

## Meetings of the Working Group (WG) and Steering Committee (SC)

### The 2nd meeting, September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2021

#### Quality assessment

**1) Quality assessment, the organizational information provided is only partly sufficient to understand the context in which the HR Strategy is designed.**

WG decided to provide more detailed information, particularly:

- a) To describe more clearly the Current practice Section, especially the explanations of the recruitment and selection part – we discuss a new OTM-R document,
- b) To establish the correspondence between the ranks/titles of the staff employed at the IBP and the four career stages R1-R4 according to the EC research profiles descriptors. This document was discussed and sent to all categories R1-R4 via e-mail correspondence.
- c) To provide the equivalent of the Czech scientific title with one of the R1-R4 stage researchers at all levels of researchers in the process, including WG and SC

**2) Quality assessment, the AP is coherent with the GA only partly, there are gaps identified in GA, but not actions addressed to them and included in the AP**

1. Responsibility: responsibility EB R4, Robert Ulrich O13, Sanislav Kozubek R4, Pavel Vacek O13.

WG discussed the coherence, and we decided:

- a) In the case of principle 3: the duration of the employment contracts related to the feeling of certain insecurity among researchers will be reflected in the AP, and the corresponding action will be described:

**Management of IBP can offer support via the Internal Support of Science in order to solve a gap in funding from the project; thus, prolong the contract duration.**

- b) In the case of principle 5: training regarding IP rights and project administration and funding will be included in the AP (Action 8)
- c) In the case of principle 7: courses on GDPR, scientific writing, rhetoric, statistics, language courses will be organized and included in the AP (Action 8). Indicators will be stated; for instance, we plan 15-25 participants in each course.
- d) In the case of principle 9: a communication plan (as a part of the public engagement) will be described and included in the AP. This plan suggests how to communicate with PR media, students, and representatives of private companies
- e) Other missing actions will be checked in the GA (10, 13, 16, 23, 21, 25). The AP will be reorganized accordingly with FA and OTM-R policy, but many aspects of these points have already been solved.

Responsibility: responsibility EB R4, Robert Ulrich O13, Sanislav Kozubek R4, Pavel Vacek O13.

**3) Quality assessment, SC, and WG have been established; however, their activities and roles are not clear.**

WG decided: The roles and activities of the WG and SC will be described properly, WG and SC will

be expanded relative to top management/leaders staff. All R1-R4 categories will be included in WG and SC.

Responsibility: responsibility EB R4, Robert Ulrich O13, Sanislav Kozubek R4, Pavel Vacek O13.

**4) Quality assessment, it is not clear how researchers who responded to the GA questionnaire are engaged in the implementation of HRS4R.**

The WG decided to provide more information about survey results and the involvement of the researchers in the implementation of HRS4R. In all points that need to address, indicators will be stated properly, including the number of participants in the action and a range of categories R1-R4 involved in the process.

Responsibility: responsibility EB R4, Robert Ulrich O13, Sanislav Kozubek R4, Pavel Vacek O13.

**5) Quality assessment, it is not clear if the management departments are sufficiently involved in the process so as to guarantee a solid implementation**

The WG summarized that the structure of the institute is described properly. The management of departments will be fully involved in the implementation process because individual department leaders guarantee the education of students and research staff

Responsibility: All department leaders (see <https://www.ibp.cz/en/research/departments>).

**6) Quality assessment, adequate targets, and indicators need to be redefined in a quantitative approach.**

WG decided to provide quantitatively defined indicators and targets.

Responsibility: EB R4, Robert Ulrich O13, Sanislav Kozubek R4, Pavel Vacek O13.

**7) Quality assessment, OTM-R policy should be visible**

WG decided to elaborate recruitment and selection policies and practices and enclose them to the AP. All scientific positions will be advertised via portal EURAXESS

Responsibility: Robert Ulrich O13

**8) Quality assessment, ambitions are only partly ambitious**

The WG will provide more actions in the AP, including new courses, summer schools for kids of employees, motivation tools (awards for the best scientific papers, etc.)

Responsibility: EB R4, Robert Ulrich O13, Sanislav Kozubek R4, Pavel Vacek O13.