

TEMPLATE 1 – GAP ANALYSIS

Name Organisation under review: Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw

Organisation's contact details: Dewajtis 5; 01-815 Warsaw, Poland; phone: (22) 561 88 52; contact person: Edyta Czerwonka; e.czerwonka@uksw.edu.pl

SUBMISSION DATE: 19 OCTOBER 2018 (REVISED APPLICATION)

DATE ENDORSEMENT CHARTER AND CODE: 26 SEPTEMBER 2016

PROCESS

The mission of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw (abbr. UKSW) is to strengthen the position of UKSW as a scientific research institution in Europe. For this purpose, in 2016 UKSW commenced the development of an HR Strategy for Researchers (further called HR Strategy)

Phase I

In September of 2016, the Rector of UKSW signed the *Declaration of endorsement of the principles of the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers*. By the Rector's decision, a Team was selected to develop the HR Strategy for Researchers. The Team included representatives from the University Authorities, academic staff, management staff from the Human Resources office, and central administration staff. Between October and November 2016 the Team met three (3) times. A survey was conducted among the scientific staff, concerning the gap analysis of current UKSW policies and practices against the 40 principles of the Charter and Code. On November 15th, 2016 an application was sent to the European Commission.

By the end of February 2017, UKSW received a negative reply to the application. The experts main objections were: 1) a low respondent rate among PhD students (11%), 2) improper methodology, 3) limited involvement of the scientific staff in the preparatory phase.

Phase II

UKSW Authorities in cooperation with the Team decided to again prepare the HR Strategy, while taking the experts' objections under concern. To do so, the following actions were taken:

- The involvement of scientific staff in the preparatory phase was increased, i.e. through presentations during the Faculty Boards meetings.
- An informational-promotional campaign took place at the University: posters, information on the UKSW website; faculties consultations; social-media campaign, and promotion through internal communication tools.
- The Ph.D. Student Government was included in order to increase involvement of said group in developing the HR Strategy
- Social Science methodologists were also included.
- A Work Group and Steering Committee were set

The Steering Committee consisted of:

1. Ryszard Czekalski, Prof. dr hab., Vice-rector for research and international cooperation – committee leader
2. Anna Fidelus, UKSW Prof. dr hab., Vice-rector for student affairs and education
3. Maria Hulicka, Dr., UKSW Chancellor
4. Janina Buczkowska, UKSW Prof. dr hab., Faculty of Christian Philosophy
5. Tomasz Chachulski, UKSW Prof. dr hab., Faculty of Humanities
6. Piotr Ryguła, UKSW Prof., Faculty of Canon Law

7. Marian Sułek, Prof. dr hab., Faculty of Biology and Environmental Sciences

The Work Group consisted of:

1. Edyta Czerwonka, M.A., Office for Scientific Research – work group leader
2. Aleksandra Burek, Dr., Head of the Office for Scientific Policy and Strategic Analysis
3. Father Stanisław Chrobak, UKSW Prof. dr hab., Faculty of Education
4. Iwona Flis-Kabulska, UKSW Prof. dr hab., Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences
5. Małgorzata Jendryczka, M.A., Head of the Office for Information and Promotion
6. Marcin Jewdokimow, Dr., Faculty of Humanities
7. Tomasz Korczyński, Dr., Faculty of History and Social Sciences
8. Marta Luty-Michalak, Dr., Faculty of History and Social Sciences
9. Wioletta Markiewicz, M.A., Head of the Human Resources Office
10. Father Cezary Naumowicz, Dr., Faculty of Family Studies
11. Ewa Skibińska, Dr., Faculty of Law and Administration
12. Beata Szewczyk, M.A., Human Resources Office
13. Mateusz Tutak, Dr., Faculty of Theology
14. Marcin Zarzecki, Dr., Faculty of History and Social Sciences
15. Igor Kilanowski, M.A. – President of Ph.D. Student Government

A schedule and methodology of work were prepared.

Due to a large response by experienced researchers (i.e. 61% of all experienced researchers participated in the survey) in the 2016 survey (the questionnaire provided by the EC was distributed), the Steering Committee has decided to use these data.

The gap analysis was conducted again among PhD students, which increased the overall participation of doctoral students to almost 35% of all PhD students at UKSW. Out of 647 doctoral students invited to participate 219 answered the questionnaire.

The survey was carried out online, using the CAWI technique (Computer-Assisted Web Interview)

The LimeSurvey online survey tool was used to create the survey and publish it to a public. Collected data were processed by statistical software IBM SPSS Statistics. Respondents could choose Polish or English version of the survey. The survey was preceded by informational campaign, among others: information on the UKSW website, posters, meetings at faculties. The PhD Student Government encouraged participation in the survey through social media.

Survey recipients were asked for opinion on the 40 rules set out in Charter and the Code under 4 thematic headings. The respondents were asked to provide reply to the question: "To what extent does UKSW meet the following principles?" based on a four point scale, where + stood for "fully implemented", +/- for "almost but not fully implemented", -/+ for "partially implemented", - for "insufficiently implemented". Additionally, respondents had the opportunity to provide their comments and suggestions on the required actions regarding the Charter & Code principles.

The structure of respondents by gender and faculty (in case of PhD students the number of faculties is smaller, because only 7 out of 10 UKSW faculties offer doctoral programmes) is displayed in the graphs in Appendix 2.

Meeting and consultations schedule concerning preparing the HR Strategy for Researchers

March – June, 2017: Team meeting concerning application evaluation; decision to apply with a new application; consulting strengthened procedure

June – October, 2017: Team meetings concerning the methodology to be used in preparing the Strategy

September 2017: Meeting with representatives of the Ph.D. Student Government; talks concerning the Ph.D. students' participation in developing the HR Strategy

October 2017: Meeting with the head of Head of the Office for Information and Promotion; talks concerning information and promotion campaign at UKSW

October – December, 2017: presentation of progress at Department Board meetings.

January 11th, 2018: presentation of HR Strategy information at Rector's Board Meeting

January 23rd, 2018: Work Group and Steering Committee meeting

January – February, 2018: meetings of the Work Group; preparing the final version of the application

February 2018: university-wide consultations on proposed solutions with the academic staff at UKSW.

The Steering Committee and Working group comprised researchers from all 10 UKSW faculties. They were responsible, on the one hand, for disseminating information about the prepared HR strategy at Department Board meetings, and, on the other hand, for initiating discussion on HR strategy, collecting opinions and suggestions from their faculty. Similar actions were undertaken among PhD students. It was assumed that meetings in smaller groups should be more effective. Collected opinions together with survey results were analysed by the members of the Working Group. As a result the whole academic community has significantly contributed to developing the final version of the HR Strategy which takes into account the specificity of individual disciplines and research areas.

GAP ANALYSIS

European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers : GAP analysis overview			
Status: to what extent does this organisation meet the following principles?	+ = fully implemented +/- = almost but not fully implemented -/+ = partially implemented - = insufficiently implemented	In case of -, -/+, or +/-, please indicate the actual "gap" between the principle and the current practice in your organisation. If relevant, please list any national/regional legislation or organisational regulation currently impeding implementation	Initiatives already undertaken and/or suggestions for improvement
Ethical and Professional Aspects			
1. Research freedom	+ (61%) +/- (30%) -/+ (6%) - (4%)	Attention was brought to the necessity to limit the influence of non-formal factors on completing research, such as: excessive financial and administrative requirements, etc. In the context of research freedom, the PhD students pointed out restrictions placed on them by promoters and research mentors, i.e. imposing their own research methods or blocking innovative solutions of students.	The University does not limit freedom of research, does not create barriers for any themes, topics, scientific problems, which the researchers explore and take interest in. Procedures related to applying for grants and implementing projects are a result of grant-donor requirements (external institutions).
2. Ethical principles	+ (65%) +/- (23%) -/+ (7%) - (5%)	The employees' complaints include a lack of solutions to questions of ethics in scientific work.	At the departments, all bachelor's, master's and doctoral thesis are analyzed using antiplagiarism software OSA (Polish Antiplagiarism System) The Code of Ethics for Researchers is under development.

			<p>In the case that actions violating the University's accepted standards and ethical norms take place the University has created competent bodies, which ensure standards are kept. There are – besides the Rector – Vice-Rector for research and international cooperation, Vice-Rector for student affairs and education, disciplinary Ombudsmen. Before issues are brought to the attention of Ombudsmen, Deans and Deputy Deans undertake consultations and talk about the issue.</p>
3. Professional responsibility	<p>+ (64%) +/- (26%) -/+ (6%) - (4%)</p>	<p>Both employees and PhD students drew attention to a reliable approach to the question of intellectual property, digitalization of research and plagiarism.</p> <p>The issues related to professional responsibility are regulated by Polish law (including property rights, rights of industrial ownership, on the fight against unfair competition, or the penal code), as well as EU law including Directive 2004/48/EC on the enforcement of intellectual property rights). Objections are brought forth on whether they are detailed and complete.</p>	<p>The University is constructing a Repository – an electronic platform, in which UKSW researchers will place their scientific works (articles, books, post-conference materials, etc.). The archiving and providing access to scientific research in the Repository, will take under consideration respect for property rights and similar laws.</p> <p>An information campaign is underway on plagiarism, autoplagiarism, open research and digitization of research.</p> <p>The University is implementing an Open Access Policy, and will create a position of an Open Access Representative.</p> <p>The University has regulations concerning copyrights, similar rights and industrial</p>

			property rights, and regulations for commercializing results of scientific research and development work.
4. Professional attitude	<p>+ (63%) +/- (24%) -/+ (9%) - (4%)</p>	<p>PhD students indicated that in developing research projects, borderline individualism and lacking information about strategic goals of the scientific community, are common.</p> <p>The respondents bring attention to the need to improve information efforts concerning applying for grants.</p>	<p>UKSW has an Office for Scientific Research (abbr. BBN), which informs about the mechanisms of financing research through: individual consultations, information on the internet website, email (monthly). Moreover, BBN organizes information meetings on research funding opportunities.</p> <p>Starting last year, there are cyclic classes for PhD students and young scientists, which help prepare them to write project applications to external institutions.</p> <p>In 2017, BBN prepared a “ UKSW’s Handbook for individuals with research grants underway” in order to facilitate implementation of projects financed from external sources.</p> <p>The department and institutions web pages contain information on conducted research and scientific goals in the near future.</p>
5. Contractual and legal obligations	<p>+ (66%) +/- (24%) -/+ (7%) - (3%)</p>	<p>Some employees indicated that they are being over-engaged by organizational activity. One must however remember that organizational responsibilities are an integral part of scientific work, in accordance with the Law on Higher Education and Science.</p>	

6. Accountability	+ (66%) +/- (25%) -/+ (7%) - (3%)	Employees complaint about having to deal with too much bureaucracy while implementing research projects.	Academic administration supports researchers in responsible spending practices of funds from external sources.
7. Good practice in research	+ (68%) +/- (22%) -/+ (8%) - (3%)	Some of the respondents indicated concerns about the security of data collected during development of scientific research.	<p>As of last year, UKSW purchased Office 365 licenses. As part of a package each employee received 1 TB of data storage in the cloud.</p> <p>Center of Information Systems provide such services as data protection and data recovery.</p> <p>A purchase of a disc array has been proposed.</p>
8. Dissemination, exploitation of results	+ (59%) +/- (24%) -/+ (12%) - (6%)	<p>Doctoral students indicated a lack of support for publishing best theses.</p> <p>Respondents indicated that focusing on commercialization impedes the dissemination of research results.</p>	<p>As of 2016, UKSW has an Open Journal System (abbr. OJS). At www.czaspisma.uksw.edu.pl one can find papers published in twenty (20) UKSW journals.</p> <p>In 2017 UKSW published the "Research at UKSW" in paper and electronic form, which presents research work conducted by university staff.</p> <p>It is planned to implement an interactive internet platform Science2Business to popularize (also in English) research results of UKSW scientific staff. The platform will be used for information about research results, as well as being used to build positive relations with the business community. Specially created tools will allow entrepreneurs to enter into</p>

			cooperation with research teams at UKSW and to bring their own requests to the University's Office for Scientific Research.
9. Public engagement	+ (59%) +/- (25%) -/+ (12%) - (5%)	The doctoral students' responses suggest that they do not see the possibility to popularize scientific activity, which use area-specific language.	The Office for Information and Promotion maintains an expert-scientist database, who are current event commentators in the media in Poland and abroad, as well as supporting the popularization of scientific knowledge within society. The database is updated annually.
10. Non discrimination	+ (72%) +/- (17%) -/+ (5%) - (5%)	Many respondents did not know UKSW employs a Rector's Representative for Disabled Persons, and indicated such a position should be created.	<p>As of 2004 the Rector's Representative for Disabled Persons position was created. This institution should be improved, so that its' presence and competencies be known in the University's community.</p> <p>Rector's decision No 19/2016 https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/2871</p> <p>In order to educate on the problem of gender discrimination, UKSW has a Team of Good Practices, which tackles the problems of gender inequality and systemic limitations, organizing training sessions and conferences.</p>
11. Evaluation/ appraisal systems	+ (62%) +/- (20%) -/+ (11%) - (7%)	The academic teacher evaluation system has received variable opinions and it is hard to indicate definite problems. The system is regularly revised. It is limited by Polish law – Law on Higher Education and Science, which regulates the conduct evaluation and procedures.	Each year the scientific staff undergoes a departmental evaluation. They are graded on educational activity, scientific activity, organizational involvement and education of

			<p>staff.</p> <p>Annex IV to UKSW Statute: https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3767</p> <p>pp. 210-217</p> <p>Senate Resolution No 131/2017: https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3762</p>
<p>Recruitment and Selection – please be aware that the items listed here correspond with the Charter and Code. In addition, your organisation also needs to complete the checklist on Open, Transparent and Merit-Based Recruitment included below, which focuses on the operationalization of these principles.</p>			
12. Recruitment	<p>+ (66%) +/- (20%) -/+ (8%) - (6%)</p>		<p>In 2017 changes were implemented into the UKSW Statute, updating and adapting it to the newest national regulations for employing scientific staff and contract extension (Attachment 5 and 6 of UKSW Statute). The Senate adopted Resolution 62/2017 concerning the rules and regulations for selection contests and advancement procedures, as well as contract extension on the same or different position. These documents provide procedures and requirements. The Rector made a Disposition 62/2017 on contests and advancements.</p>

			<p>Annex V to UKSW Statute: https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3767 pp.217 – 222</p> <p>Annex VI to UKSW Statute: https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3767 pp. 223-227</p> <p>Senate Resolution No 62/2017: https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3615</p> <p>Rector’s Disposition No 62/2017: https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3655 amendment: https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3922</p> <p>The Department authorities organize open contests for positions as scientific staff and academic staff, which are published on the University website.</p>
13. Recruitment (Code)	<p>+ (65%) +/- (23%) -/+ (7%) - (5%)</p>	In practice offers are rarely published in the Euraxess database.	<p>These topics are regulated by the new Law on Higher Education and Science which came into force on 1 October 2018. The Law defines detailed procedures and deadlines to conduct a contest.</p> <p>At UKSW it is required to post information about the contest, detailed regulations about the contest, qualification requirements, and documents to be provided by the candidate, as well as the date and place of submitting the</p>

			<p>documents, and the date the contest will be concluded.</p> <p>Information about the contest are published on the websites of the University, Ministry of Science and Higher Education, and should also be published on the European Portal EURAXESS – Researchers in Motion.</p> <p>Annex V to UKSW Statute: https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3767 pp.217 – 222</p> <p>Annex VI to UKSW Statute: https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3767 pp. 223-227</p> <p>Senate Resolution No 62/2017: https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3615</p> <p>Rector’s Disposition No 62/2017: https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3655 amendment: https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3922</p>
14. Selection (Code)	<p>+ (65%) +/- (19%) -/+ (10%) - (5%)</p>	Criteria are dependent on the areas of research and the level of the employment position.	UKSW is planning to undertake the pilot actions for member selection of recruitment commissions (including representatives of various disciplines), aimed at maintaining

			gender balance of commission members.
15 Transparency (Code)	<p>+ (64%) +/- (21%) -/+ (10%) - (5%)</p>	Lack of internal procedures for providing feedback to candidates.	<p>Providing feedback is done based solely on national regulations. There is a new Act – Law on Higher Education and Science, which will regulate feedback procedures to candidates:</p> <p>http://prawo.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/DocDetails.xsp?id=WDU20180001668</p> <p>Consultations are planned to introduce a paragraph on the minimal deadline for receiving candidate applications.</p>
16. Judging merit (Code)	<p>+ (55%) +/- (19%) -/+ (16%) - (9%)</p>	There were many comments to take under consideration evaluation aspects, such as: Specificity of certain fields of study, organizational activity in promoting the university, input into academic and social work.	<p>In 2017 new rules for academic teacher evaluation were introduced (Attachment 4 to the Statute,the Senate resolution).</p> <p>Annex IV to UKSW Statute:</p> <p>https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3767</p> <p>pp. 210-217</p> <p>Departmental criteria for evaluation take under consideration the specificity of individual disciplines and reasearch areas:</p> <p>Senate Resolution No 131/2017:</p> <p>https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3762</p>

			The Steering Committee will be monitoring if new criteria agreed upon by the departments are satisfactory and effective.
17. Variations in the chronological order of CVs (Code)	+ (63%) +/- (22%) -/+ (10%) - (5%)	The respondents comments were mainly about career breaks for research work and business activity (one must note that national regulations do have regulations regarding sabbatical leave). Accusations were made that individuals with many publications are favored, while scientific activity in business and projects not directly connected to the university is frowned upon.	Consultations of the Rector's Committee and the Senate Commission for Human Resources on introducing additional quality criteria for candidate experience beyond the field of study, into the contest requirements.
18. Recognition of mobility experience (Code)	+ (58%) +/- (17%) -/+ (15%) - (10%)	The respondents indicated that the employment criteria at UKSW for scientific staff do not consider candidates' mobility experience.	<p>Before introducing mobility experience criterion an internal debate is necessary on the validity of this criterion.</p> <p>Since September 2018 UKSW has been implementing the project <i>University 2.0. Innovative education. Effective management</i> project aiming among others at increasing the number of foreign teachers</p> <p>Rector's Decision No 14/2018 on implementation of the project:: https://monitor.uksw.edu.pl/docs/3999</p>
19. Recognition of qualifications (Code)	+ (59%) +/- (20%) -/+ (15%) - (7%)	The respondents indicated that non-formal qualifications are not taken under consideration in the hiring process.	It is suggested to include the issue of non-formal qualification in the debate on regulations for employment.

20. Seniority (Code)	+ (60%) +/- (21%) -/+ (14%) - (5%)	The scientists indicated that the entire career and achievements of a candidate should be taken under consideration in the recruitment process.	Work experience and requirements for positions are regulated by the Law on Higher Education and Science.
21. Postdoctoral appointments (Code)	+ (60%) +/- (27%) -/+ (7%) - (6%)	These issues are regulated by the new Law on Higher Education and Science .	The issue of the maximum duration of appointments as an adjunct professor/assistant is regulated by the Law on Higher Education and Science.
Working Conditions and Social Security			
22. Recognition of the profession	+ (67%) +/- (22%) -/+ (6%) - (5%)	PhD students indicated the lack of definite regulations for employing doctoral students.	According to the Law on Higher Education and Science, doctoral students can be hired by way of competition, subject to the same rules as researchers from the other groups (R2-R4).
23. Research environment	+ (58%) +/- (21%) -/+ (15%) - (6%)	Employees indicated a need to improve working conditions and research environment through improvements in infrastructure, services and trainings.	The following actions were suggested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purchase of a larger number of electronic journal databases and electronic library archives; - Increasing the number of books in the UKSW library. - Providing scientific staff with a proper working conditions (appropriate equipment and facilities); - Increasing the limits on copies of educational and research materials; - Increasing the number of

			administrative workers to provide greater support for scientific staff preparing grant applications and implementing research projects
24. Working conditions	+ (59%) +/- (23%) -/+ (11%) - (7%)	Respondents indicated that work conditions require some improvements.	<p>Between 2016-2017 there was a renovation of historical buildings on the old campus, as part of which they were made handicap-accessible and working conditions were significantly improved.</p> <p>As of 2016 a preschool functions on UKSW campus available for children of University employees.</p>
25. Stability and permanence of employment	+ (56%) +/- (26%) -/+ (12%) - (6%)	Experienced researchers postulated that individuals approaching the deadline for new degree advancement should be exempt from all administrative and organizational responsibilities. They also expressed concerns about job security due to fixed-term contracts.	Employment terms are regulated by the Law on Higher Education and Science. The employer makes the decision to hire, taking the best interests of the University and its' development into account.
26. Funding and salaries	+ (50%) +/- (22%) -/+ (17%) - (11%)	<p>The respondents indicated that the salaries at UKSW are not competitive to those of other significant Universities. A lack of correlation between an employee's salary and their evaluation. A motivational reward system was suggested, which would promote scientific staff with exceptional achievements, engagement in work, or with exceptional educational achievements, both at the level of the University and of the departments.</p> <p>The doctoral student complaints concerned too low</p>	<p>The salaries of scientific staff vary greatly.</p> <p>The doctoral stipend funds are regulated by Polish law, not through internal regulations at the University.</p> <p>Scientific staff with exceptional scientific research achievements, significant engagement in organizational activity for the University, and obtaining grants receive the Rector's award.</p>

		<p>doctoral stipends and that they do not have the same employment protection as others.</p>	<p>UKSW has a Social Fund providing the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discounts for train tickets - Holiday aid - Financial support for underprivileged families. - Low-interest loans. - Partial refunds for using the preschool. - Financial support of cultural-educational and sport-recreation activities. - Multisport Card
27. Gender balance	<p>+ (70%) +/- (20%) -/+ (5%) - (5%)</p>	<p>The dominant opinion is that the University staff should be hired based on qualifications, not gender.</p>	<p>Both women and men are present at all levels of the University structures.</p> <p>There is gender balance in university authorities (rector, vice-rectors, chancellor, vice-chancellors) :3 women and 3 men.</p> <p>Women constitute 40% of the entire academic staff.</p>
28. Career development	<p>+ (53%) +/- (21%) -/+ (16%) - (11%)</p>	<p>Experienced scientific staff has indicated a lack of regulations pertaining to scientific and academic careers of employees and a need to develop a strategy for career development. They suggest creating the function of a mentor – research supervisor, to support less experienced staff. It would also be beneficial to organize trainings i.e. increasing professional qualifications of staff.</p> <p>Doctoral students indicate very few employment opportunities at the University after completing their doctoral degrees.</p>	<p>As of 2018, one of the Faculties (the Faculty of Theology) has introduced a stipend program, as part of which doctoral stipends will be granted for scientific research.</p> <p>Santander Scholarships are provided on an annual basis for University students and staff for science and research development and for international exchange programs.</p> <p>It is suggested to hold consultations regarding a</p>

			career development strategy.
29. Value of mobility	<p>+ (58%) +/- (18%) -/+ (16%) - (8%)</p>	The respondents indicated a lack of regulations determining the value of mobility and regulating said employee mobility. They underline the benefits of such mobile employees for the University and for the employees themselves. They see a need to improve scientific staff contacts with foreign institutions, publishing in foreign languages and to increase language skills of staff and students.	<p>One of the University's priorities is internationalization. The internationalization strategy will be implemented as part of the <i>University 2.0. Innovative education. Effective management</i> project in 2018-2021. The project is co-financed by the EU within The European POWER programme.</p> <p>Bank Zachodni WBK provides students and UKSW employees with Santander Universidades Mobility Fund stipends for foreign exchange.</p> <p>UKSW participates in the Erasmus+ exchange program.</p>
30. Access to career advice	<p>+ (53%) +/- (20%) -/+ (17%) - (10%)</p>	A significant part of respondents believes that the University does not provide scientific staff with adequate career advising.	HR Team have agreed that this should not be a responsibility of the University. UKSW already has a functioning Career Office for students and alumni.
31. Intellectual Property Rights	<p>+ (61%) +/- (22%) -/+ (11%) - (6%)</p>	Experienced employees suggest organizing training in intellectual property rights.	<p>UKSW has a functioning Terms and Conditions for managing copyrights, related rights and industrial property rights, as well as Regulations for commercializing scientific research results and development work at UKSW.</p> <p>Training in intellectual property rights</p>

			<p>protection is being planned.</p> <p>The curriculum for most majors contains a class in copyrights.</p>
32. Co-authorship	<p>+ (56%) +/- (20%) -/+ (15%) - (9%)</p>	<p>Most respondents see a need to create more comprehensive criteria for co-authorship. The scientific staff disagrees that the employee evaluations rank coauthored articles below individual publications. According to them cooperation between scientists should be promoted.</p>	<p>The issue of employee evaluation has been regulated in December, 2017. The departments have designed their own regulations depending on their area of study.</p>
33. Teaching	<p>+ (54%) +/- (22%) -/+ (14%) - (10%)</p>	<p>The respondents indicated that UKSW does not have a system for educating academic teachers on educational methodologies. There are also no regulations addressing the need of increasing competency in education. Simultaneously, the scientific staff points out the PhD students are predominantly occupied with educating, and therefore cannot develop scientifically. On the other hand, researchers are evaluated on educating, even though this activity is neglected.</p> <p>Doctoral students believe that academic experience provides them with the necessary experience to teach classes. They indicate the need for methodical preparation before starting to teach.</p> <p>A change in the evaluation system was made on the number of promoted doctoral students (the number of promoted doctoral students is valued above their quality).</p>	<p>Most respondents indicate a need to implement regulations that improve working conditions linked to teaching. The University sees the possibility of improving this situation through training on the newest teaching methods and techniques, including e-learning (as well as voice modulation, psychology – working with difficult students, etc.).</p> <p>Teaching department provides a number of free courses on teaching among others: “Young teacher at the university”, “Innovative teaching methods”, “New technology in education”, “Voice emission.</p> <p>While compiling Attachment 4 to the Statute and the Resolution on interim evaluation, which took effect on January 1st, 2018, changes were made in assigning points for promoted doctoral students (placing stress on the quality</p>

			of promoted theses and conducted research, giving points for the number of doctoral students dependent on the area of study).
34. Complains/ appeals	+ (57%) +/- (21%) -/+ (14%) - (8%)	Respondents believe that there is no complaint procedure at the University, or they are unaware of it. As an appropriate body, they indicate trade unions or anti-mobbing commissions.	The Employees' Handbook provides the regulations for reporting complaints. Each employee is responsible to become familiar with the Employees' Handbook. At UKSW there are general procedures for complaints obligatory for all public universities. The annual Complaints Management Report is sent to the Ministry of Science and Higher Education.
35. Participation in decision-making bodies	+ (64%) +/- (26%) -/+ (7%) - (3%)	Doctoral students think that they have little influence on decision-making.	Greater emphasis should be placed on engaging scientific staff in decision-making processes and to develop regulations and procedures that influence scientific work.
Training and Development			
36. Relation with supervisors	+ (59%) +/- (22%) -/+ (11%) - (8%)	The most common complaint is the lack of and institutional form of a research supervisor. The respondents see the need to improve the student – master relationships.	Young scientists have promoters until they complete their doctoral degrees.
37. Supervision and managerial duties	+ (58%) +/- (24%)	There were opinions about the lack of training on the topic of human resource management. A need was indicated for an increase in the quality and method of managing human	It is being decided whether to introduce the Code of good practices in education of scientific staff, which is meant to increase the

	-/+ (12%) - (7%)	resources, especially in relation between professors, mentors and young scientific staff.	professional qualifications of academic employees and future University employees – doctoral students – young researchers.
38. Continuing Professional Development	+ (58%) +/- (21%) -/+ (13%) - (7%)	Respondents complaint about low number of training and not adequate co-financing by the University.	Proposed training was discussed in the points above. The Office for Information and Promotion disseminates information about available training.
39. Access to research training and continuous development	+ (53%) +/- (24%) -/+ (13%) - (10%)	Respondents indicated insufficient access to paid virtual libraries and databases, insufficient financing of training and information about said training.	<p>From year to year the University increases the number of electronic database subscriptions. It has access to the Virtual Science Library (EBSCO, Nature, Science, Science Direct, Scopus, Springer, Web of Science, Wiley), IBUK Libra, JSTOR, Lex Omega, MATH, MathSciNet, The Thesaurus Linguae Graecae with a large internationally renowned publisher offer. Also the funds to purchase access to electronic journals and books (current and archival), have been steadily increasing.</p> <p>The University organizes training in operating databases, access to information sources and newest research tools.</p> <p>Proposed actions: improving the transfer of information between University entities on what access to databases has been purchased and about available training; increasing the use of University infrastructure to provide access to databases and e-learning courses; conducting a survey concerning the informational needs of</p>

			<p>doctoral students and research-educational employees.</p> <p>The University has a functioning UKSW Scientific Publisher.</p>
40. Supervision	<p>+ (62%)</p> <p>+/- (24%)</p> <p>-/+ (9%)</p> <p>- (5%)</p>	Young researchers indicated insufficient scientific support; doctoral students can obtain help from promoters.	
Any additional issues			

Template 1 – Annex: Open, Transparent and Merit-based Recruitment Check-list¹					
OTM-R checklist for organisations					
	Open	Trans- parent	Merit- based	Answer: ++ Yes, completely +/-Yes, substantially -/+ Yes, partially -- No	Suggested indicators (or form of measurement)
OTM-R system					
1. Have we published a version of our OTM-R policy online (in the national language and in English)?	x	x	x	-/+	The assumptions of the OTMR policy are in the following documents: Statute, Dispositions and Resolutions available in the bulletin.
2. Do we have an internal guide setting out clear OTM-R procedures and practices for all types of positions?	x	x	x	-/+	These are documents made available to UKSW employees in the bulletin.
3. Is everyone involved in the process sufficiently trained	x	x	x	-	Persons responsible for academic teacher

¹ <http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/index.cfm/services/researchPolicies>

in the area of OTM-R?					recruitment have not been trained in OTMR.
4. Do we make (sufficient) use of e-recruitment tools?	x	x		+/-	UKSW uses Internet tools in accordance with the regulations from the Ministry of Science and Higher Education.
5. Do we have a quality control system for OTM-R in place?	x	x	x	-	No
6. Does our current OTM-R policy encourage external candidates to apply?	x	x	x	+/-	The UKSW policy is dependent on the Law on Higher Education and Science; in addition, in April of 2017 UKSW approved the Resolution on Human Resources Policy.
7. Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to attract researchers from abroad?	x	x	x	+/-	As part of the internationalization policy, UKSW aims to increase the number of foreign researchers, in part through the <i>University 2.0. Innovative education. Effective management</i> project co-financed by the EU.
8. Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to attract underrepresented groups?	x	x	x	+/-	The main criterion for hiring are qualifications.
9. Is our current OTM-R policy in line with policies to provide attractive working conditions for researchers?	x	x	x	+/-	Yes
10. Do we have means to monitor whether the most suitable researchers apply?				+/-	UKSW tools: Qualification commissions, contest commissions, statute commission for academic teachers
Advertising and application phase					
11. Do we have clear guidelines or templates (e.g., EURAXESS) for advertising positions?	x	x		+/-	The Statute and Disposition on contest procedures from September, 2017 defines basic information obligatory while advertising position.
12. Do we include in the job advertisement references/links to all the elements foreseen in the relevant section of the toolkit? [see Chapter 4.4.1 a) of the OTM-R expert report ²]	x	x		+/-	A significant majority
13. Do we make full use of EURAXESS to ensure our research vacancies reach a wider audience?	x	x		-	We do not use this database sufficiently.
14. Do we make use of other job advertising tools?	x	x		-	No

² <http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/index.cfm/services/researchPolicies>

15. Do we keep the administrative burden to a minimum for the candidate? [see Chapter 4.4.1 b) ⁴⁵]	x			+/-	Yes
Selection and evaluation phase					
16. Do we have clear rules governing the appointment of selection committees? [see Chapter 4.4.2 a) ⁴⁵]		x	x	+/_	Guidelines are published in Attachment 5 of the UKSW Statute.
17. Do we have clear rules concerning the composition of selection committees?		x	x	+	Yes.
18. Are the committees sufficiently gender-balanced?		x	x	-	Lack of concrete internal guidelines in this aspect
19. Do we have clear guidelines for selection committees which help to judge 'merit' in a way that leads to the best candidate being selected?			x	+/-	Guidelines published in Attachment 5 of the UKSW Statute; in order to objectively evaluate the candidate for professor, there is an external reviewer is employed.
Appointment phase					
20. Do we inform all applicants at the end of the selection process?		x		+	Yes, on the basis of access to public information
21. Do we provide adequate feedback to interviewees?		x		-/+	Yes, per candidate request
22. Do we have an appropriate complaints mechanism in place?		x		-/+	At UKSW there are general procedures for complaints obligatory for all public universities. These procedures include complaints concerning recruitment process. Annual report on submitted complaints and their management is sent to the Ministry of Science and Higher Education.
Overall assessment					
23. Do we have a system in place to assess whether OTM-R delivers on its objectives?				-	No

