

Selected results of focused group discussions organised within the FA UWB HR Award GAP analysis

Author: Laco Toušek, PhD (Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Arts, University of West Bohemia)

Introduction

A requirement of the HR Award, which FA UWB aims for, is the implementation of principles set in the *European Charter for Researchers* (“Charter”) and the *Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers* (“Code”). The implementation consists of multiple steps, the first of which is an analysis of the management and care of human resources (the GAP analysis). For this purpose, a questionnaire survey took place among the employees of FA UWB from February to March 2019.

In order to interpret and elaborate selected findings of this survey, two two-hour focused group discussions took place in June 2019. The participants of the discussions were eight male and ten female researchers with various work loads and types of contracts (fixed-term or permanent contracts). Each of the ten departments at FA UWB was represented by two people, except for the Department of Sociology and Department of Romance Languages, which were both represented by one person. Heads of departments and faculty management were deliberately excluded from the discussion.

The content of the discussions was based on topics from the Charter, the Code, and the *Overview of results of a questionnaire survey within the GAP analysis related to HR Award – FA*. Considering the wide range of issues covered by the Charter and Code, not all topics were given the same scope; an emphasis was put on topics that can be considered significant and relevant on the faculty level.

The analysis of data (discussion transcriptions) was based on a qualitative thematic content analysis with a focus on critical points of a given issue. Findings presented below and supported by quotations from the discussions do not necessarily cover the whole scope of the opinions but focus on the identified deficiencies and discrepancies, in accordance with the GAP analysis. The quotations are intentionally anonymised and modified so that the possibility to identify their authors is minimised. Some statements could not be sufficiently anonymised without losing their original sense; therefore, in exceptional cases, some findings are not supported by quotations.

General findings

Problems in the area of human resources and the care thereof was generally understood to be a consequence of insufficient funding of universities or the way of science and research evaluation in the Czech Republic. According to the discussion participants, an optimum quality cannot be achieved without changes in this area neither on the university level, nor within the faculty or individual departments. With respect to the purpose of the discussions, this issue was not developed in more detail.

Opinions discovered about the key topics relating to human resources which are a matter of the faculty, or university, itself were contradictory in several ways. Differences in opinions appeared not only among departments and within departments, but also on a personal level. In the first case, they were caused mainly by the different nature of the individual workplaces due to professional specifics but also the extent of autonomy available to the individual departments or their heads in the HR area.

I think, if I may, that this is very different among departments. I can't agree at all with what you say because I can see differences among departments, and it seems to me that this all depends a lot on the head's position and on how they set up the workplace. I don't think we can generalize about the whole faculty.

The role of the department's head in relation to key topics (work loads, contracts, evaluation, ethics, research freedom, etc.) appeared to be essential and ambivalent. That was the cause of different (in some cases entirely opposite) opinions among workers from the same department but also of contradictions within various statements of individual people. The ambivalent understanding of the head's position was based on their potentially limitless decision-making, which can lack transparency and form and can be based on personal relationships without checking procedures. However, some of the participants argued that the position of the head of department required a "strong representation" which could "shape the workplace" and achieve results for which they would answer to the faculty management above all.

For a long time, I have advocated the opinion that a head of department should be a position limited by time, in which the individual members of the department would rotate. I've seen this work in places where the management changes every four years. [...] The system we have here in the Czech Republic, that we have here at our faculty, is wrong because it makes people sure that once they are appointed at their position, they can stay for a long time and if they are politically and socially capable, they are basically irremovable. It's a position with a huge impact. They make decisions about the budget and the staff. They don't have any supervisor who would check their decisions. Except for the dean but we know that often doesn't work. This is the most important thing that I can think about in the HR area.

That [time limit on the position of the head of department] would be terrible for us. We beg and pray that everything stays as it is. That the heads and deputies stay as they are [...].

It doesn't necessarily have to be a change of management but, let's say, a term of office, maybe not by election but by appointment; at the end of the term, there would be a check whether the same person should stay in charge or someone else. I really know from my own experience that the department may find itself in such a situation when the head of department is really not right and there are too few means of solving that.

You're right, we're simply lucky that we don't have such a desire or pressure at the moment, we are very content but I can understand that when there is a problem, there is no solution.

It doesn't even have to be a change of management. What I mean is that once something, even though convenient for me, is based solely on my individual agreement with a specific person, it's subject to various personal relationships. It's not anything guaranteed. For example, that the head doesn't schedule my classes during evening hours depends only on their graciousness and I don't think that's right because it can be subject to all manners of personal influences [...].

The only way that is being applied and that works is to politically unite with the dean and remove the person from office by force. That seems to me the worst way possible because it's not transparent.

I don't really have such problems but that depends on my individual agreement with the department's head. If my relationship with the head were bad, I don't get any support.

It [personal management of the department] is done on a personal level but I don't complain. It's really because I have great management but if that changed, there wouldn't be any means.

I'm content, it seems fine to me. But if there [at the head's position] were someone else...

Generally, it can be said that the identified disagreements, which are further developed in relation to the individual principles of the Charter and Code, suggest a non-systemic, non-transparent, and individually focused management and care of human resources. This aspect, supported by quotations given above and

below, was identified as the main (except for insufficient funding) critical point by the participants, including those who wouldn't see it as a current issue or complain about it but who would have a personal or mediated past experience. Researchers with a permanent, full-time contract and friendly relationships with their superiors were less critical, or disapproving.

[...] Since we discussed the superiors' positions, I think [...] that we really can't complain. But personal relationships can, of course, play a role. [...] For example, I have known my superior for many years but I was scolded more by this one than the previous one.

[...] In the past, I have seen [a problematic decision by the head of department] regarding one project. That has to be said. At the moment, [after a change of management] it's fixed at our department. That's because we established regular meetings where all staff are present and transparency started to work.

Our meetings take place about twice a year and they tell us we shouldn't use the lift in case of fire. Information like that. Nothing about the department's direction, the budget development... I have no idea about those things and I don't have a way to find out because nobody talks to me about that.

Regarding the non-systemic, non-transparent, and individually based procedures, however, some posed the question whether it is possible to achieve standardisation and formalisation without reducing "academic freedom", which they see as the main advantage of their profession and the reason they do it. They were further worried if formalisation of procedures would not increase the already "unbearable bureaucracy", for which reason they contradicted their own opinions.

[Formalisation] will increase the problematic load on us and our superiors. We'll have yet another form that will distract us from our creative work. It seems to me there is too much bureaucracy we have to deal with. That it could be reduced considerably and more things could be based on oral agreement between the department management and employees. Any effort, at least from my point of view, would bring yet another rule, yet another form.

Another contradictory point appearing throughout the discussed topics was the work load and performance expected from researchers. In this case, the contradiction consisted mainly in that, on the one hand, the participants pointed out that the demands placed on them explicitly or implicitly are at or beyond the limit of what is achievable in the given conditions. On the other hand, some of them held the view that only maximum performance can lead to personal success or the success of the workplace they represent.

The load is immense. Personally, I can't complain because I have currently a really low work load. But with full-time teaching and research in addition, one doesn't have a chance to do any research work systematically. Only during the exam period or in the summer, during holiday.

I think this is a stereotype we have in our heads. The idea that a good academic is the one working day and night. In fact, the quality of professional work doesn't have to correlate with that. I can see on myself that since I've been working with low work load, the quality of my pedagogic work has improved immensely. [...] It's not true that when one slows down their pace, they do a worse job. They do less work but this work can be better and keep improving.

I'm used to working 12, 14 hours a day. I don't really mind that much. It's not sustainable in the long run [...], but I'm not different from my colleagues in this matter.

The problem is how the system is set up. A good employee is the one working day and night. The one who keeps travelling abroad and lives only for his or her work.

I think the academic environment is too performance-oriented. I have colleagues, including men, who have families. I know cases where both the man and the woman are academic workers and I feel really sorry for them because when you have two, three kids, it's almost impossible to handle.

Selected topics from the Charter

Freedom of research

Freedom of research was not one of the main topics, except for its limitations caused by insufficient funding and the way of evaluating science and research, i.e. structural causes beyond the faculty or university level. There was an exceptional past experience when a research project could not be realized after a disapproval by the head of department; this disapproval was seen as biased and based on personal antipathy, without a chance of appealing to the faculty management. See above more details on this critical point.

Ethical code, professional responsibility and approach

The problem of breaching the ethical procedures, ethical code, and professional responsibility by academic workers was being associated with the past. This was not understood as a result of successful enforcement of the ethical code by the university or faculty but as a result of staff changes and changes in the area of academic work as a whole or within a field. A bigger problem was seen in the formation of citation cartels and intentional avoidance of citing competing departments. Furthermore, in the failure of following the ethical code by the students, which was seen as the result of idleness on the part of the university, namely legal department, caused by fear of potential legal disputes.

Maybe the times have changed. Things used to be usual and aren't anymore. The publication of one and the same text in Czech and in English and so on. Today this is considered a problem.

It depends on the field a lot. In our field, the publications are so specific that any plagiarism would be discovered really fast. I don't know but I think that so many things are published in other fields that it blends better, it's simply hidden.

Personally, I don't think that plagiarism and autoplagerism is such an issue as it used to be. I don't really see it myself. But the problem now are citation cartels. However, we can hardly suggest any systemic change that would get rid of those.

I don't know the general situation but I know cases of appropriating work of doctoral students which hadn't been further developed and published. Those may be isolated cases, I don't know about that. I think that in such cases, doctoral students and basically any other researcher should have better means of protecting one's work. And what I think above all is that the lower place one has in the hierarchy, the worse means of protection they have.

We really are noticing intentional non-citing. I don't know the situation elsewhere but we have competition that doesn't cite us consistently and intentionally. These are completely objective cases but there's nothing we can do. The only thing we can do is not cite back.

Contractual and legal obligations, responsibility, and proper methods in research

The few mentions of these topics from the Charter were related to the impossibility of covering all of them for reasons of excessive workload, expertise, and duties that are unnecessarily transferred to administrative staff although the academic worker as the project researcher is the responsible person. In other words, there is a discrepancy, perceived by few, in that project researchers are responsible even for tasks which they cannot affect (due to insufficient authority, competence or capacity).

This is a big problem for me in my projects. The administrative load is huge and you have to constantly cooperate with several other university departments. And at the same time, there's nothing you do about it. Personally, I can't cover all that, even though it's my responsibility. Of course, I have a project administrator but s/he has to work with other departments, too. [...] I may be the one ordering operations but I can't make do without an administrator. It's impossible for me to communicate some specific inspection questions. They want some reports and facts that even I can't check.

Evaluation system, funding, and salaries

The evaluation system, meaning the evaluation of one's work performance as understood in the Charter, was rarely discussed. The reason was that the participants did not know how the system would be applied on the faculty level. More precisely, they mentioned the existence of career plans and that the obligations ensuing from those would not be insisted on as they are not actually feasible (due to the impossibility of planning, insufficient funds, etc.).

The evaluation system was being related rather to financial bonuses, which were understood as a real or potential critical point in the HR area. The participants' opinions differed depending on how financial bonuses were applied and distributed within their departments. The problem in this issue was identified in the bonuses forming a considerable part of one's salary and the fact that their distribution falls within the authority of the head of department without independent supervision, which can lead or leads to non-transparency.

The evaluation system is definitely non-transparent, in my opinion. Just, I don't know, but definitely non-transparent. If the head of department is the only one deciding about the work load or salary, where 60% is fixed and the rest is individual award ranging from 5 to even 50 thousand, it's highly non-transparent and, personally, I don't like that. I'd even support the salaries to be public.

I think that [financial remuneration] is completely non-transparent. It's hard to say if it's just or not if nobody knows the details.

As for our department, I must appreciate that systematic materials were made about the way awards are distributed and those were introduced to us. It's very transparent, everybody can do the math.

The boss gives clear criteria [for financial awards] and it seems fine to me. If there was someone else who gets to like someone and we give out bigger awards, s/he could do that.

...everybody knows how they're doing. But it's true it hasn't always been like that. Fortunately, I haven't experienced it but, before, the boss used to distribute the money so that someone got it and didn't know why, and someone didn't. This is the manager's business and responsibility. If anything like that happened, it wouldn't be a problem for me to go and see the dean to take care about it.

In comparison with the overall social situation or salaries in other areas, salaries were seen with criticism due to insufficient funding of universities. As a result of insufficient financial compensation together with the system of evaluating science and research, the participants felt pushed into excessive work performance or outputs based on quantity instead of quality. The employee benefits offered by the university caused amusement rather than being seen as tools providing decent social security as presented by the Charter.

When I pass a patisserie and see that my salary and the 70-crown meal voucher that I get is offered to temporary workers, these benefits make me laugh.

I used to work full-time but that was reduced because I got a grant by GAČR. I still teach the same hours but, as I got a project, I'd been duly punished. [...] No, it's no evil intention, it's just necessity. I said "punished" but that was a joke. It's about money, not evil intent. It's simply a necessity that we have to endure. I get it and if I was a manager, I'd do the same thing, I'd have to. There's no other way, no other solution [because of bad funding]. But I don't like it. Mainly because the project will end soon and I've got the feeling that they surely won't raise my hours again. [...] There's nothing we can do; it has to be done this way and we all have to agree because we want to survive. So it's about money, not any evil intention. [...] But it's not very nice, especially for skilful people who manage to get a project, because they have two or three times as much work as other colleagues who are lazy and get the same money. It's very demotivating.

A colleague is going to leave to teach the required time abroad and we will divide his/her work among ourselves. So it's expected of me to teach full-time and do research on top of that. But I also have another job beside that because I can't manage with a researcher's salary.

Regarding benefits, when I asked what benefits we had when we contribute to the cultural and social fund, we were told that we would get some Sodexo pass card after three years of employment.

This form of benefits makes me laugh. After two years we find flexi pass cards in the drawer that we haven't used. That's an unfortunate choice of form.

The greatest benefit is that I have flexible working hours. If they raised my normal salary by the worth of the meal vouchers, it would be the same.

Employment stability and permanence

In accordance with the Charter, the stability of employment was seen critically in connection with impermanent employment contracts, their duration limited to a fixed period of time, and work load. Besides insufficient funding and project-based employment contracts, which lead to insecure employment, there were further mentions of the specific role of the head of department. Such a role can lead to the assigning of working hours without transparency and form.

The work load one has and so on, that depends on personal relationships. People who go to yoga or have beer with their boss fare better. Who's friends with them knows what's going on; who doesn't interact with them on a personal level has no idea what's going on in the department.

The head of department who assigns [working hours] plays a huge role. I can see some danger in that. It depends on the person in the manager's position. This brings us back to the personal relationships. [...] When I see past and current management, I have to say the current management surprised me in that they are really trying to keep some balance.

That [employment contract] probably depends on personal relationships. More precisely, on the fact that someone didn't have a clear and strong vision so their safety measure were one-year contracts and they would wait and see after that year. I consider a one-year contract a big problem. I don't mind contracts for longer terms but one year, that's a problem.

Now I'm in a situation where I have the chance to stay on a permanent contract while I have dealt with temporary measures and insecurities for 12 years. That was a big uncertainty for me.

I've been here for 24 years and I've never had a contract for more than three years. Three years... and even that made me so happy. [...] I admit that none of the people close to me would believe that I still hadn't got a permanent contract after such a long time. And I won't even get in now since I'm basically retired.

Gender balance

Gender balance was one of the controversial topics discussed. As could be expected, women pointed out unequal gender conditions and opportunities more than men. A more critical viewpoint was taken by women who had experience with maternity and/or had a marginal position in the workplace regarding working hours or type of contract. With some exceptions, unequal conditions were seen as a result of indirect, structural causes, which, however, the faculty or university should and could equalize but does not do so consistently due to lack of information and knowledge. There was exceptional experience with repeated symbolic violence by men, either deliberate or unintentional. However, marginalisation in the workplace understood as a result of direct discrimination was mentioned as well.

It's probably not downright gender discrimination. From time to time, someone makes a stupid joke about all-powerful men and so on. It doesn't hurt me personally, I'm used to it, it can't harm me, they're not so impertinent with me. The jokes are rougher around others. I guess it depends on how each woman can deal with it.

That [denying gender inequality based on a lack of personal experience] takes place all the time. Personally, I can't complain in our faculty either. However, the moment I enter different parts of the university, I constantly meet with contempt and gender-related comments, quite intensively so. I think there's not enough awareness about the concepts of gender, direct discrimination or indirect discrimination, and that indirect discrimination can take many forms, some of which can be very serious. The awareness of that is insufficient and the management, now I'm not talking about the faculty but the university, isn't very active. It's not much of a topic, they don't take any stand. I don't see that in the faculty, there it depends on the individual staff members. But even that the individual employees can act very incorrectly when gender is concerned is related to the culture of the whole workplace, the university, to the fact that there are no norms that would be used to enforce the awareness about such things and that the individual employees wouldn't breach. So that my colleagues wouldn't go around saying that women should stay at home with kids and have no place in a workplace, that they wouldn't stop talking to them about research, asking just about the children, that they wouldn't deprive women of their position as researchers. All those are things that are very soft and inconspicuous but have a very intense impact.

It's true that the head of our department suddenly stopped talking to me about anything but the cot.

Gender stereotypes appeared more or less clearly even within some statements of the discussion participants themselves.

I admit I prefer working with female students. They're usually more careful and reliable than boys who sometimes simply don't care. I'd split the girls into two groups. One group would like a baby or a boyfriend and so they don't care about some academic sphere. And those who are ambitious, in my experience, for those the academic sphere is something like "you do your science here, I'll do my own thing and then move on to something better". [...] When I compare this to the boys' interest, boys are more interested in some ways, however smarter the girls may be in others. [...] In my opinion, the point [of gender imbalance] lies in that it's not attractive [for girls], that there are more boys who have it as a hobby while girls want a title, to graduate so that they can use it as a starting point for higher positions.

In relation to gender inequality, if admitted, unequal results rather than opportunities were pointed out (in this case also by men, with some exceptions). Furthermore, unequal results were seen as a consequence of "motherhood", not gender.

I may something a bit controversial now. But having children is a private matter and it also depends on what arrangements people make in their families. I know it may be easy to say, being a man. But I have a child myself and I dare say that I was involved quite a lot [in the upbringing]. I just don't think it's about choosing between a career or a child.

The starting position is the same but then it gets complicated mainly by short-term contracts when the woman chooses between her career and children.

I'd need some example [of gender inequality]. But I agree that this gender or womanhood is linked to maternity. Definitely in this sense because there are no conditions for women to have a career and take care of a child at the same time.

The reason is that it's basically about deciding to start a family or pursue a career. We are forced to top performance: teaching, publishing, doing grants and projects at nights... And of course, when a woman puts all this together, in the end she can focus only on one thing. It's very hard to combine with a family or the vision of starting one.

It's one thing for a woman to start a job, returnability is another. With focus on family comes the fear of instability, the contract, and the fact that you're out of the system for one to three years. If the manager accepts that you do zero research in that time.

There's also the financial aspect. Our rewards are dependent on publications within the last five years. For example, if I leave for two years [because of maternity leave], the publication gap will follow me for a few more years and I'll earn less money. The wage rate is so low that I think about this, too.

Regarding the obstacles that female employees with children can meet, insufficient support by the university was mentioned. However welcome the initiative of building a university kindergarten was, it was considered insufficient.

It would be enough for me to be able to leave my kid in a day care space for two hours when I go to a lecture. It doesn't have to be a kindergarten. It could be a room inside the building with one qualified person where I could leave my child for a limited period of time.

Mobility

The perception of mobility and its value was ambivalent. On the one hand, it was seen as positive and necessary, on the other hand sometimes as unnecessarily demanded and difficult to realize. Insisting on travelling abroad for example as a condition of reaching a higher academic rank or meeting the worker evaluation criteria was perceived negatively in such cases where research activities related solely to

domestic topics. Difficulties in putting mobility into practice were connected to excessive work load, the replaceability of workers in the department during their absence, and insufficient funding including its non-transparent distribution, but also to insufficient financial reward for workers who are supposed to practice mobility and combine it with their personal life. The approach was similar regarding a sabbatical, which is mentioned in the part of the Charter devoted to working conditions.

I find the funding system of mobility besides the Erasmus quite non-transparent. People draw funds for mobility primarily from their grants. Who doesn't have a grant can go to the head of department and ask them for money. But that's another individual decision. A British colleague of mine has such a system in the workplace where each person has their own box, their own travelling budget which they use at their own discretion. That's more transparent.

The way I do it [when travelling abroad] is that I try to delegate some things, like some seminars, to doctoral students and I compensate the rest. I travel in periods that include some holidays, I go in September before the lessons start, and during exam periods. [...] A sabbatical, half a year, a year, that would be a big problem. When I'm away for three weeks, I'm able to compensate that. But I can't compensate for half a year. So that's it.

It's a problem; more criteria to be met. "You haven't been teaching abroad for a year, you have to go somewhere." That frustrates me. I have several colleagues who go somewhere regularly for a week or two, to teach something pro forma, just for the sake of mobility. I don't see the sense in that. It won't improve my skills. For example, when I was in Slovenia, the students weren't interested at all and the professor who invited me had to apologise to me. And I thought why I even invested the time.

When a colleague wants to become a senior lecturer, s/he runs into problems; when someone has three kids, they can hardly leave and meet the criterion of half a year abroad.

The moment you want to take a half-year sabbatical, try to find someone who'd teach the basic courses...

Virtual mobility, which is mentioned in the Charter in the sense of its support, was assessed sceptically as unhelpful and another potential way of increasing the load on academic workers.

I'm sorry but it [virtual mobility] is just an attempt to make us start using tools that are forced upon us and that we'll have to use. We'll do it for foreign students, preferably after work, they won't come here but they will get credits.

Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers, recruitment and selection of employees

The areas formulated by the *Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers, recruitment and selection of employees* fall mostly within the authority of the university as a whole and thus were not discussed in detail. When they were, it was pointed out that the way of recruiting and selecting employees depends on the fact that, in the Czech Republic, the academic community is so narrow in individual fields that all people know each other and they belong to set social and political structures. As a result, the recruitment of researches is based on personal relations and selection procedures are often "tailored". Internationalisation, which could eliminate this problem by increasing staff competition, was seen with scepticism due to insufficient funding and formal barriers.

Small pond, few fish, small fish. It's connected to the larger issue of internationalisation and the fact that we're basically a regional university. The moment we'd really like to go international, we'd have to change study programmes so that they'd be taught in English.

Summary

- Problems in the area of human resources and the care thereof are understood primarily to be a consequence of insufficient funding of universities and the way of science and research evaluation. Without changes on this structural level, improvement cannot be achieved with regard to decent salaries and social securities, the security and stability of employment, lesser overloading of academic workers, improving the quality of their work, but also removing gender barriers.
- Both the Charter and the Code mention issues which can be or are approached by the faculty or individual departments in a non-systemic, non-transparent way without defined checking procedures. That is, or can be, caused by them being based on individual and informal decisions by the department management.
 - The understanding of the status of the head of department was ambivalent because the ensuing authorities can be or are dangerous with regard to some primary points addressed by the Charter and Code.
 - As far as freedom of research is concerned, such an experience was mentioned when the head of department intentionally blocked the submitting of a research project due to (interpreted) personal antipathy and personal ambition.
 - In relation to ethics and professional responsibility, examples were given of those being systematically violated by the department management without available formal mechanisms leading to a rectification.
 - The system of evaluation and financial rewards, which falls within the authority of the department management, can be non-transparent, uncheckable, and unjust as a result, which was both secondary and primary experience for the discussion participants.
 - The head of department can also influence the stability and security of employment, as they decide the amount of working hours and the duration of an employment contract. More examples were given, which had been interpreted as non-transparent and based on individual, non-standard decisions.
 - The department head's position can indirectly influence even gender inequality in a workplace by their personal approach towards this issue, which was present in the statements, with some exceptions, rather implicitly.
 - A possible solution of the above-mentioned risks, proposed by the participants, was a time-limited term of office of the head of department, at the end of which they would renew or resign from their position.
 - Another solution seen by some of the participants, although dependent on the individual decision of the department management, is the establishment of a clear system of evaluation and work loads. Its transparency stands not only on explicitly defined criteria but also the possibility of revision based on materials available to the employees, for example as a part of work meetings.

- On the other hand, the efforts to systemise and formalise the management processes, either by the department or faculty management, raised fears of losing academic freedom and increasing the already big (perceived) bureaucratic load. In general, the question followed whether this is even achievable in a sphere which includes diverse activities (pedagogic, scientific, applied, and public) without being counterproductive (a parallel with science and research evaluation).
- The issue of gender inequality was perceived in contradictory ways. On the one hand, it was denied, but assessed as real on the other, especially on the university level, i.e. outside the faculty itself. The soft and indirect form of inequality was reflected upon the most; it was the subject of criticism that the university as a whole does not address and thematise this topic, which leads to its trivialisation.
- Gender inequality was generally related to motherhood as a factor leading not to unequal opportunities but results. In terms of time, it is difficult for the female participants in the discussion to combine their role of mothers with the required quantitative performance, which leads to the underrating of their role as researchers by the work team or the academic community.
 - Practical obstacles were pointed out in this matter, which could be removed even on the faculty level. In particular, this means creating such an environment that would make it possible to combine both the mother and worker role, for example by creating a day care facility in the city centre where the faculty is located.
 - The points described above do not concern only the employees but students as well.
- The perception of the topic of performance was contradictory as well. On the one hand, performance was implicitly seen as a precondition for success at one's work; on the other hand, its focus on quantity instead of quality was criticised. In general, the participants often felt excessive workload and pressure on research and pedagogic workers.
 - This consisted mainly of excessive bureaucratic load and the high requirement of lessons taught necessary to achieve appropriate number of working hours or financial reward. The consequences of this include research work being moved into personal life, difficulties in fulfilling mobility requirements, but also lesser quality of pedagogic work.
- With regard to academic workers, the Charter describes principles and requirements which exceed the scope of their capacities but also authority. In particular, this concerns responsibilities arising from contractual and legal obligations associated with project processing. Actions connected to the administrative, financial, and legal sides of project management fall, as a rule, under the authority of other people, not the researchers, although they are the responsible persons.