed of several selection methods (assessment by the committee, oral interview, written tests, references, etc.). Candidates are always informed about the date well in advance. The committee keeps written records about the course of individual phases of the selection procedure. The records also include the evaluation of candidates. The committee processes the results of the selection procedure and determines the order of the candidates no later than 6 weeks from the deadline for submission of applications. For positions in the early stages of a career, it is usually a "good practice" to have a letter of recommendation from another senior R&D worker.</p> <p>The principle of equal opportunities between men and women in selection committees is naturally observed with regards to the relevance</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement an OTM-R policy • Revise the Recruitment Code according to the principles of the Code of Conduct for the recruitment of researchers (includes updating the setting of staff selection criteria - for example by setting the weights to individual types of criteria (publications, feedback, foreign experience, etc.) • Develop a model (standardised) procedure to carry out the Candidate Selection process • Systematise the training process for members of selection committees



		<p>of each member of the committee, without being enshrined in writing anywhere. This group of academic and research personnel is almost gender-balanced (41% of women) based on the possibilities in a particular subject area. Members of the committee are individually chosen according to the requested vacancy, making it so-called tailor-made.</p> <p>Definitions of a particular selection criteria are not enshrined in legislation, in practice these criteria result from the description of the vacancy and take into account all relevant information (work experience, evaluation of publishing and R&D activities, project experience, foreign mobility, grant success, conference invitations, etc.). Referrals (minimum two) for R2 staff (postdoctoral) are required in only one department (Institute of Mathematics).</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Recruitment Code lacks a procedure for setting staff selection criteria ● The conditions for the appointment of committees within the Recruitment code are mentioned only on general basis (missing principle of gender and emphasis on the combination of various professional knowledge and skills of the members) ● Selection committee members are not trained in recruitment and selection (procedure, not legislation) ● In some cases, where the legislation and internal regulations allow it, positions are filled without the Candidate Selection 	
--	--	---	--



		Process, e.g.: on the basis of recommendations, previous cooperation, etc.	
15. Transparency (Code)	-/+	<p>The publication of all vacancies is in the full authority of the Silesian University. The basic portal for publishing is: https://www.slu.cz/slu/cz/volnamista?backlink=q1x5c.</p> <p>According to Recruitment Code, the job offer always includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • job title; • requirements for filling it; • estimated date of commencement; • required documents (professional CV is always required); • the date and place for filing the application; • at least the approximate date of the test, personal interview, or lecture, if held. <p>The scope of work is not part of the advertisement, it is documented in the employment contract. During the course of the job interview, the candidate's questions are answered and also specific career development opportunities associated with the vacancy are outlined. At the end of the selection procedure, each candidate is provided with information on whether he/she was successful/unsuccessful, either by telephone or by email. Feedback on the reasons for non-acceptance is provided according to the practice of the individual departments, it is always provided on request.</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the Recruitment Code according to the OMT-R policy for all principles in this section • Develop a model (standardised) procedure to carry out the Candidate Selection process <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and research staff working at SU for up to 5 years (108 respondents)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 57% of respondents state that after the end of the selection process they were advised of the strengths and weaknesses of their presentation • Less than 89% of respondents were informed in advance about the selection criteria, 35% about the number of vacancies and 38% about career prospects.



		<p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Recruitment Code in the part "Announcement of the Candidate Selection procedure" lacks: job description, information on the number of vacancies, career growth opportunities, information on the course of the selection process • There is no formal enshrinement of feedback to candidates about the weaknesses and strengths of their presentation. 	
16. Judging merit (Code)	-/+	<p>The criteria for the selection of candidates have not yet been set; in practice, these criteria result from the requirements of vacancies (or project positions). Currently, the following criteria are used: highest achieved qualifications, research results (ratio of quality and quantity), experience in the field and practical knowledge, foreign experience, invited lectures at international conferences, citation and similar responses to results, obtained grants, experience in leading doctoral students, compliance with the focus of scientific activities of the workplace, etc. During the selection process, the committee takes into account both scientific outputs of candidates and acquired managerial experience (project management, team leadership, mentoring), etc. The committee is always composed in such a way that it is able to objectively assess and select the most suitable candidate, taking into account all his relevant experience and skills, whether they come from the public or the private sector.</p> <p>Specific requirements for candidates are always part of the published</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the Recruitment Code according to the OMT-R policy for all principles in this section • Develop a model (standardised) procedure to carry out the Candidate Selection process • Note (FA - The basic criterion is the quality and quantity of publishing activities (including popularisation) and possible awards for research or pedagogical results. - possible path) <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and research staff working at SU for up to 5 years (108 respondents)</p>



		<p>vacancy. During the individual phases of the process, records are made by the selection committee.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The principles of merit evaluation are in individual departments at various levels - they are not processed, they are in preparation, they are currently processed at Faculty of Public Policy. • There is no unified procedure for assessing merit 	<p>According to the respondents, the selection procedure for SU took into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • other skills of the candidate (eg team work, management, communication with the public) - 63% • quality of current research results - 77% • quantity of current research results - 43%
17. Variations in the chronological order of CVs (Code)	+/-	<p>Candidates are assessed at SU according to all relevant criteria essential for assessing the fulfillment of the requirements of the job position and according to the fulfillment of all phases of the selection procedure. During the selection procedure, the committee takes into account both the scientific outputs of the candidates and the managerial experience gained (project management, team leadership, mentoring, etc.). Individual candidates also submit a cover letter for the requested documents. During the selection procedure they can present all references or previous results of activities, regardless of career interruptions (maternity leave, working in the private sector, etc.).</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not enshrined in the documents that interruption or non-standard course of a career (maternity leave, working in the 	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carry out a revision of the Recruitment Code for all principles in this section (to include the point that candidates have the opportunity to submit all achieved results in the form of a cover letter, CV, or a copy of required documents (for professors, associate professors) according to the OMT-R policy. • Develop a model (standardised) procedure to carry out the Candidate Selection process



		<p>private sector, etc.) does not affect the evaluation of the candidate during the selection procedure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not enshrined that it is possible to submit all relevant information (evidence) 	
18. Recognition of mobility experience (Code)	+/-	<p>As part of their studies and work at SU, its employees and students can use the Erasmus + programme, which is focused primarily on the exchange of experience and good practice.</p> <p>Mobilities are also organised within: Erasmus +, Indicator D, HR Award, ESF II, Mobility II, IRP Mobility, ICRANET, cooperating institutions.</p> <p>Mobility (especially foreign experience and invitation to international conferences) is one of the criteria assessed in the selection procedure, however, there is a lack of formal enshrinement in the Recruitment Code.</p> <p>SU perceives mobility (international, institutional - at the national level, cross-sectoral - university x private sector, interdisciplinary) as very important for gaining experience of the researchers themselves and also as a source of enrichment and improvement of research and development methods.</p> <p>International mobility is one of the key topics of the Long-Term Plan of the current and currently emerging Strategic Plan of SU.</p> <p>GAP:</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise the Recruitment Code according to the OMT-R policy for all principles in this section Develop a model (standardised) procedure to carry out the Candidate Selection process



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current Recruitment Code does not emphasise the consideration of mobility in the selection procedure • General principles for employee evaluation are not set - (recruitment, continuous evaluation according to the Career Code, take into account foreign experience, stays, invitations to conferences, etc.) - follows up on other principles 	
19. Recognition of qualifications (Code)	+/-	<p>Recognition of qualifications is subject to legislation in both Act No. 111/1998 Coll., on Higher Education and the so-called Lisbon Treaty (Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region). All universities with accredited doctoral studies and procedures to grant associate and full professorships make it possible to obtain a scientific and academic degree (doctor, associate professor and professor). The government decree of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports regulates the recognition of qualifications of foreign employees. The Code of Procedures to Grant Associate and Full Professorships regulate the details of granting positions of associate and full professors at the Silesian University. Recognition of foreign qualifications is ongoing in practice, but it is not formally enshrined.</p> <p>The Remuneration Regulation stipulates that an employee does not automatically move to another position when he/she achieves a higher qualification (for example, a professional assistant who completes a professorship does not automatically move to the post of associate</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the Recruitment Code according to the OMT-R policy for all principles in this section • Develop a model (standardised) procedure to carry out the Candidate Selection process



		<p>professor). The decisive factor is the agreement in the employment contract, not the level of qualification obtained.</p> <p>In common practice, during the selection procedure, informal qualifications are assessed individually, depending on the requirements of the position and the relevance of usability.</p> <p>Only the Faculty of Public Policy and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences record active contacts with experience.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Recruitment Code does not take into account the recognition of non-formal qualifications 	
20. Seniority (Code)	+/-	<p>The current Recruitment Code does not define the concept of seniority in any way, but in practice and during the process of Candidate Selection it is taken into account.</p> <p>During the Candidate Selection procedure, the evaluation of the results of activities and other relevant indicators of the candidates is carried out comprehensively and objectively, regardless of the reputation of the institution in which the required qualification of the candidate was achieved.</p> <p>In practice, the principle of lifelong learning is perceived in the SU environment as a continuous process in a diverse environment (lifelong</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the Recruitment Code according to the OMT-R policy for all principles in this section • Develop a model (standardised) procedure to carry out the Candidate Selection process



		<p>learning), in which knowledge, intellectual skills and practical experience develop either in traditional educational institutions within the education system or outside of it. It builds on the possibilities of diverse transitions between education and employment and makes it possible to acquire the same qualifications and competences in different ways at any time during life.</p> <p>The employees at SU are actively encouraged to prepare for habilitation, including the possibility to adjust working conditions, financial support, etc.</p> <p>Lifelong learning programmes at SU are also supported as part of the university's third role.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The recognition and assessment of qualifications is not formally enshrined 	
21. Postdoctoral appointments (Code)	-/-	<p>At present, the postdoctoral position is not systematically enshrined at SU. The determination of these positions has been planned within the current Long-Term Plan, however, these points have not yet been fulfilled. This step will be included in the next Strategic Plan.</p> <p>There are institutional postdoctoral positions at research centres which are complemented by other positions funded under the IRP, Mobility II</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Revise the Remuneration regulation (and related documents) - implement the category of R2 researchers (recognised researcher) - which corresponds to the position of postdoc. ● Revise the Remuneration regulation -

		<p>projects and others.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no definition of the category of postdoctoral positions, including the determination of competencies for this position. - The internal regulations lack general requirements for postdoctoral students with clear principles of professional development (onboarding, induction plans, Career Code). 	<p>introduce the division of job functions of researchers according to Euraxess - (category R1-R4)</p>
Working Conditions and Social Security			
22. Recognition of the profession	+/+	<p>At Silesian University, the recognition of all researchers within the relevant professional groups is a natural part of working life. The internal Remuneration Regulation defines the categories of R&D employees and their placement into salary tiers. Career growth support is also enshrined in the Career Code.</p> <p>The SU Code of Ethics enshrines the principle of respect amongst individual employees. The SU takes pride that during the whole period of its existence it has conducted an individual approach to students, and the same applies for the researchers. Regardless of job classification, all R&D employees have access to further education, career development, mobility, etc.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No major shortcomings have been identified that would conflict 	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve the application of the principle by implementing changes related to other principles - such as the induction process, which should help new employees enter the new working environment more easily. <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and research staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 83% of respondents believe that from the very beginning of their careers, SU workers are treated as full members of



		<p>this principle, but further improvements can be made.</p>	<p>the relevant scientific community (definitely not 5%, rather not 7%)</p>
<p>23. Research environment</p>	<p>+/-</p>	<p>The direct tools for the support of personnel development of academic, pedagogical and scientific staff, within the framework of the Career Code, also include the support of a favourable research environment according to the required level and also current trends. The Career Code states the obligation of managers to create favourable working conditions and ensure occupational health and safety. R&D employees, regardless of job classification, have access to all necessary research resources such as IT equipment, laboratories, libraries, etc. When entering a new employment relationship, new employees undergo Occupational health and safety at work and Fire Safety training, training on best practice in laboratories, how to provide first aid, etc.</p> <p>The research environment also includes the purchase of materials, instrumentation and computer technology. In this area, SU is fully governed by the Public Procurement Act.</p> <p>Every academic/ research employee has the right to use all electronic resources of their workplace for their work and is governed by the Directive on the Rules of Use of the Computer Network of the Silesian University (no. 13/2011).</p> <p>SU is one of the universities that successfully use programmes from the structural funds (OP RDE, formerly OP EC) and institutional support of the</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To support awareness of the possibilities of improvement of research and educational environment (equipment, etc.) • Support multi-source funding and continue to use available resources • Support internal communication tools across the entire SU <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 71% of respondents believe that the university offers sufficient equipment and funding for research. (definitely not 5%, rather not 17%) • 75% of respondents believe that the university offers sufficient equipment and resources for remote cooperation with other domestic and foreign academic and research institutions (definitely not 2%, rather not 10%)



		<p>Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport.</p> <p>The research and research-educational environment is being constantly improved with modern equipment according to current trends, thanks to this co-financing.</p> <p>The strategy for the improvement of the research and research-educational environment is enshrined at individual departments by various internal regulations (Long-Term Plan, research plans, investment plans). Rector's Directive No. 3/2016 regulates the rules for drawing funds for the development of the Silesian University in Opava.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater dependence on funding from external project sources • The questionnaire survey shows lower awareness of the availability of equipment and funding for research activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 85% of respondents state that they are familiar with safe research work practices in their field (definitely not 3%, rather not 3%) • 89% of respondents state that they ensure safe working practices in research (definitely not 1%, rather not 0%)
24. Working conditions	+/+	<p>In accordance with the applicable national legislation, the SU Collective Agreement regulates, among other things, employment, working hours, taking leave and professional development of employees. The Career Code, which specifies tools for personnel development and career growth of employees, includes among the tools that support career development: the possibility of adjusting working conditions, support for active participation in conferences, support for increasing language and other professional competencies, creative leave, support for harmonisation of R&D and pedagogical activities, consultancy in applying</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support internal communication tools across the entire SU <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>SU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 95% of respondents believe that current working conditions allow flexible working



		<p>for grants, etc.</p> <p>In accordance with the Act on Higher Education, the Collective Agreement and the Career Code enshrine the possibility of using creative leave (applies only to academic staff). The internal Remuneration Regulation of the university defines the details of drawing and compensation of salary during "sabbatical leave". Furthermore, SU employees can use flexible working hours, part-time work, and cooperation in the form of various contract types (DPP / DPČ).</p> <p>The SU Code of Ethics defines the obligation of managers to remove barriers leading to discrimination or exclusion of employees and students with special needs. According to the Career Code and in accordance with the Labour Code, employees have the opportunity to request adjustments to working conditions (for example, shortening of working hours) to facilitate the return after returning from maternity or parental leave. In accordance with the operational possibilities and the nature of the job position, SU accommodates the employees' requests.</p> <p>At the same time, the legal system of the Czech Republic allows to work during maternity or parental leave, this includes a possibility of cooperation, for example, in the form of part-time work or in the form of contracts concluded outside the employment relationship.</p> <p>The SU Counselling Centre offers assistance in solving personal and study problems, various forms of counselling (psychological, special pedagogical, social, emotional, to support academic success) and</p>	<p>hours (definitely not 0%, rather not 2%). Of these, as many as 92% of respondents use the opportunity (definitely not 2%, rather not 3%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 81% of respondents believe that current working conditions make it possible to combine family life with work (definitely not 4%, rather not 11%) <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 96% of respondents believe that current working conditions allow flexible working hours (definitely not 0%, rather not 2%). Of these, as many as 95% of respondents use the opportunity (definitely not 1%, rather not 2%) - 81% of respondents believe that current working conditions make it possible to combine family life with work (definitely not 3%, rather not 11%)
--	--	---	--



		<p>counselling and professional services for students with specific needs. Silesian University accommodates students and doctoral students with special needs and employs people with reduced working capacity.</p> <p>Benefits for SU employees include, for example, part-time work, subsidised meals, library services, supplementary pension insurance, 6 weeks holiday for non-academic staff, and a mobile tariff. The rules for working from home for academic staff are set by the legislative framework. Non-academic staff can use work from home to a limited extent (in connection with the adjustment of individual departments and with regard to the job position), e.g.: at the Rector's Office and university workplaces it can be used at the employee's request according to Rector's Directive No. 2/2018 Working hours and planning holiday.</p> <p>GAP: No major shortcomings that would conflict this principle have been identified, but further improvements can be made.</p>	
25. Stability and permanence of employment	-/+	<p>According to the currently valid national legislation and internal regulations and standards of the university, employees with a fixed-term contract have the same working conditions as employees for an indefinite contract period.</p> <p>According to the Labour code, the possibility of re-newing a fixed-term employment contract is clearly defined. The Collective Agreement, in accordance with the Labour code, regulates the possibilities of</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Systematise the whole process of induction ● Define criteria for non-discrimination of staff with a fixed-term contract with regard to their motivation and work performance (beyond the scope of the



		<p>exceptions for repeated extension of employment for academic and pedagogical staff. These are also positions that are funded and included in the project/grant/subsidy. All fixed-term employees have the same working conditions, benefits, advantages and opportunities as permanent staff. At present, 41.2% academic and research staff are employed on a fixed-term contract basis.</p> <p>Thanks to the implemented projects at SU, many new attractive jobs and opportunities are created and, overall, they contribute to the development and competitiveness of the university. However, emerging project positions and their conditions are always affected by the conditions of subsidy programmes and grants. SU perceives that a fixed-term employment contract related to project work carries an element of demotivation, so it is important to offer the full range of benefits and career development opportunities within the induction process.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The induction process is missing • In some cases there is no reason to repeatedly renew a fixed-term contract of academic (non-project) staff 	<p>Labour Code, e.g.: "declaring" comparable entitlements of employees with fixed-term contract, especially working on time-limited projects)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve informing all employees (also those with fixed-term contract) about the possibilities of education, benefits, etc. - full-fledged onboarding (systematic process of induction) - motivate the employees also with the limit of renewals of fixed-term contracts <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and research staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31% of respondents state that a fixed-term contract negatively affects the motivation for career development at SU (definitely not 16%, rather not 16%)
26. Funding and salaries	-/+	<p>The remuneration system at the Silesian University is defined by the Internal Remuneration Regulations, the Career Rules and supplemented by additional Rector's Directives (extraordinary remuneration for long-term work merits, for grant researchers, for publications in foreign impact journals). Silesian University is one of the public institutions and</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce systematic support for the search for grant opportunities and the subsequent preparation of grant



		<p>funds are dependent on the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports and supplemented by funding through grants, funds and projects (EU). The remuneration for a specific project position is always set by the specific possibilities of the grant programme, subsidy, fund.</p> <p>In connection with the valid legislation of the Czech Republic (the Higher Education Act, the Labour Code and other relevant legislation), the collective agreement defines working conditions and entitlements (including benefits beyond the applicable legislation) for SU employees on social security (employment, working hours, taking leave and professional staff development, length of leave, provision of meal allowances, days of treatment, sickness pay or sickness benefit, sabbatical leave, maternity and parental leave, paternity leave, support for short-term or long-term care of a family member, etc.).</p> <p>The involvement of SU in many projects enables the development of the university, more attractive working conditions and new attractive jobs. In the case of active involvement in the project, employees also have the opportunity to obtain motivating financial rewards. Development projects are most common in terms of project types, whilst external grant projects to support the solution of specific R&D topics are represented less.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relatively low use of external grant resources for the implementation of R&D projects 	<p>applications with regard to the specifics of the departments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Make more use of the obtained external funds in order to motivate employees beyond the amount of salary set in the contract that is based on the salary tier ● Revise the Remuneration regulation and the Career Code (adjustment of the Remuneration regulation according to R1-R2 positions, introduction of the Postdoc position, etc.) <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Less than 54% of respondents believe that their salary is lower than the standard level, 17.9% of respondents state that it is at the standard level ● 45.5% of respondents state that they are or rather satisfied with their current financial evaluation (definitely not 22.6%, rather not 27.1%) ● The most frequently used benefits are: meal vouchers (78%), library services (57%), mobile tariff (46%), supplementary pension insurance contribution (42%)
--	--	---	---



		<p>- 54% of respondents believe that their salary is lower than the standard level</p>	<p>Academic + researchers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 54% of respondents believe that their salary is lower than the standard level, 18% of respondents believe that it is at the standard level, 0% that it is higher • 46% of respondents are satisfied with their current financial evaluation (definitely not 23%, rather not 27%) • 21% of respondents believe that students' feedback on teaching is taken into account in the financial evaluation (definitely not 19%, rather not 21%, others are unable to assess)
27. Gender balance	+/-	<p>The principle of equal opportunities and respect across all employees is a natural part of life at SU. The Code of Ethics describes the principles of good behaviour and good conduct at work and study at the university. SU respects the equal rights of all, all have equal opportunities in access to information, education and employment in accordance with general moral principles and generally accepted practices of work ethic in educational and creative activities. According to the valid legislation, the Labour Code and the Anti-Discrimination Act, all internal documents prohibit manifestations of any discriminatory behaviour.. The main selection criteria in the selection procedure include the highest</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add some specifics of the given principle to the Code of Ethics • Promote awareness of equal opportunities policy • Support internal communication tools across the entire SU <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p>



		<p>qualification achieved, research results (quality and quantity ratio), experience in the field and practical knowledge.</p> <p>SU fully respects the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms (Article 29), which states that "women, adolescents and persons with disabilities have the right to increased health protection at work and to special working conditions" and has not yet registered any complaints about its violation.</p> <p>However, the policy of equal opportunities for women and men is not explicitly defined anywhere.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal standards and directives are in line with national legislation and the principle is implemented in practice. However, the Code of Ethics does not explicitly state the principle and gender diversity. • 70% of respondents believe that the policy of equal opportunities for men and women in SU is sufficiently addressed (definitely not 3%, rather not 3%), other respondents are unable to assess 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 69% of respondents believe that the policy of equal opportunities for men and women at SU is sufficiently addressed (definitely not 3%, rather not 3%) - During their time at SU, less than 9% of respondents personally felt inequality in approach to gender. <p>Academic and research staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 70% of respondents believe that the policy of equal opportunities for men and women at SU is sufficiently addressed (definitely not 3%, rather not 3%) - During their time at SU, 9% of respondents personally felt inequality in approach to gender.
28. Career development	-/+	<p>The Career centre offers counselling services, diagnostics, consultations, and job market services for applicants, students, and graduates. The career portal ensures the sharing of employers' offers, connecting companies with students and graduates (jobs, part-time positions, final</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematise the process of induction (onboarding), including counselling and mentoring services for personal and



		<p>theses, projects, internships).</p> <p>Employees can actively seek educational opportunities and take an active approach to participate in their career development with the support of the employer. These also include, for example, suitable conferences for the presentation of scientific results. The decision on support from the employer remains (by law) with the head of the relevant department. SU also offers external and internal educational activities.</p> <p>A natural part of SU is the help and friendly approach of more experienced colleagues to beginners. However, career counselling or mentoring is provided by employees mainly on their own initiative, formal enshrinement is lacking.</p> <p>The departments that work with personal development plans have their method and intervals for plan fulfillment evaluation set up. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Institute of Physics and the Institute of Mathematics do not work with personal development plans.</p> <p>In all departments, the identified needs (educational, working conditions, etc.) of employees are (either in a formal or informal way) reflected in the planning of further career development.</p> <p>Note: In addition to the SU Career Code, some departments have career development included in the Departmental Career Code (The Faculty of Public Policy), the Organizational Regulations of the al (The Institute of Mathematics) or the Rector's Directive No. 4/2018 on Determination and</p>	<p>professional development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that doctoral and postdoctoral students are provided with career guidance outside the academic sector (in companies, public or non-profit sectors, etc.) • Create and implement a mentoring system across SU • Expand the services of the Career centre towards employees and support their further development • Adjust the Career Code with regard to a systematic approach to career development and the use of tools to support targeted career development (accessibility of education, participation at conferences, etc.) • Support internal communication tools across the entire SU <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and research staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 82% of respondents state that they are or rather are familiar with the rules and
--	--	--	---



		<p>Evaluation of Personal Development Plans of Academics and Researchers (The School of Business Administration).</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For R3-R4 researchers, systematic career guidance is not addressed with regard to the real needs of these groups • Missing advisors for professional and personal development (for R2-R4) • There is no definition of mentoring and the whole system, mentoring in practice takes place at an informal level (mostly in the form of discussion with more experienced colleagues), while 74% of respondents in the questionnaire survey said that they consider mentoring (as one of the forms of career development) useful • There is no induction process (there is no official procedure for evaluating an employee in the first year, there is no training set up for new staff, etc.) • There is a lack of career development strategies for researcher staff at all stages of their careers • Only 58% of respondents have a personal career development plan 	<p>opportunities for career growth (definitely not 2%, rather not 8%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 58% of respondents have set up their own individual career development plan (of which 68% of respondents have a list of educational activities they need to implement in their personal career development plan) and 71% are motivated to further develop professionally by the conditions of the setting. • For their further career development respondents most often lack: time, motivation, financial resources
29. Value of mobility	+/-	<p>A mobility system has been successfully implemented at SU. This enables employees to carry out internships within the Erasmus+ programme. Mobility is also supported through contributions from the Ministry of</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adjust the Career Code with regard to a systematic approach to career



		<p>Education, Youth and Sport. The geographical mobility of students is a part of the evaluation of universities (this affects fund allocation from the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport). These geographical mobilities of students as well as employees are therefore monitored and systematically recorded. For students, mobility is monitored through the new IS SU system (since 2019). At the end of 2019, SU acquired a new specialised mobility system (ISOIS), deployment was planned for spring 2020. However, in connection with the state of emergency, its implementation has been postponed and records are being made at the Department of Science and International Relations.</p> <p>Within the Institutional Plan of the SU, stays of visiting foreign professors, introduction of English subjects into teaching, establishment of study programmes in English, establishment of joint-degree programmes with foreign universities have been financed for a long time. SU implements projects for the development of international cooperation as a part of the Czech Science Foundation projects of the Inter-Excellence programme. Further internationalization activities are funded from OP RDE programmes.</p> <p>In the academic years 2015/16 - 2019/20, a total of 234 doctoral studies were registered, however, only less than 6% of Ph.D. students took the opportunity to go abroad.</p> <p>Within Erasmus+ it is necessary to follow fixed guidelines for reimbursement of travel expenses. Similar guidelines are used for trips financed from the funds of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports.</p>	<p>development and the use of opportunities to support career development (implement the principles of support and recognition of mobilities, including virtual ones, define their criteria and contribution within the evaluation system)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Introduce records and support for the use of interdisciplinary and intradisciplinary mobility ● Systematically support efforts to eliminate barriers to mobilities ● Promote awareness of the use of mobility opportunities ● Support internal communication tools across the entire SU <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and research staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 80% of respondents believe that SU supports researchers in mobility sufficiently according to (definitely not 2%, rather not 3%) ● 65% of respondents are familiar with the rules for the recognition of mobilities and
--	--	--	---



		<p>Trips abroad co-financed from other sources are then governed by the conditions of the specific relevant project/programme (e.g.: OP RDE).</p> <p>Due to the state of emergency and the declared pandemic, modern technologies and virtual mobility have also been used.</p> <p>The questionnaire survey shows that 80% of the respondents think that SU sufficiently supports employees' mobility. Respondents cite family reasons and lack of time as obstacles.</p> <p>For some employees, mobility is part of a set development plan. The Foreign Relations Department provides them with administrative support. (The School of Business Administration in Karviná)</p> <p>The trips of researchers are included in the majority of departments in the evaluation of staff, except for the Institute of Mathematics. Participation in foreign mobilities is also part of the support of the Ph.D. students and junior researchers.</p> <p>In the case of the use of mobility, teaching is substituted by colleagues from the workplace, creative activity is carried out within the framework of mobility.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no system for support, registration and recognition of mobilities (including virtual ones) in the Career Code 	<p>the evaluation of experience from them (definitely not 3%, rather not 13%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 58% of respondents believe that the experience of mobility is recognised and valued in career advancement (definitely not 4%, rather not 10%)
--	--	---	---



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of records of mobility between the private and public sectors (interdisciplinary, intradisciplinary) • Existence of barriers to the implementation of mobilities • 65% of respondents in the questionnaire survey state that they are familiar with the rules for the recognition of mobilities and the evaluation of experience from them (definitely not 3%, rather not 13%) 	
30. Access to career advice	-/+	<p>Applicants, students (including Ph.D. students) and graduates can use the services of the Counselling centre. It offers assistance in solving personal and study problems, various forms of counselling (psychological, special pedagogical, social, emotional, to support academic success) and counselling and professional services for students with special needs.</p> <p>The Career centre offers counselling services, diagnostics, consultations and job market services for applicants, students and graduates. They offer individual help with providing information, arranging practical experience and internships, diagnostics, activity plan, coaching tools, workshops, CV writing, etc. according to requests. The career portal offers services for sharing employers' offers, connecting companies with students and graduates. These activities also help students find practical placement after graduation. The project "Development of Education at the Silesian University in Opava", Reg. No. CZ.02.2.69 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 16_015 / 0002400, is focused on the development of provided services.</p> <p>GAP:</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend relevant Career centre services to other target groups (R2-R4) • Promote informal counselling, experience sharing and networking within SU <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 73% of respondents believe that they can seek advice from someone at SU for career and personal development (definitely not 5%, rather not 12%) • 74% of respondents consider mentoring to be useful as one of the forms of career development (definitely not 2%, rather



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counselling services for R2-R4 staff (Counselling centre and Career centre focus on applicants, students of bachelor, follow-up and doctoral study programmes) 	not 6%)
31. Intellectual Property Rights	+/-	<p>The principles of dealing with the results of intellectual activity at SU are described in the Rector's Directive. This internal document is based on valid national legislation.</p> <p>The payment of extraordinary remuneration is governed by the Rector's Directive (no. 6/2018 - Determination of extraordinary remuneration for publications in foreign impact journals, no. 2/2019 - Determination of extraordinary remuneration to grant researchers, no. 9/2019 - Principles of providing extraordinary remuneration).</p> <p>Ethical principles valid also for research and creative activities are stated in the CE SU, any violation is resolved by the Ethics Committee.</p> <p>GAP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a lack of training for employees in the field of intellectual property, patent protection, etc. - There is no system to support the commercialisation and transfer of technology, which will also include the area of intellectual property rights 	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a system to support the commercialisation and transfer of technology, including organisational enshrinement, which will also include the area of intellectual property rights • Support educational activities in the field of intellectual property and patent protection • Support internal communication tools across the entire SU <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 66% of respondents believe that the rules on the protection of intellectual property for research and creative activities are clearly defined at SU (definitely not 2%, rather not 4%) - 73% of respondents state that they are or



			<p>rather are familiar with the rules of intellectual property (definitely not 4%, rather not 14%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 38% of respondents state that the income arising from the use of research and development results corresponds with their expectations (29% can not assess, certainly not 12%, rather not 21%)
32. Co-authorship	+/+	<p>The principle of recognition of co-authorship is currently incorporated in the Code of Ethics and also through the Rector's Directive on the management of the results of intellectual activity, where the process of co-authorship is fully described.</p> <p>This Directive clearly sets out the rules for dealing with the results of intellectual activity at the Silesian University in Opava, which the originator/author created in the performance of tasks arising from his employment or other similar employment relationship with the university. The Cooperation and Intellectual Property Rights Agreement, which can be individualised according to the specific context and needs, is applied to the results achieved within the framework of joint projects or other forms of cooperation with third parties, for which the management of project results or other forms of cooperation is regulated by a special agreement.</p> <p>The Directive does not explicitly mention the term co-authorship,</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Create a Good Research Practice Guideline summarising the rules for co-authorship, intellectual property protection, GDPR, confidentiality in contract research ● Create a system to support the commercialisation and transfer of technology, including organisational enshrinement which will also include the area of intellectual property rights and co-authorship <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and scientific staff</p>



		<p>however, it is based on and in line with copyright law, where co-authorship is fully defined and its principles are set out there.</p> <p>Note: According to the statements of the departments, the co-authorship is realised in a standard way and reflected by the publishing practice.</p> <p>In general, co-authorship is encouraged.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 12% of respondents to the questionnaire survey state that in the last 3 years they have encountered a violation of copyright and co-authorship - 6% of doctoral students state that the results of their work were used without being quoted or mentioned in the acknowledgment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 83% of respondents believe that they can publish the results of their work independently of the supervisor, if he is not a co-author (definitely not 1%, rather not 5%) ● 72% of respondents state that they have not encountered an infringement of copyright or co-authorship at SU in the last 3 years. On the contrary, 12% stated that they had encountered this. ● 6% of doctoral students state that the results of their work were used without being quoted or mentioned in the acknowledgment.
33. Teaching	+/-	<p>Pedagogical activity is perceived at SU as an important part of work activities. Education is one of the key roles of the university.</p> <p>The evaluation of teaching according to the SU Rules takes place in bachelor's and master's degree programmes, usually after each semester. According to the decision of the head of the department, it is organised either electronically using the information system of the university's study agenda or as a survey in paper form (see principle 11. Evaluation system).</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make the system of development of pedagogical skills of doctoral students and other researchers more attractive and supportive - See the principle of evaluation 11. - System for evaluation of employees - explicitly incorporate the evaluation of teaching into the evaluation



		<p>The Career Code allows for the adjustment of working conditions of employees who experience or could experience stagnation in career growth resulting from objective internal constraints, given in particular by long-term unbalanced work structure (for example, excessive teaching due to workplace needs or excessive workload resulting from managerial or academic position).</p> <p>Ph.D students in full-time study are involved in teaching and consultations. It is a common practice that those students teach a maximum of 4 hours/week, the required amount is fully within the competence of the Deans. Conditions for Ph.D. students leading qualification theses are set out in the guidelines at relevant departments, approved by the SU Internal Evaluation Board.</p> <p>The internal quality assurance system of educational activities is dealt with through regular evaluation of study programmes (according to Article 6 of the Rules of the Quality Assurance System) and regular evaluation of feedback from all relevant parties (students, teachers, graduates, etc.) (Article 9 <i>ibid.</i>).</p> <p>The teaching/research and other responsibilities ratio differs from department to department. It is mainly based on the categorisation of job positions, general job descriptions, preparation of the schedule for the semester, etc.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of an attractive and motivating system for the development of pedagogical skills of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individualise the harmonisation of scientific research and pedagogical activities (take into account the competencies of the person in the field of teaching and R&D activities and on this basis adjust the ratio of his teaching and R&D activities in relation to the amendment of the Career Code) <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 69% of respondents believe that teaching at SU is considered a full-fledged part of the professional career of an academic (definitely not 7%, rather not 14%) - 44% of respondents believe that the work results associated with the teaching are taken into account during the evaluation by the superior (definitely not 11%, rather not 17%) - 78% of respondents believe that the actual pedagogical burden corresponds to their academic classification (definitely not 3%, rather not 7%) - 53% of respondents believe that
--	--	---	---



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> doctoral students and other researchers 44% of respondents believe that the work results associated with the teaching are taken into account during the evaluation by their superior (definitely not 11%, rather not 17%) 36% of respondents stated that teaching prevents or rather prevents them from scientific research activities 	<p>pedagogical activity does not hinder or rather does not hinder research activities (36% of respondents hinder or rather hinder)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 52% of respondents believe that SU provides sufficient pedagogical-didactic preparation for pedagogical activities (definitely not 9%, rather not 17%) <p>The division of working time during the semester is most often:</p> <p>0.3 Science (67 respondents)</p> <p>0.4 Pedagogical activity (64 respondents)</p> <p>0.1 Other (90 respondents)</p>
34. Complains/ appeals	-/+	<p>Review of possible complaints by a student, employee, or other entity.</p> <p>The central filing office, the filing office of a department or an employee of the university are the recipients of complaints. In the case of an oral complaint there is a template for recording a complaint or suggestion.</p> <p>All SU employees can also turn to a trade union.</p> <p>According to the study regulations (7/2017), doctoral students have the</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add some specifics of the given principle to the Code of Ethics Promote awareness of the complaints and appeals process and the activities of the Ethics Committee <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p>



		<p>opportunity to submit proposals and complaints to the supervisor, the chairperson of the Subject Area Board, the Dean and the relevant Vice-Dean. The student has the right to request a change of a tutor, a change in the topic of the dissertation and a change in the workplace.</p> <p>Possible violation of the Code of Ethics is resolved</p> <p>a) directly at the relevant workplace of the university, at the level of its organizational structure, always one level higher than the one in which the disputes occurred. To solve them, a committee (commission) can be established at the appropriate level,</p> <p>b) in the Ethics Committee of the University, if the solution is beyond the scope of the relevant workplace or if the parties to the dispute are not satisfied with the conclusions reached at the workplace.</p> <p>(c) in cooperation with all parties involved, while ensuring the highest possible protection of privacy.</p> <p>Violations of the Collective Agreement are resolved by the University Bursar in cooperation with a trade union representative.</p> <p>In these cases, doctoral students can also use the services of the Counselling centre. In practice, the principle of natural justice is introduced at SU, all complaints are resolved at the relevant time with minutes of meetings. The record of complaints according to Directive no. 4/2018 is in the competence of the Legal Department, within the section</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 53% of respondents state that they are or rather are familiar with the procedure for making complaints and appeals regarding working conditions and workers' rights (certainly not 6%, rather not 27%) • Less than 54% of respondents believe that fair and equal treatment is ensured within SU in resolving work conflicts, disputes and complaints (definitely not 5%, rather not 5%), as many as 36% cannot assess this • 78% of respondents do not want to establish the role of ombudsman (university ombudsman), 22% do <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 54% of respondents state that they are or rather are familiar with the procedure for lodging complaints and appeals regarding working conditions and workers' rights (certainly not 7%, rather not 25%) • 54% of respondents believe that fair and equal treatment is ensured within SU in resolving work conflicts, disputes and complaints (definitely not 5%, rather not 5%), as many as 36% cannot assess this
--	--	--	---



		<p>of the SU Bursar.</p> <p>The questionnaire survey shows that 78% of respondents do not want to establish the role of ombudsman, 22% do</p> <p>GAP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The position of university ombudsman has not been established. The possibility of merging the position of ombudsman with the chairman of the Ethics Committee was discussed within the focus groups, including the definition of roles with emphasis on the elimination of conflicts of interest - 32% of respondents state that they are not or rather not familiar with the procedure for lodging complaints and appeals regarding working conditions and employees' rights - 36% of respondents are unable to assess whether fair and equal treatment is ensured within SU in resolving work conflicts, disputes and complaints 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 78% of respondents do not want to establish the role of ombudsman (university ombudsman), 22%
35. Participation in decision-making bodies	+/+	<p>Researchers participate in the decision-making process at various levels represented in advisory and decision-making bodies, where they can defend and support not only personal but also collective interests (Scientific Council, Internal Evaluation Council, Ethics Committee, Doctoral Study Board). In addition, academic staff may be members of the Academic Senate and the Disciplinary Committee, and may also be elected Dean/Rector. An SU employee may also be a member of the</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Raise awareness of the possibility of participation in the decision-making bodies of SU and the possibilities of influencing SU. - Support internal communication tools across the entire SU



		<p>Board of Trustees of a university other than the one at which he works.</p> <p>The representation of academic (i.e.: scientific-pedagogical) staff elected by the academic community in the Senate is based on the Higher Education Act. The Dean or the Director appoints the members of the Scientific Councils according to the proposals of the management of the departments or institutes/workplaces.</p> <p>GAP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The questionnaire survey shows that 29% of respondents believe that they cannot influence the direction of SU, department or institute - Furthermore, no major shortcomings have been identified that would be in conflict with this principle, but there is a possibility for further improvement. 	<p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 58.3% of respondents believe that they can influence the direction of SU, department or institute, while 30% answered the opposite. <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 60% of respondents believe that they can influence the direction of SU, department or institute, while 29% answered the opposite.
Training and Development			
36. Relation with supervisors	+/-	<p>For doctoral students, the rules for the entire course of study (admission procedure, course, completion, defence), duties of the tutor, rules for the Subject Area Board, etc. are enshrined in the study and examination regulations of SU (7/2017) and also in individual study regulations of the various faculties. In general, these rules describe learning according to the individual study plan under the guidance of a tutor and stipulate the obligation of the tutor to report on study progress to the Subject Area</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support internal communication tools across the entire SU (improve the transfer of information and the sharing of values across the entire university between superiors and other employees)



	<p>Board for the relevant study programme at least once a year.</p> <p>Evaluation of students' activities in the doctoral study programme in respect of fulfillment of study obligations, research activities (including publishing activities) or pedagogical activities is in the full competence of faculties. Both the credit system (only The School of Business Administration) and evaluation by the tutor and the Subject Area Board are used. Standard tools are used for the evaluation of pedagogical activities (teaching) as with all researchers - see the principle of teaching.</p> <p>The duties of Ph.D students, which are set by the above legal and internal regulations, are, if necessary, clarified by the relevant faculty department for doctoral studies. Study obligations are part of an individual study plan, which is compiled by the student together with the tutor and approved by the relevant Subject Area Board.</p> <p>At the same time Ph.D. students regularly present and discuss their progress in seminars. Operational meetings are held regularly within departments or institutes. Employees' progress is assessed during regular evaluations.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>In some workplaces they have a regular meeting plan in place, in others meetings are held according to individual needs.</p> <p>Ph.D. seminars: doctoral seminars take place regularly once a week at the Institute of Physics and the Institute of Mathematics. Other departments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Define the competencies of individual roles (mentor, tutor, supervisor, etc.) - Systematise the education and training of supervisors and mentors - Revise the Remuneration regulation (and related documents) - implementation of the category R2 for researchers (recognised researcher) - which corresponds to the position of postdoc. - Systematise feedback - Systematise the induction process <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less than 73% of respondents state that they receive regular feedback from their superior about their work. Less than 19% state the opposite. <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 73% of respondents state that they receive regular feedback from their superior about their work, 18% state the opposite. 71% of respondents reflect or rather reflect this feedback in their
--	---	---



		<p>hold meetings depending on the content of accreditation, the needs of the student and the workplace.</p> <p>At all departments, doctoral students submit a self-assessment report that reflects their progress.</p> <p>Networking: Special events are not organised except for a specific conference at the School of Business Administration which is aimed at young researchers.</p> <p>A mentor is not a specific person, in some departments the head of a department or institute can be considered a mentor.</p> <p>The head of the relevant workplace evaluates the R2 employees.</p> <p>Employee evaluation structure: At the Faculty of Arts and Sciences the records are formal, at the School of Business Administration the personal development plan is determined and evaluated once a year, at the Institute of Physics they prepare a database, at the Institute of Mathematics a verbal evaluation takes place which is subsequently recorded, at the Faculty of Public Policy evaluation takes place twice a year, criteria according to the type of activities.</p> <p>GAP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tutors (trainers / mentors) are not properly trained in the management of junior researchers 	<p>research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 65% of respondents state that they had sufficient support from the manager at the time of joining - 76% of Ph.D. students state that they have a system of regular meetings set up with their tutor, 21% do not have this system set up. <p>Supervisory academics and tutors of Ph.D. students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 61% of supervisory academics and tutors of Ph.D. students state that they have a system of regular meetings with researchers who they supervise, 19% state the opposite. - 70% of supervisory academics and tutors of Ph.D. students state that they give regular feedback, 9% of them state the opposite. - 36% of supervisory academics and tutors of Ph.D. students state that every work progress and research result is recorded, while 40% state the opposite.
--	--	---	---



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no definition of the position of postdoctoral student and related standards and criteria for evaluation - 18% of respondents state that they do not receive immediate feedback from their superior - 65% of respondents state that they had sufficient support from the manager at the time of joining - 21% Ph.D. students does not have a system of regular meetings with their tutor - There is no systematic record of training for the needs of employee evaluation 	
37. Supervision and managerial duties	+/-	<p>The Study and Examination Regulations for students of doctoral study programmes describe the duties of tutors and the Subject Area Board. Other relevant directives include the SU rigorosum procedure. The duties of university and department managers and other relevant directives (study regulations, work regulations, organisational regulations) result from the Higher Education Act 111/1998 Coll. and are further specified in the university statute and department statutes. Rector's Directive no. 3/2019 (Characteristics of work activities and job functions) states the obligation of associate professors and professors to actively initiate and lead research projects.</p> <p>The Workplace Rules define the duties of managers, including managing and monitoring the work of subordinate employees and evaluating their</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Systematise training of employees in managerial skills development - Introduce a systematic approach to mentoring - Enshrine an "appeal" to the CE for the effective transfer of information, expertise, etc. from senior researchers to junior researchers - Support internal communication tools across the entire SU - Create motivational tools for the transfer of



		<p>performance and work results.</p> <p>GAP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Systematic approach to the education of employees in management (especially managers), pedagogical competencies. (Activities for the development of managerial competencies have not been implemented in the departments within the last 5 years.) - Although it already works in common practice, the mentoring system is not described anywhere (including the consideration of mentoring and leading research teams in the evaluation of researchers) - According to the questionnaire survey, 23% of tutors of Ph.D. students believe that they do not have enough time to support junior researchers. However, 85% of Ph.D. students consider that their tutor has sufficient time to support them as a junior researcher. 	<p>knowledge and experience within SU</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Take into account the role of the tutor with regard to the performance of other job duties <p>Results of the questionnaire survey: Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 91% of respondents know to whom to direct questions concerning the performance of work duties, 5% state the opposite. - 78% of respondents believe that building and maintaining functioning working relationships is sufficiently supported in their workplace, 15% state the opposite. - 62% of respondents believe that communication and knowledge transfer between senior and junior researchers is effective, 24% think the opposite. - 85% of Ph.D. students think that their tutor has sufficient time to support them as a junior researcher. 7% of students state the opposite. - However, 55% of tutors think they have enough time to support the junior researcher they are supervising. 23% say they do not have enough time for this.
--	--	---	---



<p>38. Continuing Professional Development</p>	<p>-/+</p>	<p>Internal documents (Career Rules, Workplace Rules, Code of Ethics) declare the importance of continuous development of researchers at SU at all stages of their scientific careers.</p> <p>Education is in the full competence of the individual departments.</p> <p>At SU, employees are actively encouraged, including the possibility of adjusting working conditions, the possibility of financial support, etc., to prepare for the habilitation.</p> <p>The Career Rules also define formal rules for career development (for example, the requirement that the employee be habilitated within 15 years).</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>For most of the departments, education is one of the criteria for evaluating employees with the exception of the School of Business Administration and the Institute of Mathematics.</p> <p>Records of implemented training are kept at most departments except at the Institute of Mathematics.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A systematic approach to the training of managers in management aspects and increasing pedagogical competencies 	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Set up an attractive and sufficiently motivating system for educating researchers (from induction and at all levels of management) linked to a career development system for all staff (R1-R4) - Support the development of talent management - Systematically offer and inform about educational opportunities - Support internal communication tools across the entire SU <p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and research staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 70% of respondents believe that SU supports or rather supports activities that expand their professional qualifications (19% say the opposite) - 74% of respondents state that they participate in development activities that are recommended to them. - 68% of respondents believe that SU informs sufficiently about the offer of
--	------------	--	---



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Talent management - Awareness of educational opportunities - Individual development plans lack training plans in all departments. - Systematic career development support for R3 and R4 employees 	<p>educational activities (20% state the opposite).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 44% of respondents state that they are motivated to participate in courses and seminars - 64% of respondents state that they are looking for educational opportunities on their own - 14% of respondents state that they use university portals for education. - 20% of respondents say they would welcome education beyond their job. - 74% of respondents believe that mentoring as one of the forms of career development is useful (8% state the opposite)
39. Access to research training and continuous development	-/+	<p>Silesian University offers internal and external training for its employees from the beginning of their careers, regardless of the contractual situation.</p> <p>With their active approach, employees themselves can participate in their career development with the support of the employer, for example, by actively seeking educational opportunities as well as suitable conferences for the presentation of their scientific results. The decision on support from the employer remains (by law) with the head of the</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To connect the system of education of employees with the system of their evaluation - Set up an attractive and sufficiently motivating system for educating researchers (from induction and at all levels of management) linked to a career development



		<p>relevant department.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>Educational events are offered to employees mainly via emails.</p> <p>The suitability of the training is approved by the direct superiors or management of the faculty or institute.</p> <p>There is no list of mandatory R&D training at any of the departments.</p> <p>Online courses for employees are not offered.</p> <p>Faculties do not have any tool or communication channels for sharing good practice and networking.</p> <p>Education is paid for from institutional money, subsidy projects.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a lack of records of education in connection with the evaluation system of employees - The assessment of the suitability of training for a given employee is not systematically addressed - There is no definition of mandatory training for R&D staff - The departments do not have any tool or communication channels 	<p>system for all staff (R1-R4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Systematically offer and inform about educational opportunities - Support for flexible forms of education and networking - Support internal communication tools across the entire SU <p>Results of the questionnaire survey Academic and research staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 70% of respondents believe that SU supports or rather supports activities that expand their professional qualifications (19% say the opposite) - 74% of respondents state that they participate in development activities that are recommended to them. - 68% of respondents believe that SU informs sufficiently about the offer of educational activities (20% state the opposite). - 44% of respondents state that they are motivated to participate in courses and seminars - 64% of respondents state that they are
--	--	--	---

		for sharing good practice and networking.	<p>looking for educational opportunities on their own</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 14% of respondents state that they use university portals for education. - 20% of respondents say they would welcome education beyond their job. - 74% of respondents believe that mentoring, as one of the forms of career development, is useful (8% say the opposite)
40. Supervision	+/-	<p>Doctoral students are assigned a tutor at the beginning of the study. Supervision of activities is inspected by the Subject Area Board for the given doctoral study programme. According to the study regulations (7/2017), doctoral students have the opportunity to submit proposals and complaints, the right to request a change of the tutor, a change in the topic of the dissertation and a change of the workplace.</p> <p>In practice, there is a natural control of professional management (supervision), which is performed by the head of the department/institute or more experienced authorised colleagues.</p> <p>A part of the ongoing Long-Term Plan (2016-2020) was the creation of a postdoctoral position, however, this activity has not been fulfilled.</p> <p>According to the Workplace Rules, a researcher is supervised by the relevant manager, i.e. the immediate superior, while the employees are</p>	<p>Proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement R2 category of researchers (recognised researcher) - which corresponds to the position of postdoctoral student. - Create and implement a mentoring system across SU <p>Note: see Principle 28 Career Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are no advisors for professional and personal development - there is no definition of who is a mentor - the list of advisors / mentors is missing



		<p>obliged to regularly submit the results of their creative activities to the superior for evaluation and to publish the results of their work. The hierarchy of monitoring/supervision of researchers corresponds to the organisational structure of the SU, unless individually regulated otherwise.</p> <p>GAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no definition of the category of postdoctoral positions, including the determination of competencies for this position. - The internal regulations lack general requirements for postdoctoral students with clear principles of professional development (onboarding, induction plans, career rules). - There is no official definition of mentoring and its role. 	<p>Results of the questionnaire survey:</p> <p>Academic and scientific staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 73% of respondents believe that they know who to turn to at SU for career and personal development (definitely not 5%, rather not 12%) - 73% of respondents state that they met with sufficient support from the manager, 43% encountered learning in the workplace - 77% of respondents believe that supervisors have or rather have sufficient expertise to support junior researchers (8% think the opposite) - 85% of Ph.D. students states that their tutor has enough time to support them as a junior researcher (7% of students say otherwise) - 55% of tutors believe that they have enough time to support the junior researcher they are supervising. 23%, on the other hand, say they do not have enough time for this. - 74% of respondents consider mentoring, as one of the forms of career development, to
--	--	---	--



			be useful (definitely not 2%, rather not 6%)
--	--	--	--