

Dílčí výstup 3.1.6: **Závěrečná zpráva z on-site visit**

On-site visit byly od začátku plánovány jako jeden z nástrojů hodnocení. Vzhledem k tomu, že během celého období, kdy probíhalo hodnocení zahraničními odborníky, probíhala zároveň také pandemie koronaviru, bylo nutné upustit od fyzických návštěv hodnotitelů na UK a veškerá setkání musela být uspořádána pouze online formou.

Během roku 2020 proběhla 2 velká setkání hodnotitelů (panelistů a Rady pro hodnocení tvůrčí činnosti) se zástupci všech hodnocených oborů a fakult UK, a to v těchto termínech:

- **25.-29. května 2020** – setkání panelů (HUM, SOC, SCI, MED) se zástupci hodnocených oborů
- **1.-5. října 2020** – setkání Rady pro hodnocení tvůrčí činnosti se zástupci z jednotlivých fakult a součástí UK

Ze všech jednání byly pořízeny záznamy k internímu využití hodnotiteli a zároveň stručné písemné zápisy. Veškeré informace, které hodnotitelé během těchto on-site visits získali, jimi byly využity při psaní oborových a fakultních hodnotících zpráv. Níže přikládáme stručné “summary” pro každou fakultu, které bylo výsledkem této aktivity, a také zápisy z jednotlivých setkání.

Obsah

SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT OF THE UNITS	3
Catholic Theological Faculty	3
Protestant Theological Faculty	3
Hussite Theological Faculty.....	3
Faculty of Law	3
First Faculty of Medicine.....	4
Second Faculty of Medicine	5
Third Faculty of Medicine	6
Faculty of Medicine in Plzeň	7
Faculty of Medicine in Hradec Králové	7
Faculty of Pharmacy in Hradec Králové	8
Faculty of Arts	9
Faculty of Science.....	10
Faculty of Mathematics and Physics.....	10
Faculty of Education.....	10
Faculty of Social Sciences.....	11
Faculty of Physical Education and Sport.....	12
Faculty of Humanities	13
Institute of the History of Charles University and Archive of Charles University.....	13
Centre for Theoretical Study.....	14
Center for Economic Research and Graduate Education	14
Environment Centre.....	15
Příloha	17
Stručné zápisy z on-site visits panelů se zástupci hodnocených oborů v květnu 2020:	17

SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT OF THE UNITS

Catholic Theological Faculty

KTF has been evaluated in four fields: Theology with C as its main field, History of Arts with B as its second strongest field, History with B and Philosophy and Ethics with C+. While the peer review brought forth very high and high grades, all panels note that too little effort is placed on international (especially high-impact) publications. There were no major international grant holders at KTF during the evaluation period, however the unit has an increasing tendency in obtaining funding from national grant sources. The evaluation revealed a great gap between the remuneration of young researchers and senior professors which hampers its ability to attract and keep young talented researchers. While the KTF is actively participating in international research activities using the opportunities offered by the national and international instruments, the degree of international cooperation and recognition in the international scientific community is quite limited.

Protestant Theological Faculty

PTF has been evaluated in six fields: Theology with the grade B in its main field, History with B as its second strongest field, Philosophy and Ethics with C, Social Work with D, Jewish Studies with D+ and Religious Studies with C+. Fields graded with C and D represent new fields (Social Work) or fields with a very small share of core faculty participating. Remarkably, most of the outputs submitted for peer review were non-native outputs. ETF has a relatively high (3.8) average number of journal articles (per core faculty) published in Scopus-indexed non-native journals in the field of theology. It is almost double the CUNI average in the field (2.08). The panel stresses the activity and efficiency of PTF in obtaining foreign grants and in participating in the implementation of international scientific and educational projects and though its visibility and productivity contributes to the profiling of the evaluated research fields. PTF has a functioning system of attracting and keeping young researchers and the level of remuneration of junior faculty members is the highest among the three theological faculties. International visibility through the membership in scientific organizations and international institutions is at a good level.

Hussite Theological Faculty

HTF has been evaluated in four fields: Theology with C, Jewish Studies with D+, Religious Studies D and Social Work C. The evaluation panel noted that it is quite striking that HTF chose not to be evaluated in either Philosophy and Ethics or Pedagogy since almost half of the core faculty members produced outputs in these fields. This is especially true in the field of Philosophy and Ethics, which accounted for the output of 11,3 of 45 core faculty members, yet was evaluated by the respective panel as below average. There are no major international grant holders at the HTF. The unit lists 4 national grants and 26 grants awarded by CUNI. The degree of international cooperation and recognition in the international scientific community is quite limited. While HTF has a strong PhD program with many opportunities for younger researchers, it fails to reach the CUNI average level of remuneration for young researchers.

Faculty of Law

The Faculty of Law is a well-established institution within Charles University with a good reputation also at the international level. It draws on a large pool of internationally recognized and active

scholars. It also has strong links with most authoritative Czech professional practice. As a whole, the Faculty is well balanced among very good quality fields. The peer review process considered that the research outputs that were evaluated were very good and excellent. The performance of the Faculty as measured by publications in indexed periodicals and by EU funded research grants is not, however, at the level of the best-performing benchmark universities. The Faculty demonstrates a commitment to improve its performance in these areas. The Board recommends that the Faculty should assess its research strategy and objectives on a regular basis, also with regard to the tutoring of PhD students, in order to achieve further advancements.

First Faculty of Medicine

The First Faculty of Medicine (1.LF) of CUNI is by size and history the largest and one of the most important among the five faculties of medicine of the university. It is traditionally viewed as the founding institution of all the medicine in the country and all other faculties of medicine (inside as well as outside of CUNI) view it as a benchmark.

The organisation structure of the faculty seems to be rather complex. High interest is devoted to the selection process of the new professors and associate professors. As concerning the international cooperation, 1.LF seems to exploit the most of the international projects, in comparison with all the CUNI medical faculties.

The international mobility of 1.LF students and researchers is well-established and institutionalized. The number of international students is quite satisfactory. The list of visiting professors is rather long and contains interesting and respected individuals. The faculty lists some highly productive and internationally recognized researchers which is a good sign for the future. The most striking deficiency is that this major research institution has not a single ERC grant recipient. It is absolutely necessary for the faculty to increase its efforts to .

1.LF operates 22 doctoral programmes which is too many for international standards. An important plan for the future involves use of the facilities in Biocev and, especially, the planned new building of Kampus Albertov. It is instrumental that these new structures are used for the recruitment of excellent researchers from abroad that might bring in new methodologies, research ideas and models.

In comparison of the 1.LF as a whole with the benchmark universities, the relative output of 1.LF normalized to the number of researchers is lower. But in national and CUNI comparison 1.LF is a leader in many research fields. The strongest research fields of 1.LF are as follows: 1.LF is rather active in cardiovascular research with high H-index that reflects the visibility of the research in this field in the medical literature. As well 43% of D1 papers (according to WoS) of CUNI in cardiology and cardiac surgery are authored by the 1.LF researchers. Another strong field is clinical neurology. Compared with the neurology as a whole at CUNI, 1.LF represents the most productive part of it, where the *Dpt. of Neurology* can be considered a leading department in this research field. 1.LF is also very strong and productive in Endocrinology and Metabolism (although some stagnation in this field shows a need for recruitment of young researchers), nephrology (among top 10% of papers in nephrology, there are 14 out of total 18 CUNI papers from 1.LF), general surgery (55% of D1 + Q1 outputs of the CUNI are produced at 1.LF), toxicology and also psychiatry can be marked as a field with significant outcome and a reliable partner for international cooperation. 1.LF excels also in the field of Experimental Biology where it is on the second place in terms of the number and quality of outputs among all CUNI.

On the other side, research fields that are encouraged for improvement are oncology (which according to the bibliometric analysis seems to be performing less well in comparison with other international medical faculties) and psychology (only approx. 25% of the outputs are published in the 1st or 2nd Quartile). Furthermore, the Board took into account the fact that 1.LF is larger than all the other

medical faculties, and thus its relative productivity per researcher/author is slightly lower, as shown in the bibliometric support. Too many research papers are published in the journals of mediocre quality in comparison to the benchmark universities, which if possible should be avoided.

Second Faculty of Medicine

The Second Faculty of Medicine (2.LF) was established as the faculty for paediatric medicine to distinguish itself from the 1.LF. The focus on paediatrics is still present in the research agenda of the faculty. 2.LF operates in close collaboration with the Motol Hospital, the largest hospital not only in Prague.

The research organisation structure is rather fragmented, as it follows the organisational structure of the Motol hospital and faculty departments, and heavily depends on a few leading research personalities.

The internationalisation of study and research slowly progresses, the total income from international projects is still rather modest. It is notable that there is not a single grant from the ERC for a faculty member. But because 2.LF is an active member in a number of international projects and consortia, an improvement of the internationalization can be expected. Also the establishment of the EpiRec joint research centre seems to be a very promising step, as well as the planned extension of the faculty facility and an opening of the spin-off Department of Bioinformatics which can create interesting opportunities for synergy within and outside the faculty.

The objective of 2.LF in research is to concentrate on a limited number of selected fields proven to be internationally competitive while keeping a high standard in the majority of other fields. This strategic decision seems to be truly followed specifically in paediatric molecular haematology and oncology, neurosciences with respect to epilepsy, paediatric endocrinology and paediatric and adult cardiology. Several top research groups can be mentioned. In the first place it is the “The Childhood Leukaemia Investigation Prague (CLIP)” that not only the bibliometric analysis singles out as an excellent research group which consistently publishes excellent papers in high impact journals. The Centre combines first class molecular biology research with advanced clinical investigation and is very successful in attracting and training PhD students and young investigators, as well as an outside grant support. The second excellent research group is the Children’s Heart Centre, the only national centre for paediatric cardiology and cardiovascular surgery. Not only research quality but also the clinical standard of care is considered to be excellent. The field of Clinical Neurology is considered to be very successful as well (one third of all the CUNI papers that belong to the top 10% according to WoS are of the 2.LF authorship), several papers were published in highly prominent journals. On a very good level is also Endocrinology and Metabolism where 2.LF (together with 3.LF and LFHK) closely follows the primacy of 1.LF. In surgery almost one third of all the D1 CUNI outputs are produced at 2.LF. In Experimental Biology 2.LF follows the primacy of the Faculty of Science and their share of AC outputs in the Q1 is quite high. An excellent ratio of outputs with AIS (higher than at the other faculties) needs to be mentioned also for the field of Psychology, even if the number of researchers in this field is rather low.

On the other hand, adult cardiology is an example of a department that should be encouraged to improve. Although they have published quite successfully, including high impact journals, the overall rating of scientific productivity is quite low. With an H-index of 16 this group is not competitive internationally. There is no clear research leader and the number of manuscripts published is low.

In general, the overall productivity of the faculty in terms of research outputs per author is relatively low, well beyond the benchmark international universities.

Third Faculty of Medicine

The Third Faculty of Medicine of CUNI (3.LF) has been originally founded as the faculty of epidemiology and public health. Later it underwent a rather unique re-organisation of its curriculum, which now uses problem-based learning throughout the six years of medical curriculum. The students are taught in both Czech and English languages. 3.LF is medium in size which gives opportunity to create a community spirit and encourage inclusivity and cooperation.

The organisational hierarchy has a relatively rigid structure that may be a barrier to collaboration and effective use of resources. 3.LF should consider strengthening the role of cross-departmental research coordinators and increase the autonomy of research group leads, for example, by allocation institutional support derived from research performance to group leaders rather than chairs of departments.

There are a number of important international collaborations at 3.LF. Nevertheless there is a room for improvement. International grants, such as those funded by the European Commission provided only a minor contribution to research funding during the evaluation period. They have neither had a successful application as the principal applicants for networking projects nor for ERC grants. 3.LF should also develop a positive motivational scheme for appointing international researchers. At the moment, there is no formalised mechanism for hiring and retaining senior academic staff. Head hunting is performed on an ad hoc basis.

The Bibliometric support suggest that the overall publication productivity of 3.LF does not substantially differ from other Prague medical faculties of CUNI when normalized to the number of researchers, but significantly lags behind comparable benchmark universities of Heidelberg, Milano or Copenhagen. 3.LF has the by far most visible Cardiology Department. It has a prominent international standing in the field of acute cardiovascular care (Prague Trials, Stroke management). In cardiology and cardiac surgery 3.LF has the second highest number of high impact D1 publications among other CUNI faculties and has the most cited authors (the leaders are Ales Linhart and Petr Widimsky). Prof. Widimsky is clearly the leader in cardiovascular medicine in the country. Due to Dr. Tesar the field of nephrology has gained an international reputation as well. In Endocrinology and Metabolism 3.LF closely follows the primacy of 1.LF and is also stimulating international collaboration.

The Czech National Institute of Mental Health, affiliated with 3.LF, is a leading centre for research in psychiatry in the Czech Republic. This institution cooperates with other Faculties of Medicine of CUNI but also with other institutions in the Czech Republic and abroad. Prof. Höschl is a departmental and international leader. There are several research fields with both high attractivity and level of scientific work (for example, MRI in psychiatry, psychotropic substances for treatment of mental disorders).

Concerning the shares of AC-Outputs in the Top Decile, 1st and 2nd Quartiles, this faculty is the second best performing CUNI faculty in the field of Psychology. Despite having only a few faculty members in the psychology field, there are a high number of publications in Journals with AIS.

On the other side, as a field which publication profile is limited can be pointed out the Obstetrics and Gynecology.

As it is the case for all other medical faculties of the university, too large a proportion of research outputs is published in the lower two quartiles according to the AIS.

Faculty of Medicine in Plzeň

The Faculty of Medicine in Pilsen (LFP) was established in 1945 and belongs to the smaller medical faculties of CUNI. The faculty sees its main research interest in regenerative medicine (replacement, support and regeneration of vital organs, especially in the setting of infectious and oncological diseases), and focuses predominantly at sepsis, antibiotic resistance and viral infections in transplantology.

In 2014, using the funds from European Operational Programme the Biomedical Center of LFP was established, allowing integration of the best research teams and optimal use of research infrastructure and human resources. The Biomedical Center with a number of foreign professors, postdocs and postgraduate students grows steadily. Thanks to the Centre the internationalisation of the internal environment of the faculty gradually increases as well. LFP also participates in the project Biobanking and BioMolecular resources Research Infrastructure - European Research Infrastructure Consortium. Another large research infrastructure project, to which the Faculty of Medicine in Pilsen contributes is the National Center for Medical Genomic (NCMG).

The first major success in international European competition is the ERA Chairs (Horizon 2020 Widening) project Chaperon (CHAPERON – ERA Chair Position for Excellent Research in Oncology), which has been launched in 2019 (2019-2024, 2500 th. Euros). It has been obtained after the evaluated period but still could show the strive for internationalization at the faculty.

Concerning the performance in the field of Clinical medicine, LFP has the lowest output in comparison with the 3 faculties in Prague, however, since it has significantly less staff, resulting normalized output of papers per author is comparable. The Department of Microbiology and Biomedical Centre is a leader in the pharmacology of antimicrobial drugs. In endocrinology and metabolism LFP (as well as LFHK) is notably weaker. Also in Cardiology, Neurology, Endocrinology and Psychiatry and Sexuology the overall research and publication activity of LFP is lower. The question is, whether individual faculties have to be active in all fields or focus on those, in which it has selective advantage.

LFP seems to be successful in attracting and establishing young research groups (e.g. group of Experimental neurophysiology). LFP also has a long-term strategic plan where excellence of research teams, internationalization of the research and long term development of research activities and technology transfer are the main interests. Together with the establishment of the Biomedical Center it is a major opportunity for the future, which will possibly impact the grading

Faculty of Medicine in Hradec Králové

The Faculty of Medicine in Hradec Králové was established in 1945 and it is closely connected to the University Hospital Hradec Králové, a very large and modern health care facility. It also closely collaborates with another faculty of Charles University that is located outside Prague - Faculty of Pharmacy in Hradec Králové. A new university campus Mephared has been currently built near the University Hospital Hradec Králové. The main goal of this project is to interconnect the two separate faculties and to promote their collaboration on interdisciplinary research projects.

Academic staff of the faculty actively participates in various international professional societies, many academicians are members of editorial and advisory boards of international impact journals. The faculty participated in two prestigious collaborative research projects financed through the EU 7th

Framework program. LFHK has more than 25 years of academic and research cooperation with the prestigious American Mayo Clinic where summer courses for students and researchers are held.

The faculty supports the research activities of undergraduate students who have the opportunity to participate in student research at any department and apply for junior projects. The Board noted that support of the young generation of medical researchers specifically in clinical sciences is critical as the upcoming generation is often lacking motivation, while focusing on clinical practice.

According to Bibliometric Support in the evaluation period the bibliometric indicators suggest slightly weaker overall publication performance of LFHK in comparison to the 1st and 2nd Faculty of Medicine (Prague) but comparable to the Pilsen LF and 3. Faculty of Medicine. LFHK showed generally less favorable distribution of research papers than the best performing CUNI medical faculties (1.LF and 2.LF). In terms of the international comparison, the bibliometric data for the LFHK seems to show slightly better picture than for the benchmark medical faculty of the University of Warsaw and even University of Vienna, and lags behind University of Copenhagen, KU Leuven, Uni Heidelberg and Uni Milano, both in terms of the most excellent results and research productivity.

Science and research areas that the faculty develops are age-related diseases, development of new diagnostic methods, experimental pharmacology and toxicology, liver physiology, modern trends in oncology and hemato-oncology, neurosciences, stem cell biology, surgical trauma and new operational approaches. Clinical research is carried out mainly in close cooperation with the University Hospital.

As examples of excellent researchers of LFHK can be mentioned Jan Vojacek who is the second most productive cardiovascular surgeon as judged by the bibliometric analysis of the CUNI authors. In Obstetrics and Gynecology Marian Kacerovsky is a faculty leader with an H index of 26. In surgery Filip Cecka stands out with a publication of D1 paper in high-impact class journal (Annals of Surgery). In Endocrinology and Metabolism LFHK (together with 2.LF and 3.LF) closely follows primacy of 1.LF in this field. In Pharmacy LFHK was second in productivity in high ranking journals over the last four years.

Faculty of Pharmacy in Hradec Králové

At CUNI the subfield Pharmacy and Pharmacology is much more strongly represented than the subfield Toxicology. Whereas in Pharmacy and Pharmacology FaF HK is the flagship faculty in the period 2014-2018, the flagship institution in Toxicology in the same period is 1.LF.

Research at FaF HK is focused on all traditional as well as modern fields of pharmacy and covers the entire process of drug development and clinical use, i.e. synthesis, medicinal chemistry, natural products – pharmacognosy, pharmaceutical analysis, molecular biology and pharmacology, pharmaceutical technology and clinical pharmacy, as well as drug regulations.

International grants allow purchasing of top equipment for analytical studies including environmental aspects (going green). Thanks to EU co-funded projects STARSS and EFSA-CDN, and further support from institutional funds, several new pieces of research equipment have been purchased and core facilities established. Commendably, FaF HK owns several patents protecting various structural types of antimicrobial compounds, instruments and methods. A patent application on new antituberculosic agents was licenced to a pharmaceutical company. While patent applications are numerous, successful technology transfer is still rather rare and should be supported more.

FaF HK currently curates two large EU co-funded projects focused on excellent research: STARSS and EFSA-CDN. The Faculty invites excellent foreign experts to present a lecture. Faculty also regularly organizes international meetings and conferences concerning separation sciences. The leading

faculties and Departments are strongly recommended to analyse how continuous fostering international collaboration could provide added value to existing prevailing inter-CUNI or national collaboration. But it can be seen that FaF HK pays attention to this already at the time being - about 30% of all papers published by staff of FaF HK have been produced in cooperation with foreign institutions.

FaF HK pays a significant attention to inclusion of young researchers in new research teams. The FaF HK has the highest success rate of their doctoral degree programme students within CUNI. Publications in top journals are substantially bonified. Positive progress came with the EU co-funded projects that brought funds to attract foreign postdocs to work at FaF HK. The faculty bonifies the departments with foreign academic and research employees.

With some exceptions the FaF HK works have mostly not been published in highest ranking journals but importantly contribute to the coherence of pharmaceutical research at CUNI. The researchers in the cited areas are strongly recommended to increase the visibility of their research by targeting higher ranking journals. The highest number of top half publications in Pharmacy, Pharmacology and Toxicology in the period 2014-2018 were produced by FaF HK. The analysis of the published papers demonstrates that very often the research is performed primarily within one Faculty or within CUNI collaboration only.

Bibliometric analysis clearly confirms the analytical chemistry at FaF HK ranks among the best in the Czech Republic. Nearly 50% of publications of FaF in this area are in the 1st quartile and more than 75% are in the top half journals according to AIS (and also IF). In the WoS "Chemistry, Analytical" category, FaF HK produced the highest number of top half and also 1st quartile ranked articles among all research institutions in Czech Republic.

From the strategic point of view, an extremely important operation will be the completion of the joint research campus Mefared together with the Faculty of Medicine of CUNI in Hradec Kralove using the EU Operational Funds. Smart use of this facility for not only enlarging the current facilities but also acquiring excellent young researchers from outside the university will be critical for the further development of both faculties in Hradec Kralove. This opportunity must not be missed.

FaF HK could be considered as a role model for international collaborative research, grants, policy stimulating and motivating young researchers, as well as collaborating with the Medical faculty.

Faculty of Arts

The Faculty of Arts (FF) is a unit representing fields with very good rankings with very good or excellent research outputs. FF has been evaluated very highly in most of its fields: more than half of the fields received grades A, B+ or B. More than 80% of the core faculty members work in fields that have received grades A, B+ or B. While the unit is seldom successful in the competition for top international grants, it is the recipient of the greatest number of international grants at CUNI. It is also very successful in competing for national grant funds. It has a system for attracting and supporting junior researchers, though FF's funds are limited. FF is involved in many international research networks; it has some international researchers and students; and its core faculty members hold important positions in international societies and are invited for talks at prestigious universities. FF is the largest faculty at CUNI. It is much larger in size than the faculties at benchmark universities. It is all the more remarkable that the faculty manages to maintain such a high standard in most of its research fields.

Faculty of Science

The Faculty of Science was evaluated in Biology (SCI); Chemistry (SCI); Geography (SCI); Geological and Environmental Sciences (SCI). All fields of the faculty show a sound development with a clear tendency to strive for excellence. The overall performance of the Faculty of Science at CUNI is at a very good level. There is a large number of research that contributes to the high reputation of faculty with faculty members winning ERC grants, which is highly appreciated and a measure of the international competitive nature of the performed research. Biology has seen some important achievements for example with the opening of the BIOCEV centre of excellence in 2016, creating a stimulating environment for the development of its research labs and core facilities. Chemistry compares fairly well to European standards. The number of top 10% outputs (publications) are comparable with the other benchmark universities. Indeed, the majority of the outputs are publications in international journals with AIS, as is the case in most successful chemistry institutes worldwide. Geography occupies a prominent place in the international rankings scoring rather well (rank 51-100 globally), in the same tier as Heidelberg and better than Vienna or Warsaw. Geology and Environmental Science compares well to the benchmark universities. On the basis of the peer-reviewed outputs, there is indication of high-quality research in Geological and Environmental Sciences.

There are 14 PRIMUS projects (the university-initiated start-up program for young PI's) enabling several excellent international PI's to be supported. Hence, the faculty makes great strides towards internationalization.

The question has been raised by the panel, whether a flatter organization with more agility to react to research developments and the ability to make serious investment in people and plans for the future would suit the requirements better. It appears that units are fragmented in different Departments and disseminated in different buildings of the university.

Faculty of Mathematics and Physics

The Faculty of Mathematics and Physics is one of the flagship units at Charles University. It has been very successful during the evaluated period with several major outputs which have received international recognition, including several ERC grants. Physics at Charles University is well integrated into the international research network and contributes significantly to large international projects and infrastructures. Computer Science is a strong asset, with a Theoretical Computer Science group that has achieved top international recognition, and takes its share in the rapid development of the field, with huge potential for both basic and applied research. The School of Mathematics produced outputs of excellent quality which are very well recognized internationally. The presence of talented and active young researchers is a good indicator of its vitality and potential. The Faculty has the full potential to become fully competitive in the near future and to reach the level of the top benchmark institutions. To achieve this, overall research strategies should be defined and regularly updated in the various areas to react to new developments and opportunities and to improve their visibility. In addition, more efforts should be made to leave the comfort zone of mainstream research and take up more risky and cutting-edge topics.

Faculty of Education

The Faculty of Education is a well-established institution within Charles University, with the primary goal is to train teachers and other pedagogical personnel for all types of schools and school systems, at various levels of study. In some fields PedF is well-known and considered at the international level,

less in others. Moreover, it has strong links with the most authoritative Czech educational institutions and this is definitely the variable that strongly determines the activity of the faculty.

PedF has been evaluated in 14 fields from Social Sciences and Humanities. As far as publications are concerned, the fact that they are often in Czech and published in local magazines is penalizing: while the peer review brought good results, especially in some fields, it has to be noted that too little effort is placed on international (especially high-impact) publications.

International cooperation and recognition in the international scientific community should be strengthened.

The research organisation structure seems to be rather fragmented: often, in fact, instead of focusing on specific aspects characteristic of the Faculty of Education, research themes common to other faculties are developed, and this sometimes results in fragmentation of disciplines and areas, and in difficulty in keeping a consistent level at which research is practiced.

It seems that relatively few doctoral and postgraduate students are involved in research. As far as PhD students are concerned, they are on average older than their colleagues in other faculties, they extend their studies for a long period of time because they are often working students, and they should be more supported both financially and from the point of view of the research organization.

Faculty of Social Sciences

The research evaluation exercise by the panels produced grades for 8 separate areas/fields, ranging from B in four fields (economics, history, public policy, and sociology); C+ in three fields (media and communication studies, area studies, and political science), to the grade of C in one field (anthropology). Weighted by staff representing those areas, the Faculty of Social Sciences (FSV) achieves a solid C+ grade in the international benchmarking exercise. This grade stems in part from the importance that panels in the social sciences attribute to publishing in English in AIS ranked journals with an international reach. The Board recognizes the 'intensity' of foreign cooperation by FSV evinced in an admirable influx of foreign students and researchers, alongside a substantial number of visits and exchanges among FSV researchers and their counterparts abroad. However, the level of international academic engagement of FSV scholars that lead to publications in English in journals with an international reach remains low.

The board acknowledges the support that FSV has already offered to researchers in designing and administering grant-funded projects and publishing books. Yet the FSV can engage to a greater extent with the continental European academic scene by supporting the publication of articles in international journals and securing milestone grants like the ERC. The Board's reading of numerous panel reports led to recommendations for enhancing research excellence that align with weaknesses that the FSV identifies in its own self-evaluation report. One key recommendation is to increase incentives for high quality rather than quantity of output through research training programs for FSV researchers at all levels, research sabbaticals, and reform of dissertation rules. Other recommendations include: increasing the use of English in research and teaching to create a more welcoming environment for international researchers; expanding recruitment outside the FSV to reduce academic inbreeding; and expanding inbound and outbound visitor programs to increase international exposure. The Board sees great potential for the FSV to contribute to international academic debates for which Prague-based researchers are well placed to gather qualitative and quantitative data. Political scientists at FSV should be at the center of debates on rising authoritarianism in the EU, or the long-term nexus between the economy and the environment. The

Board also recommends that FSV branch into new areas of quantitative social science research, in particular non-economic social sciences using modern digital methods.

Addressing these concerns will help propel FSV to greater research excellence. To remedy a sizable gender gap in promotion to associate and full professor levels, the FSV should make a more concerted effort to recruit, train and promote women at all levels. The Board recommends the institutionalization of an independent standing committee to monitor issues of discrimination and to recommend steps to improve the climate for women and minorities. Similarly, PhD programs should be standardized and streamlined; smaller numbers of students with greater financial resources, more methods training and more intensive supervision could be beneficial. Centralization and standardization of doctoral training across FSV would enhance professionalization across the departments as well as consolidate expectations in the job market and at the workplace. A coordinated reorganization of doctoral studies to harmonize examination procedures and quality standards would reduce overall fragmentation in the faculty. In general, fragmentation appears to be an obstacle to academic excellence in funding, training and evaluating PhD students and in incentivizing high-quality research across FSV and the entire university. Bold steps should be taken to overcome this fragmentation.

Faculty of Physical Education and Sport

The Faculty of Physical Education and Sport at Charles University in Prague (FTVS) is an important institution combining teaching and research. Research in sport and physical education is by nature interdisciplinary and includes areas such as education and methodology, psychology, ethics and philosophy, history, sociology, applied biomechanics and physiology, rehabilitation, nutrition, management, and others.

In recent years the Faculty has registered a considerable increase in its research profile that is also evidenced by the continuous year-over-year growth of AIS outputs. A similar trend relates to research funding. On the other hand, only a very slight increase in the number of researchers has been noted.

In relation to PhD students there should be an increased focus on research and scientific orientation and theoretically more grounded training. A maximum effort must be made among students to help them to understand the importance of the scientific and analytical approach to sport, health-focused movement activities, physiotherapy and social-science topics.

Multidisciplinarity is welcome, but this is also sometimes done to the detriment of certain disciplines. The inquiry, for instance, could relate to the distribution of sports practices according to social groups, or to the way in which the younger generations favour certain practices to the detriment of others, or the way in which male and female practices evolve.

The Faculty would also benefit from accentuating international relations, in particular with European centres where research has a long tradition and with researchers with the track record of research originality.

Individual sectors within the Faculty, either the more practically as well as theoretically oriented could be better defined. The quality of research output needs to further improve, focusing on fields of competence of FTVS and aiming to publish in top journals in the field.

Faculty of Humanities

The Faculty of Humanities is the youngest unit within Charles University. In only two decades, however, FHS developed an original research culture based on a deliberate interdisciplinary profile (present throughout most of its departments) and on very specific innovative subfields (e.g. longevity studies). Specific to FHS has been its focus on socially relevant fields, which meet many of contemporary Czech society's challenges (migration, intercultural communication, gender inequality, social exclusions, and so forth).

This dynamic research culture has been made possible to a large extent by the relatively small size of the unit: it encourages a direct dialogue between researchers, and, as a result, bottom-up research initiatives that have proved very fruitful. This also allows a more active involvement of PhD students in the faculty's research programs.

Although 11 fields from social sciences, humanities and medicine are represented at the FHS, 85,8% of its core people work in four main fields: Philosophy & Ethics, History, Sociology and Social & Cultural Anthropology. These fields have been rated from good to very good.

Maintaining this dynamic culture based on grassroots research initiative can be a challenge. The faculty's original profile and small size can have its drawbacks both in terms of ranking (as some of the centres and departments escape traditional research areas), as well as in terms of publishing opportunities. Similarly, for want of a full-fledged administrative support system, FHS has only been able to apply to international grants in partnership with other institutions. Therefore, the internationalization of FHS is a work in progress.

Currently, FHS tries to address these problems as it has been engaged in a comprehensive internal restructuring. Similarly, it has managed to improve its infrastructure with the acquisition of a new building in the Summer 2020.

These efforts however need external support and interfaculty cooperation. This is necessary both in order to complement FHS's scant resources and in order to better integrate it into the university's larger research strategy. The Board would like to stress two points in particular:

- The necessity of an improved interfaculty dialogue. This would allow research teams and PhD students to increase their visibility while accessing the pool of resources of the university as a whole.
- The faculty, with the support of the University, can provide incentives for researchers to publish in very visible international journals with high impact. In our opinion, this should not diminish the importance of publishing in local venues: it is only by maintaining both local relevance and international visibility that the local journals will increase their prestige.

Institute of the History of Charles University and Archive of Charles University

The Institute of History and Archive (UDAUK) has two main and complementary tasks. The preservation and processing of exceptional archival resources is clearly predominant. Both require highly specialized technical competences and the process of digitization of the fund has made significant progress over the recent past years.

The second task is research on the history of Charles University and its larger diffusion. It has brought some major scholarly contributions whenever the global output is more mixed, with a number of traditional or casual publications. Most of them (90 %) are available in Czech only. Yet, there are some positive signs of renewal: an interest for the history of sciences and scientific disciplines, together with

new openings towards sociology and the institutional contexts of knowledge, networks, gender issues, and more generally the so-called « science studies ». It goes along with signs of stronger international collaboration. In 2021, Charles University is expected to welcome the next International Congress for the History of Science.

The Institute faces obvious material space constraints. It is waiting for a new, more favorable up to date setting.

In terms of research and training for research, we recommend the recruitment or, at least, the assignment of new scholars and overall a stronger integration and a more dedicated articulation with research teams at work in other faculties. Joint training programs at the Master and PhD level could work as a useful appeal for a number of students.

Centre for Theoretical Study

The Centre for Theoretical Study (CTS) has been evaluated in five fields: Biology (SCI) with B+ is currently the main field of activity; History and Archaeology (HUM) evaluated as B; Philosophy and Religion (HUM) evaluated as C+; Sociology (SOC) evaluated as C; Economic Science (SOC) evaluated as C. It is clear that research conducted at CTS is very uneven, is dominated by one discipline, namely biology.

CTS is a joint unit of Charles University and the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, however there is no clear evidence that CTS serves as a bridge or liaison between both institutions that established it. CTS primary mission was to conduct inter- and trans-disciplinary research covering e.g. mathematics and complex systems, biodiversity, theoretical physics, biology, economics, archaeology, sociology, philosophy. Thus, having such a broad context on board, the role of CTS can be rather considered as a think-tank that fosters the integration of researchers who work in various fields from exact and natural sciences to humanistic and social sciences focusing on complex phenomena and developing novel methodological approaches. Unfortunately, unlike the intended mission, the diversity is strongly unbalanced.

Although CTS is a relatively small unit within Charles University, with a very small number of core staff, accompanied by contract employers, the expertise of staff members is very diverse. This is a very important advantage and resource of the centre, but only if scientists work together to obtain the added value in their research. It is very important to promote ground-breaking, forward-looking research. As a small unit with the small number of employees, the CTS does not have a strictly defined organizational structure. It is rather considered as a club of intellectuals, exchanging ideas and knowledge. Over the evaluation period, 3 grants financed via FP7 where CTS staff members serve as principal investigators were identified; all of them were completed by 2014 (two grants) or by 2015 (one grant).

Apart from purely academic research, it is important to mention the role the CTS plays in shaping national and international discourse in biodiversity, sustainability and climate change, bringing into discussion biological and philosophical point of view. The leading researchers of CTS represent a very important voice in the public debate.

Center for Economic Research and Graduate Education

In the view of the Economic Panel and the Board, CERGE-EI comfortably exceeds the parameters defined by comparator institutions. It thereby achieves the grade A as overall research grade in the international benchmarking exercise, based on information from bibliometric performance measures, peer review, panel evaluation, and self-evaluation. The economic research conducted at CERGE-EI is broad, covering labor and family economics, econometrics, industrial organization, information

economics, political economy, and the economics of innovation. The most outstanding research published in the measurement period features new frontiers of economics: behavioral economics, decision economics, and experimental economics, and to some extent macroeconomic theory. The institute's organizational structure reflects a concern for research productivity represented by publications in peer-reviewed international journals, freeing time for younger colleagues to focus on substantive projects and shielding them from undue bureaucratic burdens. Promotion of excellence permeates all parts of the institute. CERGE-EI scholars are visible at major international conferences as well as in editorial boards of leading international journals. They are integrated with the very top of the pyramid of world-class universities. Two very prestigious European Research Council (ERC) grants were awarded to CERGE-EI researchers during the evaluation period. Public outreach exists, but does not crowd out the ultimate goal of producing and publishing world class research.

Despite this excellent evaluation, the Board does note that some sub-disciplines of economics are underrepresented in CERGE's output. In these areas, demand for world-class research is emerging and economies of scope at CERGE-EI could be readily exploited. Environmental economics, the economics of climate change, health economics, urban economics, public finance, inequality, and applied macroeconomics and finance are less present in the CERGE-EI research portfolio. New and expanding research initiatives in data science and program evaluation ("big data and causal analysis") could readily be added to the research agenda. Praiseworthy efforts in outreach could be expanded in applied areas synchronized with public research needs.

In the Unit Report, the Board makes a number of concrete suggestions to help CERGE-EI achieve even higher levels of academic excellence. The expansion of research scope might be financed by creative integration or even consolidation of activities of CERGE-EI with those of the IES at the Faculty of Social Sciences. Partnering and coordinating teaching engagements between the two institutions could make CUNI economics a better-diversified powerhouse overall. CERGE-EI could assume the role of a dynamic "academy of excellence" to which IES faculty members could be nominated for limited and renewable terms on the basis of excellent, measurable research output. This status would grant blanket teaching load reductions and more research time to its members on a pure merit basis. The Board also noted that the fraction of women at CERGE-EI is low compared with the rest of the university and the profession in general, and that this situation merits serious attention. More aggressive international recruiting, also from the best students of IES, could alleviate this problem.

Environment Centre

The Environment Centre (COŽP) has been evaluated in four fields: Environmental Sciences (SCI) evaluated with B+; Economic Science (SOC) evaluated with C; Public and Social Policy (SOC) evaluated with B; Pedagogy (SOC) evaluated with B. The status of COŽP is unique in being situated within the organizational structure directly under the Rector and is largely financed by external grants, which to some extent may hinder long-term planning and time for more time-consuming in-depth studies. COŽP aims to conduct research and provide expertise in the broad field related to the environment and is of a different nature than the other other units of the University. COŽP collaborates with governmental institutions, e.g. parliamentary bodies, the state administration, non-governmental organizations as well as a number of national and international academic and research institutions.

The COŽP is divided into five Departments and has its own Scientific Board that consists of 15 members. It has the tasks of approving the research concept of the Centre and evaluating its research results.

The specificity of research conducted at the COŽP is in its multidimensionality in the context of inter- and transdisciplinary research. It is worth highlighting that this distinguishes the research activity of the COŽP from research conducted within individual Faculties of Charles University. COŽP should be

viewed as focused on applied research and evaluated in terms of, say, its financial contribution to CUNI, measured in terms of grants and contracts., but also in terms of the societal impact, the influence of the current discourse on sustainability, climate change etc.

There are a number of international grants, which cover close to 40% of all grant funds. Those projects exemplified the close collaboration with a network of international scientists. A significant number of staff members of COŽP are internationally recognised, and in general, the publications outputs are satisfactory, both in respect of the number of publications as well as quality of journals.

Although being a relatively small unit of Charles University in respect of the staff member, the COŽP can be considered to be a dynamic, expertise-oriented institute. Moreover, taking into account the high scientific position, it is worth emphasizing its effectiveness in obtaining international grants.

It will be very important for the stability and sustainability of research at COZP to secure a larger proportion of its budget from the institutional financing (directly from the University).

Příloha

Stručné zápisy z on-site visits panelů se zástupci hodnocených oborů v květnu 2020:

PANEL HUM:

Arts and Cultural Studies:

1. Introduction
2. Internationalization and Excellence
 - a. How do you address the need for internationalization?
Most outputs that we went through were in Czech. Most conferences take place in English. There is a lot translated from its original language Czech and there is cooperation with foreign universities which also takes place in English. There are scholarships for Ph.D. students as well.
 - b. Do you write your papers directly in English or other world languages?
There is a pressure to publish in English. It takes time to publish in foreign language magazines. There is a problem that rules of evaluation are continuously changing in ČR. In history of art it is common to write in German as well. There are some important resumé in German.
 - c. Some international topics like theatre or cinema are addressed only in Czech and Slovak context. We are looking into the archives and try to work with themes that have been closed for a long time. Some topics need to be published in ČR first and only then be published abroad.
3. Institutional Support
 - a. Is there a cooperation or competition between the departments?
Do you have support from the administration of the university and the faculty? We have experience in getting grants.
In the field of European grants our experience is quite low. There was a Hera project in the Department of Musicology. We could imagine more support from the faculty. There is no sufficient administrative support at the faculty or university compared to other universities that we have cooperated with. Our colleagues in the EU can concentrate more on research.
 - b. We usually work within the faculty. It is not effective if same research topics are dealt with at different departments.
4. Debate with Ph.D. students
 - a. Are you involved in research in your units? Yes, we are involved in research and we also invite foreign researchers in our department. But most experts come to us because of personal contacts.
 - b. How many hours a week do you teach? Some have just one subject and a workshop. There is still enough time for research. Some have not been involved in research yet. There should be more cooperation between the departments. If the supervisor wants a student to become part of the project it is the best way. If not the students usually do not take part in research because their research field may be too narrow.
 - c. Where do Ph.D. students usually come from? Do they have a chance to study abroad?

Some students follow their supervisors when they go abroad. They receive a lot of mails with chances to study abroad. A lot of students go to international conferences. And they also have access to funding.

Literature and Linguistics:

1. Introduction
2. Internationalization and Excellence
 - a. How do you address the need for internationalization?
Most outputs that we went through were in Czech. Most conferences take place in English. There is a lot translated from its original language Czech and there is cooperation with foreign universities which also takes place in English. There are scholarships for Ph.D. students as well.
 - b. Do you write your papers directly in English or other world languages?
There is a pressure to publish in English. It takes time to publish in foreign language magazines. There is a problem that rules of evaluation are continuously changing in ČR. In history of art it is common to write in German as well. There are some important resumes in German.
 - c. Some international topics like theatre or cinema are addressed only in Czech and Slovak context. We are looking into the archives and try to work with themes that have been closed for a long time. Some topics need to be published in ČR first and only then be published abroad.
3. Institutional Support
 - a. Is there a cooperation or competition between the departments?
Do you have support from the administration of the university and the faculty? We have experience in getting grants.
In the field of European grants our experience is quite low. There was a Hera project in the Department of Musicology. We could imagine more support from the faculty. There is no sufficient administrative support at the faculty or university compared to other universities that we have cooperated with. Our colleagues in the EU can concentrate more on research.
 - b. We usually work within the faculty. It is not effective if same research topics are dealt with at different departments.
4. Debate with Ph.D. students
 - a. Are you involved in research in your units? Yes, we are involved in research and we also invite foreign researchers in our department. But most experts come to us because of personal contacts.
 - b. How many hours a week do you teach? Some have just one subject and a workshop. There is still enough time for research. Some have not been involved in research yet. There should be more cooperation between the departments. If the supervisor wants a student to become part of the project it is the best way. If not the students usually do not take part in research because their research field may be too narrow.
 - c. Where do Ph.D. students usually come from? Do they have a chance to study abroad?
Some students follow their supervisors when they go abroad. They receive a lot of mails with chances to study abroad. A lot of students go to international conferences. And they also have access to funding.

History and Archaeology:

1. Introduction
2. Selection of results and outputs

- a. How were the results and outputs selected?
Do all of these researchers teach at the department? How was it decided what not to include in the evaluation? There were several rounds of nominations at the faculties. Out of this process there have been results and outputs selected on a faculty level. But these were nevertheless approved by us in the final stage. There is just one exception but all other researchers are active in their respective departments. It is more or less a mixture of outputs selected according to their impact in widely recognized magazines. Some were selected from senior and some from junior members of the units. Sometimes it was the monographs which were selected.
- b. Who does the research? Is it the professors or Ph.D. students or postdocs? It is usually done by associated professors and Ph.D. students. Research tasks are not divided according to generations. In the past the research was usually done by widely recognized professors but now the tasks are much more distributed.
3. Ph.D. supervision
 - a. How are Ph.D. students selected? How are they recruited? Do they come from abroad? Do they get financial support? Do they have teaching experience? How successful are they finding a job? Most Ph.D. students come from the master programmes. Some Ph.D. students come from abroad. They receive stipend in the first 4 years of their studies but they are also quite successful in getting grants. After they finish their studies some students go to the Academy of Sciences, some do to NGO's and some to the civil society organizations and the public sector in general. In order to be accepted to the faculty they have to hand over a Ph.D. project and go to a personal interview. As Ph.D. students they are usually involved in research and they also teach. Quite a lot of students cooperate in Erasmus Plus and Aktion etc. projects.
4. Institutional tasks and Ph.D. students
 - a. What are the relationships between different institutes? The fact that there are e.g. two different institutes has historical reasons. These institutes are about the same size (Faculty of Arts) and have quite high number of Ph.D. students. This is because most Ph.D. students study for 8 years which is the maximum.
 - b. How do the departments work on an everyday basis?
In Ph.D. studies there are regular seminars, students cooperate on international projects and there is of course the individual supervision of the projects. There is also a virtual platform for the students where they share their knowledge, organize conferences etc.
 - c. Do you plan to expand to other world areas when it comes to the fields of research? It sometimes happens through the cotutelle. Sometimes we expand our research beyond the EU. Students are encouraged to take part in these projects and they are supported to do that by the faculties.

Theology, Religion, Jewish Studies:

1. Introduction
2. Organisation of the units
 - a. Why are there different departments dealing with same issues?
In Jewish studies the departments are organized according to the interpretation of religious texts, i.e. Judaistic and Hebraistic texts. Both parts are now cooperating. There are also historical reasons for the division. Teaching programmes are only at the Faculty of Arts and at the Hussite Theological Faculty.

b. How many researchers have Jewish studies as their main topic? The fact is that some of the publications from that field could be listed in another fields.

In the past it was not possible to have Jewish studies at university. It is also a problem of time until the whole matter settles down.

3. Ph.D. studies

a. Are the students required to have another foreign language besides English in their study plans at theological faculties? The other language is usually German.

In some cases two other languages are required. There are language centres at university like the one at Faculty of Arts which offer languages like Hebrew or Yiddish.

At some faculties they distinguish between active knowledge which is required in case of English and other languages where the students should only have a reading knowledge.

b. Are there limits on how many

Ph.D. students should one academic supervise? One supervisor should have not more than 5 active Ph.D. students. This rule

has changed throughout the past. There are also consultants of the students who help the students besides the supervisors. Some of them come from abroad. This is usually required by the faculty.

c. What are the publication requirements during Ph.D. studies? It is usually part of their study plan. They should publish 3 papers in peer reviewed journals.

In some outputs the supervisors could also be involved. Some students publish even more.

But the requirement is that the students should also publish outside of university. It is an important experience for them.

4. Publication patterns

a. Is there a publication plan at the faculties? What is the relation between national and international publications? Our disciplines are

by definition international. It is not only the publications but researchers and scholars want to present their results at international conferences. There are

Czech journals that publish papers only in foreign languages.

Peer reviews are always international. It is in our view equally important to publish in both languages – Czech and English. It is important to publish in

Czech because we want to preserve the Czech heritage.

And we are also committed to the Church. The main question stemming from these tasks is what research culture do we want to have in ČR?

5. Questions on Ph.D. students

a. How would you describe the connection with your supervisors? It varies. Some consult their theses and research plan on

a regular basis, some meet only irregularly. The meetings usually take place at the seminars.

b. What is the status of the Ph.D. student? Are they employees of the university? Do they consider themselves financially independent? They have a student status.

In the past there were strict rules regarding the amount of money that the Ph.D. students should receive in the respective years. It has changed since that time.

Most students do work anyway because the current stipends are not enough. Some faculties even have funds from (under)graduate student fees to support the Ph.D. students.

PANEL SOC:

Economic Science:

Prior to the meeting the panellists asked relevant faculties and units to answer the questions found at the beginning of this text. This text contains answers to these questions. More questions were asked by the panellists during the meeting. These can be found later on in the text.

- 1 Do you recruit through open calls or do you target people to whom you make direct offers?
- 2 If you do open calls, what is your specific experience; how did you advertise, and did you go through the AEA or the EEA/RES job market? If you went through the economics job market, how was the interview committee selected? How many applications did you receive and how many flyouts did you organize?
- 3 Who decides to whom an offer is made? In particular, is this decided by the economics faculty, the head of department, or someone else?
- 4 When you made an offer, but did not succeed, to whom did you lose (i.e. who are your relevant competitors)?
- 5 How does promotion and termination work? How many people did you promote or dismiss in the last 5 years and at which stage of their career? If you dismissed people, for what reason?
- 6 Did some of your faculty leave within the last 5 years? If so, where did they go to and why have you not been able to retain them?
- 7 What is the strategy or process for filling leading positions? How has it changed during the past 5 years?
- 8 What is the typical teaching load at your unit (contact hours, teaching period)? Do you grant grace periods for younger researchers?
- 9 Have you been able to attract PhD students from outside of Charles university?
- 10 Is the old quantity-based incentive scheme for research already abandoned and, if so, what has replaced it?

The Environment Centre (EC):

The EC hires economists.

The EC does not use "the academic job market for economics" to hire staff.

Funding is to a large extent from grant sources.

The EC often hire long term collaborators who are considered to be useful for specific tasks and their names (CVs) are already put in grant proposals. The EC makes direct offers to scholars.

For posts such as post-docs the EC organises open calls.

For the post-doc position EC does not receive any money from CU, positions are financed from grants. Where there are no concrete persons in the proposal, the EC places adverts with collaborating institutions or on ResearchGate.

The EC interviews about 15 candidates on average (online).

The EC does not advertise many open positions and the persons who we want to employ are already embedded in the grant proposals as grant agencies require concrete names on applications. Perhaps if there is money to develop the unit then there might be more emphasis on that type of hiring. 3 out of 6 applicants came through advertising.

A probable reason for this hiring policy is that the EC's salaries are not sufficiently competitive.

Center for Economic Research and Graduate Education (CERGE):

CERGE has an International Executive Supervisory Committee that includes 2 Nobel Prize winners. CERGE organises annual open calls for economists, even if they do not have any particular needs in case an exciting researcher has interest in a position in Prague.

Hiring methods are identical to economics departments worldwide. Staff is hired on a competitive job market in the US and Europe (adverts in July, September, October)

Flights to the US to interview candidates (20-30 interviews this year) and also in Europe to the Rotterdam faire.

CERGE seeks to avoid "in-breeding" and tends not to employ their own graduates. There are a few employees who graduated (from CU?) a long time ago but who were successful in Edinburgh and the US before coming back.

Institute of Economic Studies (IES)

The IES would like to attend the European job market but it depends on what they are able to offer. The IES needs people in various finance disciplines and there are financial constraints. Joint appointments are made with CERGE, and there are also IDEA joint faculty members. There are vacancies.

Department of Economics, Faculty of Law:

The Faculty opens calls for the head of Department of Economics. The department focuses on the law in economics and also on new ideas how to attract new scholars. The transition started two years ago, and the major constrain is to find money to get on the competitive market. Open calls for academic positions. The department is changing 50% of the staff.

The Economics department is a small department with only one PhD student. It experienced a crisis of personnel and the situation is changing now.

The department attempts to hire staff by the standards of the western academic departments, so far three rounds of open call hiring procedure. They all were open, all of them were competitive. This approach works for the associate professor positions. The department advertises at other faculties at CU and also through social media. Because they are unable to pay as much as others who hire on an international competitive market, it is not worth going in that direction at the moment. On the other hand, the department had another call which provided funding for a post doc, generously funded by an EU project. This was advertised on "inomics", it attracted 24 applicants from all over the world.

Conventional assistant professors' positions attracted 10 applicants in one case and 14 in the other. So, by Czech standards these are unusually open and unusually competitive calls (especially concerning the recent history at the Law Faculty). The department's goal is to advertise positions on the international market. The current salary level does not allow this.

Question: How does the system of promotion works at the individual departments?

Environmental Centre (EC):

The EC's economists are hired for (temporary) the grant positions and the EC employ senior PR staff efficient in writing grant proposals and securing funding for their research groups. It happened twice during last 6 years that within the units also other people have become efficient in obtaining grants. Then there were the university's incentive grants for mid-career research applicants, and our bids have been successful, and there were also other sources. Research groups are established around concrete scholars who are capable of securing sufficient funding. Occasionally, a research subgroup within a group develops into a new, separate research group. From time to time external scholars join the EC. The Centre has a post-doc returning from Norway with a grant.

Question: When for instance the economists finish their post doc, do they typically leave? Or would they be promoted?

Environmental Centre (EC):

Not very often because usually their grant-based position lasts for two years and then they leave. For instance, we have a group that looks at transfer of goods - environmental impact of international trade, and a unit looking at environmental indicators and then unit looking at environmental externalities. Certain sets of skills are needed to get grants so these people may find more grant

funding and they have been able to keep their positions for 15 years or so. Formally, though, these are temporary positions. The majority of staff work under such conditions. So, the staff either develop a group around themselves or they possess a useful skill such as in modelling which then can become useful in other research. Their name is then put on the next application and they can progress their career in this way. The EC does not have academic position per se because the Centre does not teach, we only supervise PhD students from other faculties and quite extensively so, but formally all EC employees are in research positions. So, the EC does not have a formal scheme for the promotion to the rank of associate professors as in the faculties.

Center for Economic Research and Graduate Education (CERGE):

CERGE uses a typical contract, after three years there is organised an intermediary review with an internal and two external executive committee members. An external executive committee member is the chair to ensure the impartiality. The committee meets annually, then a major 10-year review is organised after 6 years with the same rules as before. Letters from external members (6-9 letters) play a major part in this. CERGE asks the evaluator to provide them with a list of universities where the particular evaluated candidate would or would not receive a tenure. If the 10-year evaluation is successful, the scholar can have a sabbatical. Senior researchers are evaluated every 6 years - their performance and financial incentives may follow.

Institute of Economic Studies (IES):

A distinction has to be made between a national regulation and our own rules.

The national regulation stipulates that academic titles are transferable across universities.

The Institute also has its own rules. The IES does not employ any full professor from any (Czech) local university. The IES has been following its own system for five years: the IES employs an assistant professor for six years and when that person applies for promotion, the IES wants them to be promoted at a university which meets the IES's expectations in terms of academic excellence. This scholar's performance has to be measured according to quantitative criteria which include article influence core points as defined in the IES's documents. As a department, the IES has no control over promotion. It is in the hands of the scientific council of the Faculty of Social Sciences. Economists make up 10 per cent of the scientific council. There is also a committee which consists of economists, but the promotion is not a decision of the department.

Question: Usually the faculty would go along the recommendation of the department. Formal rules may be different but effectively the department has a lot to say. Is it so or are you overruled by the faculty?

Institute of economic studies (IES):

If a scholar wants a promotion and does not meet the IES's standards, the solution for them may be to apply for the promotion at a different university, but they will not be in a full professor position at Charles University. So, they may have a title of a full professor but from the point of view of the IES department they remain senior lecturers. If the promotion takes place at CU, we have a lot to say but we have no control over the decision of the scientific council of the Faculty of Social Sciences. It is in contrast to the US system, where there is no decision at the level of the department. The IES has these formal criteria which work in such a way that the Head of the Committee, who is in charge of the promotional procedure, can request information from the director of the IES on the question how this person fulfilled the promotional criteria. It is a complicated system, but it works well. It is competitive. The Department may be happy if someone is promoted with three papers, but at the level of the university with three papers they would face a negative feedback, it is not typical. Informal recommendations exist on what the number of publications should be, and these are again heavily quantitatively oriented, depending on the quality of the department.

Question: Titles are one thing but what about the control over whose contract to extend or not to extend? Do the departments have some or complete control over this?

Institute of economic studies (IES)

The IES is fully in control over the contracts. The Institute has to fulfill the requirements for the department's accreditation, hence staff with certain qualification is needed for teaching certain courses. There is also a labour law and it is not easy to lay off someone.

Panellist:

To sum up, regardless of the formal academic titles, the typical path is that after the six-year period there would be a decision about what you would internally call an assistant professor versus a senior lecturer. What is a distinction between these two positions? in terms of teaching load and research support?

Institute of economic studies (IES):

Research support is performance driven, if you have a history of research everyone is eligible. The distinction is between teaching load and admin duties.

The IES is a teaching institution. The IES teaches 100 courses and supervises 150 thesis per year. The IES needs many staff and when someone is not successful, and hence what happened in the last few years, would be the reason for (not extending...?)

Department of Economics, Faculty of Law:

CERGE and the IES have spent years to establish a system of personnel policies and promotions that get them as close as possible to the standards at western universities within the many constraints of national regulations.

The department copied their systems with some specifics to the Law faculty.

Assistant professor is hired on a three plus three plus three-year basis. After six and nine years an assessment on the sufficient quality of publications in national and international journals is conducted, for which the exact standards have not been set but an international publication and impact factor are a requirement. For example, an assistant professor from a lower rank university was hired, and they have not produced international publications, and therefore their contract will not be extended because they have not met the department's standards.

As for hiring, the department hired an associate professor from abroad who already published a paper. This is the way forward.

Question: Does the department have a control over the contract?

Department of Economics, Faculty of Law:

In terms of promotion, also economists from the Faculty of Law have to be promoted at different faculties, though.

Faculty of Law:

In 2017, the Faculty of Law adopted the Dean's directive on standards of performance including standards for research and teaching activities, and based on these standards, which are checked regularly, decisions to extend or not extend the contract are made.

Question: What are these standards?

Faculty of Law:

The standards are: How many articles in the WoS everybody has to publish in three years, how many monographs, how many articles in regular journals, how many hours should be taught, the number of foreign visiting scholarships, requirement vary among different ranks of academics.

Panellist:

So, this is more like the quantitative system which does not consider qualitative criteria?

Faculty of Law:

Not at all. PF distinguishes publications for Scopus and WoS journals and publications in most prestigious journals.

Law:

Panellists asked the following questions:

1. On research institutions and PhD programmes research career advice - what does good research consist of, what leads to promotion?
2. On impact case studies of research outputs - do they have any direct impact of research on practice, policies and law making?
3. Questions relating to the new evaluation method of research output quality: Is it welcome but there might be weaknesses in the method - does the faculty have anything to say about it? Suggestions?
4. How do the faculties support publishing in foreign languages in international journals?

Faculty of Law:

Impact on legal practice: Various researchers who work at the faculty are judges, legislators and attorneys at the same time. The former president of the Supreme Court is from our department, and so were judges of the Constitutional Court. Members of staff have a strong influence on case law. There are also judges of the Constitutional Law at the Faculty. Some staff are members of international organisations such as the European Parliament and the United Nations. Some staff are also members of the Legislative Council of the government.

Faculty of Law consider themselves somewhat different from other faculties. Scholars of the Faculty of Law also produce commentary on the Criminal Code, Civil Code, national, international legislation, EU Treaties and this is not considered as research.

Promotion: New policy on the promotional development from PhD to the next stage of academic career. Three years ago, the faculty set standards for evaluation of academics and now the first round of evaluation is available. Among its standards are scientific activity, international cooperation and activities aimed at the general public. The standards are set for the staff at the beginning of their career.

Promotion of publication in foreign languages in prestigious journals: In the discipline of economics the faculty reached good results. But the faculty wants to concentrate on other areas that concern the Czech law where the faculty needs to overcome some obstacles.

A special grant for academics who publish in prestigious journals is available.

Foreign publishing is regarded as a necessity for promotion. It is a change from the former "tradition".

The Faculty's suggestion: In law discipline it is easier to publish in International Law in journals which are indexed in the WoS and Scopus. But in other areas it is more difficult. Prestigious journals in Austria and Germany are published in the German language and they are not easy to get published in. Our suggestion would be that qualitative assessment is good but not only in terms of WoS journals but also prestigious journals in Germany, Austria and Poland.

Question:

On research institution: according to your website the faculty is divided into departments and institutes. The objectives and activities of the research institutes are not always clear in terms of their own resources for promoting research. The Centre for Legal Skills, for instance, this research institute organises training for PhDs and academics in legal skills and legal publishing. Is constitution of more research centres at the faculty considered? If yes for what reasons?

Faculty of Law:

Centres were traditionally established in fields to promote legal science and to connect the university and the Czech Academy of Sciences after such equivalent at the Academy was in decline in areas of legal history, copyright law, intellectual property and comparative law. Centres have been also established in order to attract more money from grants. This strategy is thought to have worked in terms of the grant funding it provided.

The Centre for Legal Skills was established after the faculty was successful in getting the first European grant and first grant 10 years ago. This was the way to promote this field in a conservative central Europe.

The faculty has a new accreditation in the legal skills curriculum. The Centre is not only used for the Magister (Masters) study but also for the PhD study for the training in academic and legal writing which is connected with their activity, teaching methods for PhD.

In the self-evaluation report the faculty was compared with benchmark universities and their law schools. Almost all of them have multidisciplinary centres basis. The Health Law Centre is a good example because this centre focuses on private law, public law, European law. The multidisciplinary approach is promoted by CU.

On the question of plans to establish more centres: What is not covered is the relation between IT and law and copyright law for research. The faculty is also quite strong in sports law.

We are using new structures to develop new research but also new subjects for students but also for changing our curricula for students.

Question:**On PhD programmes:**

There are 14 PhD programmes. Do these programmes have some common structure, obligatory training, how many places are available in English, how does the faculty increase the attractiveness and how about the research environment? Do you see any weaknesses in the current PhD programme?

Faculty of Law:

The faculty is in the second year of new accreditation. The move to 13 PhD programmes in Czech and 1 in English is considered as good.

Although it is only the second and this year affected by Covid-19 but last year there were 27 applicants for the course in English and 11 students were admitted.

There have been 12 applicants this year.

We originally intended to open only 6 places. We extended the number in response to the high quality of applicants.

The faculty has a limited number of students enrolled in Czech language programmes, but it also depends on the quality of students. According to the Czech law the number of students cannot be limited if they fulfil the requested criteria. The focus is now more on the quality of the applicants' project than on their interview and their previous success in studies. The strategy is to attract students with promising career plans and ideas.

PhD students attend introductory lectures, their scientific project as a compulsory part, they attend seminars in teaching methods because some of the students take part in teaching. There are common faculty rules for scholarship. Through scholarship the Faculty attempts to attract students who are active, with special scholarships for best students. Students can also be awarded the same money as academics for best articles. This opportunity is offered this year for the first time.

Weaknesses: some PhD students study in a combined study. Also, the Faculty loses some students during their studies to legal profession in Prague and the EU.

Some students choose to do their PhD elsewhere.

Also, the Faculty would like to encourage more foreign students to come to Prague or attract more students from Brno to Prague.

The conditions that the Faculty can offer to students are not competitive but the Faculty currently works very hard to provide a more attractive offer.

Media and Communication Studies:

Questions:

1. In media studies departments I can see there are different research traditions visible to different extent when it comes to publishing in English language journals?
2. Another question regards a low number of grants in comparison with other departments at the Faculty? What do you do to address this?

Faculty of Social Sciences:

Different research and publication strategies at the Institute of Communication Studies are a legacy from the past. The faculty struggled to persuade colleagues in Media History about importance of publishing in foreign languages because of their belief that their research is closely related to the Czech Republic and not interesting enough to foreign scholars. However, some improvement has recently taken place.

Academics working in the new media and journalism are much more interested in international cooperation. Measures have been taken by the current Head to change the situation and it has been improving.

Question:

Public Relations and Marketing Communication which are typical international research areas in the field, huge areas, but nor those are visible when it comes to journal publications?

Faculty of Social Sciences

It is a very small unit at the Institute and also traditionally its interest lay in the history of marketing and not in public affairs but this year it produces two articles in journals indexed in the WoS which is welcome. The colleagues are involved in international networks like the Marketing Monitor.

Two colleagues from the department went on Fulbright scholarships at Columbia University in the USA and they do international research.

The Faculty had significant difficulties to secure grant funding but in 2019 we received three new grants in applied research. But we continue having problems in getting large international grants. In the past colleagues did not apply for them thinking their research was not interesting to the international audience. Again, the situation has now improved.

We are expecting results of two international submissions. Current grants are more regional grants (like Visegrad), and also grants that were brought by foreigners from abroad (Brussels and Uppsala).

Question:

How do you want to increase the number of people from foreign countries?

Faculty of Social Sciences:

As the results show, the faculty is working on recruitment. Recruitment of two colleagues is in negotiation.

Question:

What do you think about PhD careers outside of academia (students attracted by private sector)? Do your students find jobs outside academia or not?

Faculty of Social Sciences:

It is a financial question although employment of students by an institution with synergy is not considered as bad.

The faculty has the highest number of full-time PhDs. They are expected to do research and also work as a part of research grants. The best ones are offered a possibility of joining research centres where they are expected to only focus on their own PhD research.

The problem with the PhD programme is a low completion rate. CU and the Ministry are aware of this problems and there are measures under preparation aimed to address this problems. The main problem is the level of funding for PhD.

The current PhD stipend is approximately 200 Euros.

On careers outside academia - students from economic science can stay in academia or join the central bank. Media studies students typically end up in senior editorial positions, from area studies and political science they often study abroad and pursue their academic careers there. The issue is the completion rate of their studies.

Question:

Have you considered a change of policy from having a lot of PhDs who do not complete their study and instead have a lower number of students but with a better funded scholarships?

The money is paid according to the number of students. The cash flows related to the number of students who join and leave the Faculty have stabilised. Changes must be done very carefully, otherwise the cash flows could be destabilised and make the Faculty's finances more precarious. The Ministry has been preparing a new strategy for financing new students - Strategy 20 - 21plus. And in this new strategy it is clear that the main funding criterion will be the number of students who complete their studies. It is believed that the new strategy will lead to more successful PhD students.

Question:

Is there any support for students in terms of training and mentoring? To help them to complete their thesis?

The Centre for Doctoral Studies operates at the Institute of Economic Studies and provides peer reading of successful students who have completed their study and their colleagues (who have not completed yet), the Faculty also works in the Media Studies and Political Studies with people who are in transition from PhDs to post docs. These are very good students and the senior people help and mentor them.

This also happens during their PhD studies when they are trained and helped in the development of their presentation skills. The situation is not ideal yet and it would be beneficial to have all those courses available at all institutes. Nevertheless, there is a full focus at the Faculty on this area along with an effort to level up the differences between institutes.

There is also a good support from courses organised at the University level: seminars in teaching and ethics of research work.

The comparative advantage of the Faculty of Social Sciences is in its internationalisation of PhD studies: 12 per cent of students in the English Language Programme which is 10 per cent higher than the CU average.

The faculty does not compete with the University offer of seminars and provides complementary seminars in English.

Sociology:

Question:

Can also the Faculty of Social Sciences add some information on the pre-graduate students and research?

Faculty of Social Sciences:

For instance, twice a year the Institute of Economic Studies opens a call for three Master students and these students with research experience can later on progress to the PhD Programme.

Faculty of Social Sciences:

Graduates move on to good jobs that are competitively paid, so prospective PhDs have to be identified early which means at the Masters level.

They can apply for grants and for bonuses for published papers etc. So that the students know that the career with a PhD can be financially sustainable. There are also awards for good final theses (Bachelor and Masters), students are also encouraged to turn their theses into research articles, so that this can also become a starting point for their PhD. Overall, it is important for students who are empirically oriented or who do computing that they can demonstrate to their future employers that they can do computer analysis.

Psychology:

Questions:

For Faculties of Education, Humanities and Physical Education on the structure of PhDs and support and help for PhDs?

Faculty of Education:

There is a problem to recruit foreign students as study programmes at the Faculty are focused mainly on Czech education.

Faculty of Education, Department of Psychology:

15 applicants for PhDs this year and probably 5 best applicants will be admitted.

6 applications from abroad.

The programme in the English language has been relatively new, and international students is something they want to focus on in the future.

Some of the pre-gradual students are living abroad, they need to pass the compulsory parts of the Czech programmes too and receive help from the Faculty.

The faculty cooperates with international departments especially in Great Britain, Italy and Hungary in research and based on this cooperation foreign students will be attracted to study at the faculty.

Practical issues concerning PhD studies:

The Faculty has a good experience with the duty of PhD students to publish 2 scientific articles, it is critical for the students to have academic skills at the end of the study and to know what the basic part of an academic career is.

Another duty of PhD students is to submit a research proposal to the University's funding agency to be a part of a bigger researcher group, so they learn to prepare a proposal and it helps the University

to get to know students' abilities. It helps the Faculty to choose the most suitable students for academic careers.

An example is four colleagues who were PhD students at the Faculty ten years ago and now they have strong international connections.

Question:

During PhD programmes are the students encouraged to spend a period of time abroad, are they pushed to establish contacts abroad?

On the list of PhD duties is to spend at least three months abroad. The Department of Psychology had mainly female PhD students and for some of them it is not very easy to go abroad, they are helped but it can also be accepted if they have some very close relations abroad.

Question:

What is the proportion of former students to find an academic job wherever and what is the proportion of students who find jobs in some other field?

Faculty of Education, Department of Psychology:

The estimate is that 20 per cent after completing their PhD stay in academia and secure a full time job.

Most of PhD graduates remain in some kind of relationship with our department, especially the best experts who then teach some specialised courses. For example, one colleague is a clinical sociologist and he takes part in several courses.

It is good to select the most capable PhD students to be scholars. We consider the PhD study as the best time for the students to familiarise themselves with an academic career.

Question:

Since there are so many PhDs in many different units - is there a way to integrate them together in a seminar?

Faculty of Education, Department of Psychology:

PhD students are expected to take part in a methodology course, and they also need to take one or two courses offered by the Faculty where they can meet other students. Some courses are organised outside of our Faculty, students are encouraged to attend events outside the Psychology Department, but it is not obligatory, with the exception of the compulsory methodology course, history of education and sociology of education. It is an opportunity to meet students from other fields there.

At the beginning of the PhD study at the Faculty of Education a research skill workshop for all the students at the faculty is organised. It is very interdisciplinary and students from outside the Faculty are also accepted if they are interested. We encourage students to develop links between different field of studies. This is the main platform.

Question:

On undergraduate students – are there opportunities for their involvement in research activities. If yes, how?

Faculty of Education, Department of Psychology:

Students are involved or at least they have a chance to get involved. The department has three research projects now and in each of them we are opening some research assistant position (collection of data) and some other position for PhD students as well. Students are encouraged to

find research topics that are connected to the project so that they can see that their research can be a part of a larger research group project.

Students can speak about their scientific experience of their courses or working on their theses at a conference organised at the Faculty. Recently students reported on their one year work which is a good experience also for pre-gradual students.

Question:

To psychologists from the Faculty of Arts and Humanities and Faculty of Education: What is your policy to promote publication in international journals?

Faculty of Arts, Department of Psychology:

It is obligatory for PhD students to publish in an impact factor journal, and relevant seminars are organised for them (and for staff).

The department is increasingly involved in international research grants.

Faculty of Education:

The Faculty has a policy to include points for high quality publications in our departmental budgets and the money is then distributed to staff. Generally, scholars (at the Faculty) do not publish in high impact journals but the situation is gradually improving. Scholars at the Faculty tend to publish monographs and chapters in monographs.

Faculty of Arts, Department of Psychology:

There is Head of Department fund available from which academics can receive more money for excellent publications.

Questions aimed at various faculties:

Question:

What is your policy to promote publication in international journals?

Faculty of Physical Education and Sport (FTVS):

Substantial evaluation system in operation provides annual evaluation and all publishing activities are converted into hours and authors receive extra money if they achieve good results.

Question:

Do you have any internal committee which assess publications before they are submitted in order to support and advise young scholars?

Faculty of Physical Education and Sport (FTVS):

The publications of young colleagues are published in cooperation with senior colleagues, they collaborate, that is how young colleagues are supported.

There is one board for evaluation of monographs which reflects the current system in which only a small part of non-bibliographic results is evaluated so the Faculty wants to choose the best to be part of evaluations conducted by the University and the Ministry for Education.

Faculty of Education:

The same situation and the Faculty library organises training courses on how to publish.

Faculty of Arts, Department of Psychology:

The Faculty has a taught subject oriented on the topic of publishing in psychology and on the American Psychological Association's citation norm during pre-pregradual study. It is one of the first subjects students study, then they have a Master thesis seminar. For PhD programmes seminars on how to write are also offered. PhD students can take Faculty-organised e-courses which are more general than in psychology.

Faculty of Humanities, Department of Sociology:

Research money is not sent directly to departments. The faculty is divided into groups according to Progress programme, there is a competitive grant system three times a year open to academics and students including master students and sometimes undergraduates.

PhD students are supported by their supervisor, post docs participate in research groups and they are supervised in Progress programmes, grants are offered for high quality articles.

Faculty of Social Sciences:

High quality is encouraged in research — money motivation, rewards are very non-linear, not focused on a Q1 but top 10 per cent or 5 per cent, according to the quality of journal. The question is what is a good one - it is somewhere on the edge of Q1 and Q2. Members of staff who publish in top 10 per cent journals should get much more (money). Success in publishing varies across the Faculty. But in some departments, there are publications with the impact factor above 5 and 10. The reward system raises questions about fairness (among scholars?) but it works well.

There is a good experience with working paper series for young researchers where they can submit preliminary results. They receive feedback either from their colleagues or from colleagues abroad. A part of that can also be a discussion with the editor about which journal it should ideally target. It seems to work well.

Faculty of Education, Department of Psychology:

It is important to support senior and junior scholars in publishing in foreign journals but at the Department it is also important to produce publications for the use in school psychology departments and parents, for instance. It is very important that our output is also aimed at the general public.

Question:

For the Faculty of Arts: What is the number of students who continue in academia and other in paths?

Faculty of Arts, Department of Psychology:

The estimate is that 25 per cent stay in academia, others choose more practical jobs, for instance working in prisons.

Question:

On collaboration of researchers and finance: Do faculties have a fund that scholars can use for missions to travel abroad or do they have to use resources from research projects?

Faculty of Education, Department of Psychology:

We have a duty to have as a minimum 1 publication to go to a conference once a year home or abroad. We can use the money from the Faculty or Erasmus money or other grants. Departments always finds the money to fund conference attendance.

PhD students:

Student of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities:

Although the financial part of PhD study is very important, motivation and mental health are also very important in terms of having support from peers and supervisors.

What student like about the department: the division into research groups and how they are closely knit together. There is a lot of initiatives to be together, to work together, to build the skills together.

It is important that the Heads and supervisors build their soft skills.

The student believes that PhD students and supervisors, students from different faculties, struggle because they do not feel included, they are not empowered, and they are left to self-sufficiency. They struggle, and they are not sure what they are doing, even if there is motivation, financial motivation, they still feel at a loss and that they do not have much power in their environment, especially at the beginning of their studies. It is improving a bit.

There is a need for more peer to peer communication at the beginning.

There is a need for staff providing advice on mental health and soft skills.

Bachelor and Master students in the PhD student's research group seem not to have sufficient financial support for them. They participate a lot and do a lot of work, their financial award is too small.

Question:

What kind of support do you wish to receive from the faculty while pursuing your research objectives?

Student of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities:

The student has received a grant from the University, feels lucky and quite satisfied, also has a supportive supervisor. There is always a way to receive financial aid. The research groups are very important. They have a seminary twice a year. At the beginning of the year they talk about conferences students would like to attend. This way there is more accountability because it is not only written in the students' individual plan, it is also shared with their peers.

Maybe there should be more support for students to build their independence. For example, in my experience, activities such as seeking international cooperation, some students think it is not what they should be doing. Also, it could be beneficial for PhDs to have Bachelor and Master students in groups so that they can help with collecting data.

Question:

On attraction of legal practice relative to an academic career: is the main difference economic? How could this be improved apart from increasing funding for scholarship?

Law Student 1, Faculty of Law:

Almost every PhD student is in a full-time employment as an assistant to a judge, as a candidate to the bar. It is difficult to say to the students not to do it when most academics do it as well as the difference in remuneration is so high between practice and academia.

Many professors have never had any grants because they are sufficiently paid by their practice. They do not have international connections because they have never time to travel abroad. They cannot properly help students to develop these connections. So, students themselves have to figure out how to submit proposals.

There are few exceptions, but the student believes this description applies to the majority.

Student at Faculty of Physical Education and Sport:

The student agrees with the previous student. They would never go on to study a PhD because of their military background. When they wanted to do a PhD, they were denied this opportunity by their commander. However, at CU the student was offered a PhD Primus grant and without it the student's salary would be much lower than in the army. It became possible therefore to leave the military. The student thinks the research teams should always try to find a research grant to fund a PhD otherwise it is difficult to live on insufficient PhD money. Otherwise students need to work outside academia.

Law Student 2, Faculty of Law:

The student has combined a PhD with a full-time job. The student had a job before joining the PhD programme and then the opportunity to do a PhD came along.

There are two reasons why the student is combining the two. One of them is a financial.

The student is aware that more activity to apply for more research money would be beneficial but there is no time for that due to his full-time employment. However, the student's work is connected to the topic of the PhD which is sport law, anti-doping law and he works for the National Olympic Committee. The student does not regard the combination of study and work ideal and knows it cannot be sustained for a long period. The student realises that the private practice will have to be reduced or abandoned in order to concentrate on academia because the student wants to improve research skills and wants to apply for a grant. Has a plan to teach because he enjoys teaching. The student would like to teach in the future and does not want to do simultaneously research, teaching and full-time legal practice.

Question:

Do you think that your PhD is recognised as a good PhD or not? Are PhD students recognised as highly qualified and well trained? Is your training well regarded by various parties such as in work environment etc?

Psychology Student 1, Faculty of Arts:

First year PhD student: On the national level Charles University is highly regarded, so PhD on the national level is well recognised, not sure on the international level, though.

Question

With regard to your national career recognition would anyone like to add something?

Law Student 1, Faculty of Law:

The student has been to Max Planck Institute, Leiden, Cambridge and other institutes and thinks neither CU nor the Faculty of Law is well known. So, it is rather about the specific project or quality of research. CU itself does not carry any particular significance in this respect.

Student at Faculty of Physical Education and Sport:

The student has recently returned from the USA, the University of Pittsburgh's neuromuscular research laboratory where they spent 9 months. The student went there through a contact made at a conference with a researcher from Pittsburgh University. After 2 months of work there they started to work as a research assistant and after 4-5 months they were offered opportunities to do more important work including leading the testing. Perhaps it takes a time but then they realise that we are OK ("we" from CU).

Student of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities

The group's or the supervisor's prestige means a lot. The student thinks the studies at CU prepared the student well, but some colleagues would probably disagree because they seem to lack confidence. This seems to be the case mainly because they have to study and work as well and some of them started family and while others cannot see themselves as successful.

The student's PhD is in comparative cognitive psychology, but they work part-time with colleagues at the Institute of Mental Health and the colleagues are in different areas in psychology. The student enjoys working there and it helps financially.

The graduates will be recognisable once they show some (good) results of work. Otherwise, a student needs to be backed by a good name of someone from the department where they come from.

Question:

Do you think there might be improvements in PhD courses and study? I mean, other than internationalisation? More relating to training and organisation?

Psychology Student 2, Faculty of Arts:

Student in the last year before submission.

The student would welcome more team work involving both students and scholars. Thinks that older students can help to younger students, share opportunities and ideas. This should be more developed.

Students meet three times during a semester to share the latest developments in their research but for Student 2 it is not a sufficient format.

Student 2's PhD is in organisational psychology and this is a very small team so more opportunities to meet with students and staff would be welcome.

Student of Psychology, Faculty of Education:

The student was looking for an internship abroad this year but has not succeeded. I think I will go abroad with Erasmus Programme but there has been only one opportunity suitable and available for me to apply. I have to go now because I also have a job to do.

Law Student 2, Faculty of Law:

Team work with students and professors.

The best experience was a PhD workshop where students could meet with other students, present their and discuss other students' research. However, it was not organised by the Faculty but by the Association for European Comparative Law.

Similar events would be welcome if they were organised by the Faculty of Law or by the University in order to exchange ideas.

To have the possibility to exchange ideas and receive feedback from others is something Student 2 would welcome.

Law Student 1, Faculty of Law:

Bonuses for publishing in high impact journals have been previously mentioned by Deans. I think sometimes the faculty try to do a good thing, but they need to better adapt it to the needs of PhD students.

For instance, at the Faculty of Law good bonuses for publications were introduced but authors receive the reward the following year in September after the publication was printed. It may take 3 or 4 years for the print article to appear and significantly diminishes the benefits of this system for PhD students.

Question:

What about call for papers not only in Czechia but all over Europe? Or the US? Is it something advisable in Prague or not? Or it is not relevant?

Law Student 1, Faculty of Law:

Yes, some participate, depends on the department, some Heads are interested, and some are almost not at all interested in publishing abroad.

Psychology Student 1, Faculty of Arts:

The student is at the beginning of their PhD, but they have recently received funding from a specific student research fund which also funds publications and is paid upfront for students who need to publish.

Student of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities:

The student is surprised by some of the things other students said before.

The student believes that there are not enough incentives for students to publish.

The student does not understand that other students say about their supervisors not helping them to secure grants. Because in this student's research group the situation is different (better).

The student always thought that it was important for the supervisors to have successful students.

Law Student 1, Faculty of Law:

At the Department of Criminal Law no external funding is available other than from the University level.

Question:

Do you think they are not interested or they apply but do not succeed? In Italy, for instance, criminal law departments are also less inclined to apply for research funding.

Law Student 1, Faculty of Law:

The student believes that plays a role, but also nobody at the Faculty of Law trains PhD students in grant applications and the staff were not trained either.

The staff often work (outside the Faculty), as a result of which they do not have a track record of successful grant bidding and often they do not have time to develop proposals.

Psychology Student 2, Faculty of Arts:

It takes time to write a proposal and scholars have also other academic duties and because the salaries are low, they have to work elsewhere too. It is about priorities.

Student 1 of Psychology, Faculty of Arts

From the first moment PhD students were encouraged to apply for grants such as CU grants. More guidance on this would be appreciated.

PANEL SCI:

Chemistry, Physics:

Loeser: We want to find out about the structure of research and the institutions. There are conceptual questions that we have.

Lohse: How this structure of research came about? What was the rationale behind it? Is it dynamic according to you?

Trlifaj: The structure goes back to the concept of habilitation and professorship areas and to the structure of research fields according to WoS created by Vice-Rector Konvalinka and Mr. Popelka.

Petrusek: We have more research fields in the area of chemistry than in the area of experimental biology.

Lohse: What are your plans and obstacles in the research structure?

Baumruk: In Physics we have 40 different departments. It is a historical structure, but flexible and there are overlaps between them. Our research plans are divided according to the money we receive from the university. Main grants that we get come from GAČR and TAČR. We have a vision what we want to do. E.g. we also have operational grants which consist of two different teams.

Trlifaj: We have a conservative structure. Traditional areas are supported.

Feldmann: Are there problems with space for your research? Is it an obstacle if you have to do research in two different places?

Němec: We have to do research in different spaces but that is normal at university which is divided into different faculties and different teams which get their grants from different sources. Different spaces do complicate things but there is a lot of cooperation within the faculty anyway.

Feldmann: How did the structure of the advisory board come about?

Nachtigall: We are happy to have a lot of international members in the advisory board. But the question for us remains how to get excellent Ph.D. students.

Zschech: Is there a problem with IT protection in your field of research?

Nachtigall: It is the basic research that is important for us and not the applied research. We have a very traditional structure.

Feldmann: How come Biochemistry field is part of the Chemistry field?

Němec: This is due to the traditional structure that we have since the 1970s. Biochemistry is considered to be a different section.

Kratochvíl: Our research system is based on excellent people and not on research fields. Formal procedures to change the research structure are complicated. The initiative for such a change should start from below at the faculty and only then should be approved by the academic senate. The only such change happened in the Department of Computer Science as far as I can remember.

Petrusek: Formal change in the faculty structure is a very complicated procedure which has to be agreed upon by the senate. But a change of research groups is a common thing, e.g. within the grants of Primus, ERC etc. Overall, we still have very traditional and rigid structures.

Vaněk: There are programs of cooperation between different departments of biochemistry and there are overlaps. This structure has historical origins. Whereas we look more at the molecules, other departments have a more general approach. Biochemistry has only little cooperation with Biocev. I personally think it should be linked more to Biocev.

Lohse: Are there problems with space for research?

Baumruk: There is an ongoing project of Kampus Albertov which should unite physicists, chemists and biochemists in the future. But still we have three years to go for its completion.

Nachtigall: In our grants we report directly to MŠMT and not the university because we receive the financial support directly from the Ministry. We have to report every 6 months. There are milestones and goals to build new infrastructure. We have already built new laboratories from these grants. With the help of these grants we want to reach for new research environments and new people.

Feldmann: Are the analytical facilities in Chemistry sufficient?

Němec: There are two central laboratories in the chemistry section. We have a good collaboration with MFF and with AVČR. Our main needs are saturated. But the problem with space remains.

Baumruk: Research instruments are shared among different departments in the Physics section. Our facilities are comparable with those in the West.

Lohse: The international cooperation section in the report is very convincing. Do you have more wishes?

Trlifaj: There is a 4EU+ Research structure system at the rectorate which helps with the networking. We already have cooperation with some universities from Ivy League.

Lohse: Is the cooperation with AVČR good for you?

Baumruk: The point is that AVČR does not have Ph.D. students so we have our Ph.D. students that actually work there.

Petrusek: We have a cooperation with AVČR but there is also a lot of competition.

Lohse: Do Ph.D. students have access to AVČR laboratories and do they teach?

Petrusek: They do teach but a direct access to the laboratories of AVČR is based on individual cooperation in projects.

Kratochvíl: There are formal agreements with institutes of AVČR. Doctoral programs are organized together with AVČR, they also supervise students but the Ph.D. students have to have a contract if they want to teach.

Němec: Cooperation in the field of chemistry is common and necessary. It is also attractive for the students.

Baumruk: We share instruments of research with MFF and PŘF.

Zschech: I suggest you try to apply for the larger consortia in the future. There you will be able to get more money.

Feldmann: Do you think that the support from administration of the university is sufficient?

Němec: The main activities come from the faculties, not from the university. E.g. at our faculty applicants get support when they apply for the ERC grant.

Nachtigall: In the past we participated in the 7FP grants. It was not easy to receive a grant in the EU frameworks. We have to try again and again.

Zschech: At Fraunhofer Institute we have a success rate of 17% when applying for these grants.

Petrusek: The main initiative has to come from the faculty. The university cannot help much in expertise and research connections. We cooperate with people that we already know.

Lohse: Why is it that the success rates of hiring academics and students are limited? Can you state a reason for that?

Trlifaj: Erasmus and Primus grants help academics and students from abroad to take part in research at our faculty. But there are obstacles in

Czech law that does not recognize foreign academic titles here.

I can think of an example of one excellent researcher who was interested in one of the academic positions that we have offered, but because of Czech law he did not qualify and so went to find another place abroad.

Lohse: (to Ph.D. students) Is there something that should improve according to you? Are you happy with the way your Ph.D. theses are being supervised?

Votavová: For each Ph.D. student there is a supervisor who is ready to help with every question of the studies. That is the case with other students in other departments as well.

Eva: I am the only Ph.D. student in the department of analytical chemistry. I have different consultants at the faculty and at AVČR who help me. It is not the main task for the supervisor.

Kasal: There is no problem with the supervisors. We discuss our tasks with them.

Zschech: Are there any requirements from the supervisors at the start of the Ph.D studies concerning e.g. the number of articles in peer review journals that should be published by Ph.D. students every year?

Votavová: There are requirements that come from the faculty, e.g. each Ph.D. student has to publish 2 papers (1st as the main author and 2nd as co-author) and also each student should spend several months abroad, which is strongly required but not obligatory.

Veselý: And also you have to at least once apply for a grant during your Ph.D. studies.

Feldmann: Do you have enough time to finish your Ph.D. studies? Is part-time Ph.D. possible?

Votavová: Ph.D. students are struggling financially. Usually they have another job, so for a lot of them there is not enough time for their studies. A lot of students end up in the companies where they used to work during their studies. There is in fact a kind of competition between the university and the companies.

Mathematics and Computer Science:

Q concerning international visitors:

Do you consider the number of international visitors sufficient, are there budget concerns?

DS: happy, budget enough, foreign post docs; they are fine; visitors come from Dresden, Linz, from US.

Unnamed man Math

analysis: We are able to fund visitors with joined grants, people are mostly from Europe and also from the U.S.

MT: happy, visitors collaborate on publication; could be always better; part of their small departments is international.

MK: one semester or one year in the past they always have visitors paid from grants; very fruitful; collaborators on publications; they are short of desks, for short time many visitors.

Q: Are you satisfied with reciprocally visiting foreign research institution, do you have funding for it, also for conferences?

DS: depends on department grants from GAČR mainly. Without it they would have problems.

Unnamed: Happy

MK: also very happy; they have money.

Ondrej Bojar (CU MFF): they are

happy, have money, visitors - good situation for short time visits, for longer stay it is difficult with competitive salary - salaries within the UK are much lower, employment difficult.

J Sgall computer science: short term visits OK; long term visits difficult with competitive salaries; sometimes visa. Outgoing visits, grants are OK, sabbatical do not happen as frequently as they would like to.

Jan Rataj: agrees with colleagues short term

fine; longer stays difficult sabbaticals one time in six years is the rule of the faculty, post docs now for second time (one year with a reasonable salary).

Q Industrial engagements, collaborations with industry, if not why, would you like to collaborate on research?

MKulich: with banks and insurance companies; topics of masters theses; pharma companies on coronavirus topic: PhD topic with Johnson and

Johnson. We are interested doing it more. Sometimes it is difficult with Czech companies who are not used to it, foreigners are and there are also administrative hurdles.

Miroslav Tůma: some coallaboration but not much.

Q: So would you say that in your country there is not a big tradition of collaboration between industry and academia?

Unnamed: from the group of modelling who does analysis: it is not a tradition but they have two collaborations and fund two PhDs from this money.

Q Probability

and statistics how do you define your future research direction? data science to attract good students and collaborators?

MKulich: not sure about data science meaning, but statistics is important part of it; they are changing courses so that data science is a part of it but not separate data science course. They are good in their field, ideally they would like to hire people for it but it is difficult to find someone, but people from abroad is difficult because of financial reason, possible to hire an assistant professor, but after that not because of habilitation.

Dan Kral: now it is possible to hire extraordinary professor?

Jan Trlifaj comments to it: it is improvement but not enough because this person has to be approved by the rector of the university and by scientific council of university so if you are opening a position you also have to start the process of approval of the position by the university, it works in very special cases but it is not a solution of the problem.

Jan

Kratochvíl: the law is such that these extraordinary professors cannot guarantee the study programs; they would need to have habilitation.

Q LVega: would like to know the relation between the Institute of Mathematics and the rest of the faculty of Mathematics and what is the relation to other institutes and Academy of Science?

Jan Rataj: it is a bit misleading but it has historic reasons; it is on the same level as other departments at the faculty; we have collaboration as the other departments with Academy of Sciences.

We have overlaps with other departments.

LV: Does this organisation create any problems, is it well organised?

Jan Rataj: we have separate budgets.

Libor Barto does computer science

but is at the department of algebra, personally thinks the division of departments does not make sense, it only has historic reasons.

Abramsky says that in the UK the department covers or has a sort of overview of the whole discipline and here it is more like a research group within a department; he wonders if this relates to the earlier point about direction....

In the UK you would have something like a research committee and department which would be a forum where it could be said: here are the new areas which should be covered by our department, there are opportunities coming up and should the department expand what should be covered and it is easier to do it on this level when you oversee the whole discipline at one time? So he just wonders how this works in your structure?

Jiri Sgall: Departments have developed historically.

More as in the German system of "Lehrschule"? One professor funds a group and then expands. Most of the time research directions are decided on departmental level or the grant agency level. The best way to start a grant and is a research group.

Mirko Rokyta (Vice dean for mathematics) the basic unit is the school of mathematics; may be a good idea to re-organise but a question is whether reorganise the whole school or always according to the new project. With new projects people always re-organise, also the financial part of it. Academic positions with tenures are decided by the whole school of mathematics and are partially financed by the school of maths. Purely scientific positions which are almost all financed by grants are decided by the departments with grants. The structure often works but may be restructured in the future.

Jan Trlifaj (Vice dean for research) Our structure is different from University of Manchester which I know now and I understand that from that point of view our departments are more like research groups that in some cases last for a long time and their research varies. This structure is good for continuing in the established areas but in terms of going in a new direction, it is more difficult. **JT** finds this point important and thanks for raising this point. I would like to mention that going in new direction ERC and Primus grants help.

MR agrees that the new people and new directions are gathering around the new grants.

Q:

Francois Loeser whether exist joint activity between math and computer science departments together (seminars etc.)?

Libor Barto No interaction with other school of maths, modest with computer science, it is very modest, partially the problem is that the buildings are far away from each other so we meet at conferences.

David Stanovský we have a joint program on study level, masters programme.

FL computation linguistics unusual because I cannot think of any similar other structure consisting of computer science and linguistics, which belongs to a different structure. Is the fact that it belongs to computer science positive or not?

JS this happened historically; people from philosophy migrated. I think it works well, there are groups at both faculties. They do interact on different research subjects as well.

Ondrej Bojar very happy about the organisation of computer linguistics within computer science; doing solid research in linguistics; you need good computational power and to harness that power you need good background in computer science.

We have PhDs from our own department but also from Faculty of arts; it is the same PhD degree but students from different faculties, we collaborate with the Faculty of arts.

They need this collaboration as the methods of translation approach slowly; similarity with human translation, we need to know what they think...

Q Do you plan to participate in Erasmus Mundus Programme?

JS we only participate in computer science

JT yes in linguistics

OB yes we are a part of double master programme, it is very common that we have students doing masters for a year. Don't have the numbers but we possibly have more foreign students than Czech, at least half and half.

Q FL for other groups do you plan the same?

Unnamed: Yes we are starting to prepare a joint degree in applied maths with Warsaw, Heidelberg, Sorbonne; we may extend to computer maths and modelling. School of maths young people, assist professor also several candidates, foreigners win. I think the direction is good.

Organisation at School of Maths. I thought about it 10 years ago
- now is time to discuss if to change it or not.

FL the aim is to make

CU competitive at European level, what do you think is the main thing that should be done?

Ondrej Bojar:

It is the number of native speakers who are able to provide high level of English to tell the story.

Jan Trlifaj Two weaknesses mentioned in the self evaluation report: Low number of international professors and low impact of publications. We need to open the international programmes to foreign students.

Mirko Rokyta we do not have a whole programme in English but most are 30 % taught in English. Students also come to study from abroad to study in Czech and take advantage of seminars and examinations in English.

We are having problems with hiring professors because of the earlier mentioned constraints but we hire assistant professors for tenure track. Since 2014 we hired 28 people on tenure positions out of which 40 per cent are from abroad and speak English.

Dan Král question of absence of native speakers? Can you explain?

Ondrej Bojar may be just

my personal impression. Passing the review procedure when paragraphs do not have the right structure they are filtered out and the message is not understood by the reviewer. Native speakers are needed to shape the story of the article.

Michal Koucký (TCS IUU) completely disagrees; we don't have problems with publishing in top magazines.

Jiří Sgall thinks it may be a little specific to computer linguistics.

PhD questions:

Q Are you happy with your studies; do you feel well supervised; what should improved?

Student 1: I am happy, good supervisors, more than enough money to study abroad. I want to stay also home because of personal reason. Computer linguistic courses are very popular and helpful to computer scientists.

Student 2: happy but also welcomes international students to develop collaboration. I can very often go to conferences but it is hard to start collaboration there.

I get to know people, more senior people, but juniors would be good. Since the beginning of my Ph.D. studies I participated only on one summer school.

Student 3: also happy, strongly supported. In my group I am working; we PhDs have a lot of opportunities. The only problem is the stipend.

Dan Král the stipend is low but university provides extra support. Do you also receive something from the faculty?

Student 3: yes we get this support from the department. I am not forced to teach but I enjoy it and get some more fundings for it.

IVega your opinion on international relations?

Student 3: I am from a small department, we are in close touch with Danish and German universities.

Student 4: I am different, I am senior postdoc in computation neuroscience; started new discipline. I feel very supported; school of informatics is very supportive. I completed my postdoc and already obtained funding for the future. Obstacles: the level of salaries for the Primus programme - a Czech source, foreign salaries from programmes are triple. Structure of departments. Ph.D. students need to pass some exams which are in discipline boxes. This may be a problem for computer neuroscience.

Q: Are you anxious about your future? What is your plan in your country or abroad?

Student 1: I would like to stay in academia. I do not have any particular plans. I am at the beginning of my studies.

Student 3: I am focusing on staying abroad in Denmark for a few months. I like academia. But to combine it with a family is a tough task. I am focusing on short term goals now.

Student

2: finishing next year; looking around, maybe will go abroad, perhaps Ohio State University which he knows.

Biology, Geology and Environmental Sciences:

Konarska: What are the most difficult aspects of establishing labs in Biology?

Petrusek: Space is the main limiting factor. When you lack space, you cannot hire people even if you receive faculty funding. A major expansion is a tough task for us. We fight for every square meter.

Frouz: In our centre we are not limited by space because we do not work in labs. Our major problem is lack of financial sources. We are 90% funded from grants.

Palková: We built new infrastructure along with Biocev so lack of space is not a limiting factor for us. It is the lack of financial resources that is a problem. You are also well aware that to publish in top journals takes a lot of time. We receive grants usually for a three-year period.

Frouz: To receive the funding is time consuming.

A half of financial resources for research come from EU grants.

Mašín: We experience two problems. First is the amount of money that Ph.D. students receive in their scholarships, which is not competitive. Second is a lack of language skills of senior lecturers.

But we have lectures in English for long-term positions. In case of short-term position there is usually no problem.

Frouz: The salaries are

not the main problem. It is rather the lack of welcoming service for newcomers at university. We would very much appreciate that.

Petrusek: There is a new centre at university that deals with these matters. Staff Welcome Centre.

Derek: Czech language training for the newcomers from abroad would help.

But there is always someone in the administration who speaks English.

Palková: A lot of information is already in both languages, Czech and English.

Konarska: How many groups at your faculties do not have grants at all?

Frouz: In our centre it is only the secretary who receives money from university. All other employees receive money from grants.

Petrusek: A lot of employees receive money only from university and have no grants at all.

But research groups cannot survive without grants. If they don't have them, they have to shrink.

Žárský: To hire a new employee for an academic position is quite a complicated process.

Konarska: Do you have some kind of allowance for researchers who do not teach?

Žárský: We have a system of permanent positions, which is a problem for personnel mobility.

Friis: Do researchers teach? Are there any limits for them for that matter?

Petrusek: Not all researchers teach but they usually want to teach. Pi's of grants should e.g. not teach more than 10 hours a week. Researchers are usually not overloaded with teaching.

Konarská: Is there a system that helps researchers who suddenly do not have a grant to overbridge that period?

Mašín: It is up to the head of the department to overcome that period without grants.

In the meantime they (researchers) should be involved in teaching.

Konarska: What is your perception of completeness of every research area at your faculties?

Žárský: We want to specialise. We are not aiming at covering all areas of research. We do not have problems with single - purpose labs if they are well internationally connected.

Palková: We have a nice cooperation with Biocev. We share the same building with them.

Petrusek: We cannot teach the complete fields of studies if we do not do research.

Palková: There are also methodological aspects to this.

Konarska: I have a question for junior scientists. What is your perspective in your research activities? What is your personal experience? What hampers your work? How do you see your future research chances?

Pánek: First problem for us is a lack of space. Teams usually have to share their labs. Salaries went high in the past but it was not the case of science. In the past it was almost impossible to hire a Ph.D. student for a permanent academic position. But now there are programs like Primus which help.

Foreign researcher (name not visible): There is a lack of tenure track system, which could be attractive. Labour markets usually offer better-paid positions so it is quite a challenge to find new (local) researchers.

Petrusek: We do not have the tenure track system.

To find a good external candidate for a research position from ČR is a problem. We have to try harder.

Friis: A lot of Ph.D. students do not study full-time. Is it a problem that there are some who study full-time and some only part-time?

Petrusek: Yes that is a major problem. 50% of

Ph.D. students fail in their studies. All the departments should do their best to support their students.

Konarska: Do the students tend to stay at university as post-docs or do they leave?

Petrusek: It depends. I can think of an example of one student who stayed after completion of his Ph.D. studies and was successful in receiving grants afterwards. Others go abroad. There are also people who leave science altogether.

Mašín: That is not a problem in our case. Our students usually get permanent positions at the faculty. But there are problems with language skills.

Petrusek: Sometimes it is a problem to include English lectures in Czech language programmes.

Derek: I think that foreign researchers need more support. Sometimes it is a problem to understand all the administrative information.

Lexa: Most master courses in Geology are taught in English. That is not a problem.

Friis: Do you have a problem with space in Geology?

JR: That is not a problem. I can see lack of funding as the major problem.

Ettler: Now we look forward to a new campus that should be finished in a couple of years. It should also include new laboratories.

Mašín: We are currently in the old faculty building. There is also a temporary building which is now going to be demolished.

Friis: Do you have a good collaboration with the National Museum?

Ettler: Yes we do, we cooperate with them a lot.

Žák: We have a very good cooperation with the National Museum.

Friis: How did you collect data for your peer reviews? How did you select your outputs regarding the bibliometric data?

Ettler: We cover all the disciplines that should be taught. We collaborate with all the possible institutions and see if they are better than we are and then share our knowledge.

Friis: Do you have a publishing strategy that could improve the university ranking? Do you think it is better to publish more or to publish in better quality journals?

Mašín: There is certainly pressure to publish in more quality journals.

Frouz: Researchers in our institution have a lot of deliverables in the grants. The point is that they have to concentrate on publishing.

Weinzettel: The main task is to secure the funding. To publish an article in a top journal takes a lot of time. That is why we have a motivating system for the researchers to publish. It is also the Ph.D.'s who need to publish.

Konarska: Do you as Ph.D. students write your theses in Czech or in English? And are the courses in Czech or in English?

Magdalena: Bachelor thesis and master thesis are usually written in Czech. A lot of Ph.D. theses are written in English. Ph.D. students do not have to attend courses. It is not obligatory. But they can do that or even attend master courses.

Lucie: It is more or less the same thing at our faculty.

Příbylová: We have to write 3 papers during our Ph.D. studies. First and second as the main author and the third as co-author. There is not much time for that. Besides we have to write the main theses. Most Ph.D. students study for approximately 6,5 years. On average a lot of people leave their studies because of lack of money.

Konarska: Do you have to publish just for the sake of it?

Příbylová: It also depends on the supervisor but there are these requirements from the faculty.