



# A4L\_ACTIONS

## Alliance for Life Sciences: From Strategies to Actions in Central and Eastern Europe

*H2020-SC1-2020-Single-Stage-RTD-964997*

### D1.1 Self-assessment report template

Work Package: WP1  
Task: T1.1  
Deliverable due date: 31/05/2021  
Responsible partner: BMC SAV  
Editors: Silvia Pastoreková  
Deliverable number: D1.1  
Deliverable type: R  
Dissemination level: PU  
First Created: 01/06/2021  
Last Updated: 14/06/2021  
Version: 3.2 (final)



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 964997. This document reflects the view of Alliance4Life's consortium and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY OF SELF-ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	SWOT ANALYSIS.....	4
2.2	SELF-ASSESSMENT OF MANAGERIAL PRACTICES .....	5
2.3	SURVEY OF INTERNAL RESEARCH CULTURE & INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT .....	6
<b>3</b>	<b>BENCHMARKING INDICATORS .....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	RESEARCH EXCELLENCE .....	7
3.2	KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER.....	9
3.3	FUNDING AND GRANTS .....	9
3.4	HUMAN RESOURCES.....	11
3.5	CORE FACILITIES AND/OR SPECIAL INFRASTRUCTURES .....	12
<b>4</b>	<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1	APPENDIX A: SELF-ASSESSMENT OF MANAGERIAL PRACTICES .....	14
4.2	APPENDIX B: ANONYMOUS ONLINE SURVEY .....	18

## 1 INTRODUCTION

**D1.1 Self-assessment Report Template** is the first public deliverable of the A4L\_ACTIONS project (No. 964997). It falls under the work package **WP1 – Culture for Excellence, Task 1.1 Institutional self-assessment of R&I excellence and research culture** (Lead: BMC SAV, Partners: all, M1-M6). This deliverable sets the basis for the D1.2 Self-assessment reports due in month 7 (November 2021).

With the self-assessment task, the Alliance4Life intends to build on the work performed during the previous project of Alliance4Life (No. 779303) in order to

- get an **overview of the progress of member institutions** – the baseline for the progress assessment provides the deliverable *D2.1 Assessment Report\_779303*, and
- learn **how the member institutions work with the best practices** formulated during the previous project in the deliverable *D2.2 Inventory of Best Practice\_779303*.

In comparison with the previous project, the current self-assessment task has been enriched with SWOT analysis, self-assessment of managerial practices and survey of institutional culture (see chapter 2). The reason for the methodological enrichment is based on our **focus on excellence**. Excellence in science is a function of hard work and outstanding personalities. We need to foster an environment which attracts and supports exceptional individuals, where they feel freedom to pursue big questions and ambitions, and where their efforts are not hampered by an envious community, lack of resources, or excessive duties on top of their research. In Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), such an environment emerges sporadically, often by lucky accidents, and is not systemically built and nurtured. However, **institutional practice** (administration, human resources policy, relations with industry, focus on impact of research) are the underlying **aspects which make a difference** between good and excellent research institutions.

In order to **make the environment attractive for top scientists** we need to imprint a **culture favourable for excellence** into the “DNA” of institutions in CEE. We consider evaluation of not only scientific performance, but also of institutional practices as the best grounds to start with the cultural transformation. Fair and open feedback from both internal research personnel and from scientific peers will enable informed decision making by institutional managements, will provide guidance for strategic decisions, and will open up the mind-sets of leaders by bringing in new perspectives.

## 2 METHODOLOGY OF SELF-ASSESSMENT

There is now wide recognition that quality of research is very difficult to assess using metrics alone and that qualitative assessments are essential. Therefore, we intend to promote the international evaluation of scientific performance as a strategic management tool for decisions supporting culture for excellence in CEE research institutions.

The evaluation will start with **internal reflection through self-assessment reports** including:

- ⇒ SWOT analysis
- ⇒ Self-assessment of managerial practices
- ⇒ Internal survey of institutional culture and environment

Using **SWOT analysis**, all partners will identify their unique attributes and factors that are expected to shape their sustainability and progressive development and will select ten most valued basic research, application and/or societal outputs generated throughout 2018-2020 period.

In addition, all partners will respond to a set of questions related to **institutional practices** including internal rules of management and communication, science evaluation, research integrity, staffing policy, human resources and mobility, grant support, tech transfer and IP management, etc. This part and the SWOT analysis will be **completed by the management** of the Alliance4Life's member institutions.

On voluntary basis, A4L\_ACTIONS partners will perform an **anonymous internal survey among employees** with the aim to receive individual opinions on **institutional research environment**, working conditions, senior-junior relationships, time devoted to real research compared to complementary activities, perception of high-quality research, motivation to perform research, teaching and training etc.

The institutional self-assessment reports will be supplemented by the collection of **bibliometric and other quantitative indicators** that will be used in a standardized manner for benchmarking of their research performance and for evaluation of trends when compared to the baseline situation reflecting data collected by the Alliance4Life members three years ago.

The Alliance4Life partners that are comprehensive institutions covering a broad range of research areas will perform their self-assessment reports on research activities related to Life Sciences.

## 2.1 SWOT ANALYSIS

**Table 2.1 SWOT analysis template**

<p><b>STRENGTHS</b></p> <p>advantages, uniqueness, competencies, skills, capacities, resources, reputation, management, partnerships etc.</p>	<p><b>WEAKNESSES</b></p> <p>internal barriers and limitations, gaps in skills, knowledge and infrastructure, low staff motivation and involvement etc.</p>
<p><b>OPPORTUNITIES</b></p> <p>improvements, performance, motivation, collaborations and strategic alliances, new trends, innovations, grant opportunities etc.</p>	<p><b>THREADS</b></p> <p>external barriers, strong competition, lack of funding, loss of sustainability etc.</p>
<p><b>SELECTION OF 10 BEST OUTPUTS</b></p> <p>outstanding research papers, innovations, projects, societal impacts</p>	

## 2.2 SELF-ASSESSMENT OF MANAGERIAL PRACTICES

Self-assessment of managerial practices will be accomplished via **online survey to be filled out by the management of the Alliance4Life’s member institutions**. The aim is to get an overview about the adoption of best practices suggested by Alliance4Life (as described in the deliverable “D2.2 Inventory of Best Practices\_779303” from the previous project).

**Table 2.2 Main domains covered by the survey template\***

Domain	Topic	Particular aspects
Management Practices	<b>Science Evaluation and Benchmarking</b>	Evaluations on a regular basis Independent peer review Bibliometric analysis Benchmarking Indicators and mechanisms of data collection Consequences of the evaluation
	<b>Research Integrity and Ethics</b>	Research ethics committee or consultants Procedures for handling RI&E cases Courses on RI&E at institutional level SOP Trainings
	<b>Internalization of Human Resources and Mobility</b>	English language in internal communication Website in English Welcome office Guidelines for new employees
	<b>Grant preparation &amp; Implementation</b>	Grant office or external services Guidelines Motivation Support in grant preparation
	<b>Technology Transfer and IP Management</b>	Tech Transfer Office or external consultants Tech Transfer Strategy Policy on IP protection Funds for IP protection Commercialization board Match-making Training
	<b>Science Communication</b>	Communication/PR department Communication/PR plan Work with media and journalists Trainings in communication skills Twitter account
	<b>Organization and Management</b>	Free text on organizational structure, management system and decision-making autonomy

\*Full-text template is included in the Appendix A to this deliverable.

## 2.3 SURVEY OF INTERNAL RESEARCH CULTURE & INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Table 2.3 Main domains covered by the internal survey template\*

Domain	Topic	Particular aspects
Internal Environment	<b>Profile of Respondent</b>	Career stage Job position Gender Caring responsibilities Current employment status Average numbers of hours dedicated to research
	<b>Management and Leadership</b>	Activities of supervisor, PI or manager Leadership skills Management decisions Research freedom Plans and opportunities Open communication
	<b>Career Development</b>	Markers of a successful career Barriers of a successful career Work-life balance Competition versus collaboration KPIs Research ethics Satisfaction with work and prospects
	<b>Perception of Research Culture and Experiences</b>	Competition versus creativity Quantity versus quality Impact of metrics Bureaucracy Safety, diversity and equality in working environment Personal resiliency Work-load versus well-being
	<b>Visions</b>	Prerequisites and responsibilities for positive changes Opportunities for improvements Personal engagement
	<b>Science Communication</b>	Role and impact of science communication Responsibility Opportunities for improvement Personal engagement
	<b>Internalization of Human Resources and Mobility</b>	English language in internal communication Website in English Welcome office Guidelines for new employees

\*Full-text template is included in the Appendix B to this deliverable.

### 3 BENCHMARKING INDICATORS

We selected a set of indicators reflecting bibliometric parameters, projects, HR capacities, etc. with the main focus on criteria of excellence. The indicators are mostly corresponding to indicators used in the previous project **to allow for direct comparison of A4L partners' trends** in research performances.

#### 3.1 RESEARCH EXCELLENCE

In the set of indicators of research excellence, we included a new indicator related to **multi-author papers** based on Clarivate analysis concluding that the combination of many authors/many countries creates a complex authorship pattern that differs from more typical academic papers and **drives elevated citation rates**. This is particularly visible at the level of institutions and small countries.

([https://clarivate.com/webofsciencegroup/wpcontent/uploads/sites/2/dlm\\_uploads/2019/12/WS419558643\\_1\\_SJ\\_Global\\_Research\\_Report\\_6\\_v9\\_RGB\\_SP.pdf](https://clarivate.com/webofsciencegroup/wpcontent/uploads/sites/2/dlm_uploads/2019/12/WS419558643_1_SJ_Global_Research_Report_6_v9_RGB_SP.pdf))

Indicators will also include **a list of top research personalities** of the partner institutions, including 10 senior researchers and 10 junior researchers, who can serve as experts for external peer review evaluation and/or as speakers at mini-conferences/match-making events.

**Table 3.1 Benchmarking Indicators for the Research Excellence Domain**

Domain	Indicator	Definition
Research Excellence	<b>Publications</b>	Number of publications that are part of the Web of Science Core Collection; type of document (i.e., article, review, or letter), published 2018 – 2020 (cumulative total for the whole period)
	Number of multi-author publications	Number of publications with more than 100 authors (according to WoS)
	Publications Tier 5*	Number of publications in Tier 5 (according to WoS)
	Publications Tier 10*	Number of publications in Tier 10 (including T5, according to WoS)
	Publications Quartile 1*	Number of publications in Q1 (including T10, according to WoS)
	Highly Cited Papers*	Number of highly cited papers (according to WoS)
	International Collaboration	% of papers with international collaboration (i.e., at least one author has at least one affiliation to foreign institution)
	National Collaboration	% of papers with only national collaboration
	Without Any Collaboration	% of publications without any collaboration
	Cumulative Impact Factor*	The sum of Impact Factors of all publications

Average IF*	The cumulative sum of IFs across all publications, divided by the total number of publications
IF Median*	The middle value of IF calculated from full IF dataset. A value separating the higher half from the lower half of a data sample.
Cumulative Citations*	The sum of citations of all publications (including self-citations)
Average Citations*	The sum of citations of all publications per item (including self-citations), divided by the total number of publications
Citations Median*	The middle value of citations calculated from full citations dataset. A value separating the higher half from the lower half of a data sample.
Number of Publications of Corresponding Author	The number of publications of the corresponding author with affiliation to the domestic benchmark institution
Cumulative Citations of Corresponding Author	The sum of publication citations across all publications of the corresponding author with affiliation to the domestic benchmark institution (including self-citations)
Average Citation of Corresponding Author	The sum of citations across all publications of the corresponding author with affiliation to the domestic benchmark institution per item (including self-citations), divided by the total number of publications
Median Citation of Corresponding Author	The middle value of citations across all publications of the corresponding author with affiliation to the domestic benchmark institution (including self-citations)
<b>ERC Grants</b>	Number of ERC holders in 2018 – 2020 (that were implemented in 2018 – 2020 period, as beneficiary)
<b>MSCA-IF Grants</b>	Number of MSCA Individual Fellowships holders (that were implemented in 2018 – 2020, as beneficiary)
<b>The most active research area</b>	The research area into which are the publications of given institution mostly assigned according to the Subject categories in WoS (max. 5 areas).
<b>Top research personalities</b>	Excellent researchers (10 senior and 10 junior researchers** with the highest recognition in research and/or innovation) their KPIs and research fields

\* Indicators will be collected separately for regular and multi-author publications

\*\*Category of junior researchers includes researchers up to 7 years from PhD award, with extensions for special circumstances as defined in ERC Work Program 2021: [https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/wp-call/2021/wp\\_horizon-erc-2021\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/wp-call/2021/wp_horizon-erc-2021_en.pdf)

### 3.2 KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER

**Table 3.2 Benchmarking Indicators for the Knowledge Transfer Domain**

Domain	Indicator	Definition
Knowledge Transfer	<b>Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) Application</b>	Number of PCT applications (cumulative total from 2018 – 2020)
	<b>Licenses and Intellectual Property (IP) Assignments</b>	Number of licenses and IP Assignments (cumulative total from 2018 – 2020)
	<b>Spin-offs</b>	Number of spin-offs (incl. start-ups exploiting the know-how of the institution) in the period of 2018 – 2020

### 3.3 FUNDING AND GRANTS

**Table 3.3 Benchmarking Indicators for the Funding and Grants Domain**

Domain	Indicator	Definition
Funding & Grants	<b>Total Cumulative Funding (EUR) Spent During 2018 – 2020</b>	Total operational cost (including investments)
	Spent-International (competitive)	
	Spent-National - Institutional (non-competitive)	
	Spent-National (competitive)	
	Spent-ESIF	
	Spent-Private	
	Spent-Other	
	Spent-Investments	Long-term investments, as part of total cumulative funding, from all sources (e.g., construction, equipment, etc.)
	<b>Total Awarded Funding During 2018 – 2020</b>	Timing is based on institutional practice; the sum of all categories below = total awarded funding
	<b>Core Funding-National (non-competitive)</b>	Institutional funding
	Operating	
	Investment	
	<b>National Grants (competitive)</b>	
	Research	
	Infrastructure	
	CSA, Capacity-building, and Networking	
	<b>ESIF funding</b>	
Research		

	Infrastructure	
	CSA, Capacity-building, and Networking	
	<b>International Grants</b>	Awarded during 2018 – 2020 (includes all types of collaborative projects, as coordinator and partner(s)); EC contribution is only for the A4L institution
	H2020 ERC (number)	Includes only those who host the ERC (implementation matters)
	H2020 ERC (value, EUR)	
	H2020 HEALTH (number)	
	H2020 HEALTH (value, EUR)	
	H2020 MSCA IF (number)	Includes only those who host the person (implementation matters)
	H2020 MSCA IF (value, EUR)	
	H2020 MSCA ITN (number)	
	H2020 MSCA ITN (value, EUR)	
	H2020 MSCA ETN (number)	
	H2020 MSCA ETN (value, EUR)	
	H2020 MSCA RISE (number)	
	H2020 MSCA RISE (value, EUR)	
	H2020 Teaming (number)	
	H2020 Teaming (value, EUR)	
	H2020 Twinning (number)	
	H2020 Twinning (value, EUR)	
	H2020 ERA-Chairs (number)	
	H2020 ERA-Chairs (value, EUR)	
	H2020 LEIT (number)	
	H2020 LEIT (value, EUR)	
	H2020 FET (number)	
	H2020 FET (value, EUR)	
	H2020 SC (except Health) (number)	
	H2020 SC (except Health) (value, EUR)	
	ERA-NETs (number)	
	ERA-NETs (value, EUR)	
	IMI (number)	
	IMI (value, EUR)	
	EUROSTARS (number)	
	EUROSTARS (value, EUR)	
	Other (number)	
	Other (value, EUR)	

	<b>Private income</b>	
	Contract research	
	Knowledge transfer	(e.g., from licences)
	Other	(e.g., private donations, rental of premises, etc.)
	<b>Other sources</b>	

### 3.4 HUMAN RESOURCES

**Table 3.4 Benchmarking Indicators for the Human Resources Domain**

Domain	Indicator	Definition
Human Resources	<b>Total Staff FTE (all)</b>	FTE=full-time equivalent: number of working hours that represent one full-time employee of the institute (for 2018 – 2020). Include: total staff of the institute: research, supporting technical, and supporting administration Exclude: PhD students without a working contract
	Total Staff FTE (female)	
	Total Staff FTE (international)	
	<b>Total Staff HC (all)</b>	Total staff HC (all): HC=headcounts: number of employees at the institute
	Total Staff HC (female)	
	Total Staff HC (international)	
	<b>Research Staff FTE (all)</b>	FTE=full-time equivalent: number of working hours that represent one full-time employee of the institute. To calculate FTE of research staff, encompass all working hours of research-affiliated staff, including those dedicated to their teaching or managerial duties. Research staff FTEs/HCs: include total research staff of the institute (researchers and facilities staff) Exclude: technical support, administrative, management, and students without a working contract
	Research Staff FTE (female)	
	Research Staff FTE (international)	
	<b>Research Staff HC (all)</b>	
	Research Staff HC (female)	
	Research Staff HC (international)	

	<b>Supporting Technical Staff FTE (all)</b>	Include: Core Facility staff
	Supporting Technical Staff FTE (female)	
	Supporting Technical Staff FTE (international)	
	<b>Supporting Technical Staff HC (all)</b>	
	Supporting Technical Staff HC (female)	
	Supporting Technical Staff HC (international)	
	<b>Supporting Administrative Staff FTE (all)</b>	Include: administration and management
	Supporting Administrative Staff FTE (female)	
	Supporting Administrative Staff FTE (international)	
	<b>Supporting Administrative Staff HC (all)</b>	
	Supporting Administrative Staff HC (female)	
	Supporting Administrative Staff HC (international)	

### 3.5 CORE FACILITIES AND/OR SPECIAL INFRASTRUCTURES

Table 3.5 Benchmarking Indicators for the Core Facilities / Special Infrastructures Domain

Domain	Indicator	Definition
Core Facilities	<b>Number of Commercial Partners/Contracts</b>	Number of partners cooperating with the institute based on a commercial contractual research/service provision when the partner institution is the supplier in this relationship, and company is in the position of the customer (for each year 2018 – 2020).
	<b>Volume of Commercial Activities</b>	Volume of a commercial contractual research/service provision to companies (for each year 2018 – 2020). Amount excl. VAT in EUR to be filled in.
	<b>Coverage of the Running Costs from Core Facilities' Earnings (%)</b>	Percentage of operational costs of Core Facilities covered by users' fees (for each year 2018 – 2020).

	<b>International Network Memberships (e.g., ESFRI roadmap membership)</b>	Count each membership (not only leading position, but also the position of the partner). Include full membership only, not preparatory phase. Situation on December 31, 2020. Provide the list of memberships in ESFRI.
	<b>Users group</b>	Percentage of the usage of Core Facilities by different user groups (to total 100%) (for each year 2018 – 2020).
	Internal	
	External Academic	
	External Commercial	

## 4 APPENDICES

### 4.1 APPENDIX A: SELF-ASSESSMENT OF MANAGERIAL PRACTICES

#### Status of Best Practices Adoption

Online survey to be filled out by the management of the Alliance4Life's member institutions. The aim is to get an overview about the possible adoption of best practices suggested by Alliance4Life (as described in the deliverable "D2.2 Inventory of Best Practices\_779303" from the previous project).

**RESPONDING INSTITUTION:** *(name of the institution)*

#### SCIENCE EVALUATION AND BENCHMARKING

##### 1. Are the following statements true for your institution?

- YES, we had the practice in place already before Alliance4Life  
 YES, we have adopted the practice based on inspiration from Alliance4Life  
 NO, the practice has not been implemented  
 PARTIALLY, the implementation is in progress

1.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	The evaluation is being organized regularly at least every 6 years (relates to internal and/or external evaluation)
2.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	The evaluation is being organized regularly with frequency more that every 6 years
3.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	The evaluation includes an independent peer review
4.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	The evaluation is performed by ISAB, i.e., the scientific advisory board has international members
5.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	The bibliometric analysis supports the quality of publication performance, i.e., the quality of publications is assessed by a position of the journal in Tier (T) or Quartile (Q)
6.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	For the bibliometric analysis, type of authorship is taken into account, i.e., first, corresponding, or co-authorship
7.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	The evaluation includes benchmarking with other institutions
8.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Indicators and mechanisms of data collection and processing are well defined and described. i.e., guidelines exist
9.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	The possible consequences of the evaluation results are known to everybody in advance, i.e., transparent rules exist

#### RESEARCH INTEGRITY AND ETHICS

##### 2. Are the following statements true for your institution?

- YES, we had the practice in place already before Alliance4Life  
 YES, we have adopted the practice based on inspiration from Alliance4Life  
 NO, the practice has not been implemented  
 PARTIALLY, the implementation is in progress

1.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	My institution has established a Research Ethic Committee (REC), or introduced research integrity officers/consultants for review of research integrity cases
2.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	My institution has implemented transparent and clear procedures for handling research integrity cases
3.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Courses on research ethics/research integrity are available at institutional level
4.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Quality training materials exist, i.e., EU guidelines/manual/e-books for REC members
5.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	REC provides consultancy on ethical issues also for grant writing
6.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Standard operating procedures are defined that include a clear set of rules for avoiding institutional and personal conflict of interest
7.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	The scope of ethics review is broad and includes also social science research methods

### INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES AND MOBILITY

#### 3. Are the following statements true for your institution?

- YES, we had the practice in place already before Alliance4Life  
 YES, we have adopted the practice based on inspiration from Alliance4Life  
 NO, the practice has not been implemented  
 PARTIALLY, the implementation is in progress

1.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	English is the primary language of internal communication at my institution
2.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Important documents are being prepared or translated into English
3.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Meetings with at least one foreign employee are held in English
4.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Institutional website is completely available in English
5.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Institutional website includes at least sections in English with the most relevant and important information
6.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Recruitment of all positions, including administrative and technical positions, includes the requirement of a certain level of oral and written English
7.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	“Welcome Office” exists to assist researchers coming from abroad
8.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	“On boarding” for new employees exists, i.e. guidelines on how to navigate in the organization, information about employee rights and duties, about scientific career development and trainings etc.

### GRANT PREPARATION & GRANT IMPLEMENTATION

#### 4. Are the following statements true for your institution?

- YES, we had the practice in place already before Alliance4Life  
 YES, we have adopted the practice based on inspiration from Alliance4Life  
 NO, the practice has not been implemented  
 PARTIALLY, the implementation is in progress

1.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	For grant support, one or more centralized grant offices (GO) exist, i.e., departments or units dedicated to grant support
2.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Specialized GO departments exist for pre-award and post-award phases
3.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	My institution uses services of external agencies or advisers for grant support
4.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Grant preparation processes and guidelines for researchers have been defined and described

5.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Some kind of motivation to submit international and prestigious national grants is in place, e.g. scheme for re-submission of promising proposals, benefits for successful applicants etc.
6.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Some kind of support for preparation of international and prestigious national grants is in place, e.g. financial support, availability of external advisers etc.

### RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT (CORE FACILITIES)

#### 5. Are the following statements true for your institution?

- YES, we had the practice in place already before Alliance4Life  
 YES, we have adopted the practice based on inspiration from Alliance4Life  
 NO, the practice has not been implemented  
 PARTIALLY, the implementation is in progress

1.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	The model of specialized service-oriented core facilities (shared laboratories) has been introduced in order to concentrate costly equipment and provide access and services to internal and external users
2.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Rules of management and operation of core facilities exist
3.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Evaluation process and quality management guidelines are in place
4.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	My institution is member in one or more European-wide infrastructures (ESFRI)
5.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Cost model and method of price calculation have been established
6.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Booking system or other e-tool for laboratory management have been implemented

### TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

#### 6. Are the following statements true for your institution?

- YES, we had the practice in place already before Alliance4Life  
 YES, we have adopted the practice based on inspiration from Alliance4Life  
 NO, the practice has not been implemented  
 PARTIALLY, the implementation is in progress

1.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	For spin-off support and commercialization of research results a Technology Transfer Office (TTO) exist
2.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Technology transfer strategy has been formulated
3.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Institutional policy on Intellectual Property (IP) protection has been formulated incl. rules of using the income from commercialization (incl. royalties to inventors)
4.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Institutional Committee / Valorisation committee on IP evaluation has been established
5.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Dedicated funds for IP protection exist
6.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Institutional "Commercialization Board" including members from industry has been established
7.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	TTO is networked on national/ international level in order to receive nationwide/ international support
8.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	External consultants /agencies are being used in order to help the internal technology transfer team (with scouting, commercialization, etc.)

9.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Science and business collaboration is being fostered by match-making sessions with industry
10.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Trainings on technology transfer issues like IP management, entrepreneurship, patent law etc. are being organized for staff and/or PhD students

### SCIENCE COMMUNICATION

#### 7. Are the following statements true for your institution?

- YES, we had the practice in place already before Alliance4Life  
 YES, we have adopted the practice based on inspiration from Alliance4Life  
 NO, the practice has not been implemented  
 PARTIALLY – the implementation is in progress

1.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	My institution employs a dedicated Communication / PR manager
2.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	My institution has a dedicated Communication / PR department
3.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	An institutional PR / Communication Plan has been formulated
4.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	List of priority scientific media is in place and network of journalists/ media contacts has been created
5.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	My institution works actively with journalists – e.g. organizes roundtables, public discussions, joint meetings / training for (scientific) journalists and researchers etc.
6.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	Trainings for researchers in communication skills are being organized
7.	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/>	My institution has a Twitter account

### ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Description of organizational structure, management system and hierarchy, potential integration/subordination in a larger organization/institution, decision-making autonomy

Free text (max. 500 words)

## 4.2 APPENDIX B: ANONYMOUS ONLINE SURVEY

### PERCEPTION OF INTERNAL RESEARCH CULTURE IN A4L PARTNER INSTITUTIONS<sup>1</sup>

#### PROFILE OF RESPONDENT

1.	<b>Career stage</b>
	<input type="radio"/> Entry level (up to 4 years after master graduation)
	<input type="radio"/> Early career (5 – 15 years after master graduation)
	<input type="radio"/> Mid-career (16 – 30 years after master graduation)
	<input type="radio"/> Late career (more than 30 years after master graduation)

2.	<b>Job position</b>
	<input type="radio"/> Researcher – team member
	<input type="radio"/> Researcher – team leader, department head or director
	<input type="radio"/> Administrator
	<input type="radio"/> Technician – team member
	<input type="radio"/> Technician - team leader, core facility head
	<input type="radio"/> Other

3.	<b>Gender</b>
	<input type="radio"/> Woman
	<input type="radio"/> Man
	<input type="radio"/> Prefer not to specify

4.	<b>Country of origin</b>
	<input type="radio"/> Same as that of current working place
	<input type="radio"/> Different from that of current working place

5.	<b>Caring responsibilities</b>
	<input type="radio"/> None
	<input type="radio"/> Primary carer (of a child, disabled person, older person)
	<input type="radio"/> Secondary carer (another person carries out the main caring role)
	<input type="radio"/> Prefer not to define

6.	<b>Current employment status</b> (maximum two choices)
	<input type="radio"/> Full-time permanent
	<input type="radio"/> Part-time permanent
	<input type="radio"/> Full-time fixed term / contract
	<input type="radio"/> Part-time fixed term / contract
	<input type="radio"/> PhD study
	<input type="radio"/> Maternity / parental leave

<sup>1</sup> The template for this questionnaire has been inspired by the Wellcome Trust survey on institutional culture from 2019 (see <https://wellcome.org/reports/what-researchers-think-about-research-culture>). The pilot anonymous survey was performed at A4L partner BMC SAS in November 2020 and provided important cues for better understanding of institutional environment and its further cultivation.

<input type="radio"/>	Temporary working stay / sabbatical outside of the institution
<input type="radio"/>	Other
<input type="radio"/>	Prefer not to define

<b>7.</b>	<b>Average number of hours dedicated to work for the institution</b>
<input type="radio"/>	Less than 31 hours
<input type="radio"/>	31-40 hours
<input type="radio"/>	41-50 hours
<input type="radio"/>	51-60 hours
<input type="radio"/>	More than 60 hours
<input type="radio"/>	Prefer not to define

### MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

<b>8.</b>	<b>Has your supervisor, PI or manager done any of the following within the last 12 months?</b> (Multiple choice)
<input type="radio"/>	Discussed your performance
<input type="radio"/>	Noted your achievements
<input type="radio"/>	Conducted a formal appraisal
<input type="radio"/>	Had a conversation with you about your career aspirations
<input type="radio"/>	Provided expert or career advice and guidance
<input type="radio"/>	Connected you to others within or outside your field
<input type="radio"/>	Supported your wellbeing
<input type="radio"/>	Offered you training to support your skill development
<input type="radio"/>	Supported you with personal issues
<input type="radio"/>	Provided an example of appropriate research standards
<input type="radio"/>	Provided an example of appropriate ethical codes
<input type="radio"/>	Requested your feedback on their management of you
<input type="radio"/>	Discussed alternative career options
<input type="radio"/>	None of the above

<b>9.</b>	<b>How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements?</b> ( <input type="radio"/> agree – <input checked="" type="radio"/> neutral – <input type="radio"/> disagree)	
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	I can work independently
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	I enjoy managing people
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	I have received training on managing people
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	I have the confidence and skills to manage a diverse team
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	I have the confidence and skills to support others with their professional development
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	I feel good management and leadership is recognized at my institution
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	I feel good management and leadership is recognized at my department/team

<b>10.</b>	<b>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding:</b> ( <input type="radio"/> agree – <input checked="" type="radio"/> neutral – <input type="radio"/> disagree – <input type="radio"/> not relevant)	
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Leaders communicate clear expectations regarding: behaviours / culture in my work environment
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	I am satisfied with the way my workplace handles performance reviews
<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	I think senior management makes wise decisions

	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	My supervisor gives me freedom to explore my results
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	My supervisor values negative results that don't meet an expected hypothesis
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	I would feel comfortable approaching my supervisor if I couldn't reproduce lab results

11.	<b>How important do you think the following research leadership characteristics are? How successful is your workplace team and your institution / workplace as a whole in demonstrating each leadership characteristic?</b> ( <input type="radio"/> important – <input checked="" type="radio"/> workplace team success – <input type="radio"/> institutional success) <i>multiple choices in each characteristic</i>	
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Setting the direction for research and creating the plans to achieve it
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Leading and supporting teams of diverse individuals
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Setting and upholding standards in the conduct of research and its application
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Creating development and career opportunities
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Open communication in problem solving

### CAREER DEVELOPMENT

12.	<b>What would you consider to be the markers of a successful career in the research community?</b> ( <i>multiple choice, max 5</i> )	
	<input type="radio"/>	Being perceived as an expert in my field
	<input type="radio"/>	Securing a strong record of published work
	<input type="radio"/>	Earning recognition from peers
	<input type="radio"/>	Job security
	<input type="radio"/>	High degree of autonomy
	<input type="radio"/>	Publishing work through renowned journals
	<input type="radio"/>	Influence over strategic decisions
	<input type="radio"/>	Becoming a mentor
	<input type="radio"/>	Promotion to a leadership role
	<input type="radio"/>	High salary
	<input type="radio"/>	Developing a highly refined skills
	<input type="radio"/>	Access to high-profile projects
	<input type="radio"/>	Promotion to a management role

13.	<b>Do you face any barriers in achieving a successful career in the research community?</b> ( <i>multiple choice</i> )	
	<input type="radio"/>	Lack of funding
	<input type="radio"/>	Complicated and lengthy public procurement
	<input type="radio"/>	Excessive bureaucracy and administrative processes
	<input type="radio"/>	Job insecurity
	<input type="radio"/>	Unmanageable workload
	<input type="radio"/>	Lack of opportunities
	<input type="radio"/>	Lack of advice and guidance
	<input type="radio"/>	Inequalities / discrimination / bias
	<input type="radio"/>	Lack of training in relevant skills
	<input type="radio"/>	Lack of training in relevant field
	<input type="radio"/>	None of the above

14.	<b>How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to your current working environment?</b> (○ agree – ● neutral – ● disagree)	
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	Rigor of results is considered an important research outcome by my institution/workplace
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	My working environment promotes a collaborative culture
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	Creativity is welcomed within my working environment in all its forms
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	My institution/workplace provides me with support to navigate the grant application process
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	My working environment promotes a good work-life balance
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I am confident that my institution/workplace would listen and take action if I raised a concern
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	Expectations of me to undertake a number of roles leaves me little time for research
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	My institution/workplace places more value on meeting metrics than it does on research quality
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	Unhealthy competition is present within my team
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	Unhealthy competition is present within my institution

15.	<b>How far you do agree or disagree with the following statements relating to your career over the last 1-5 years?</b> (○ agree – ● disagree)	
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	The work I do is fairly and adequately recognized
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I feel pressured from my team leader to meet Key Performance Indicators / Metrics
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I feel pressured from my institution management to meet Key Performance Indicators / Metrics
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I would feel comfortable reporting instances of compromised research standards and misconduct
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I know how to report instances of research misconduct
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I have a clear understanding of what my workplace considers compromised research to be
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I am able to efficiently balance the competing roles required as part of my employment
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I have experiences issues with others taking credit for my work
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	My administrative duties have increased during the last 5 years

16.	<b>How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to your career?</b> (○ agree – ● disagree)	
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I am proud to work within the research community
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I am aware of alternative career options outside of research that could utilize my skills
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I would recommend my lab/department to other researchers
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I would recommend my institution to other researchers
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I would recommend a research career in my sector
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I am satisfied with my career prospects within my institution
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I am considering moving to another part of the research sector (e.g. leaving academia for industry)
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I am considering leaving the research community within a next 3 years to start a non-research role
	<input type="radio"/> ○ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ●	I am considering moving to another country within next 3 years

### PERCEPTIONS OF RESEARCH CULTURE AND EXPERIENCES

17.	<b>How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to research culture?</b> (○ agree – ● disagree)	
	<input type="radio"/> ●	High levels of competition have created unkind and aggressive research conditions
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Creativity is stifled due to research being driven by an impact agenda / emphasis in impact
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Research culture promotes quantity over quality
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Current culture is unsustainable long-term
	<input type="radio"/> ●	High standards and integrity are valued with the research community of the institution
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Current metrics have had a positive impact on research culture
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Administrative processes and bureaucracy hinder research quality

18.	<b>How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to your working environment?</b> (○ agree – ● disagree)	
	<input type="radio"/> ●	I feel safe within my working environment
	<input type="radio"/> ●	My team/department is committed to promoting diversity and equality
	<input type="radio"/> ●	My institution/workplace is committed to promoting diversity and equality
	<input type="radio"/> ●	I experienced bullying or harassment during my research career
	<input type="radio"/> ●	I witnessed bullying or harassment during my research career
	<input type="radio"/> ●	I experienced discrimination during my research career
	<input type="radio"/> ●	I witnessed discrimination during my research career

19.	<b>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?</b> (○ agree – ● disagree)	
	<input type="radio"/> ●	I consider myself to be a resilient person
	<input type="radio"/> ●	I find it difficult managing my workload when I'm experiencing personal issues
	<input type="radio"/> ●	I have a difficult time dealing with work-related stresses
	<input type="radio"/> ●	I am able to separate work-related setbacks from my personal sense of self

20.	<b>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to your institution/workplace?</b> (○ agree – ● disagree)	
	<input type="radio"/> ●	I believe wellbeing is fundamental to an effective working environment
	<input type="radio"/> ●	A career in research can be isolating and lonely
	<input type="radio"/> ●	I have felt supported by peers/colleagues when I've encountered personal problems
	<input type="radio"/> ●	The system exploits my interest in the work I do leading to a heavy workload
	<input type="radio"/> ●	There is a long-hours culture at my institutions/workplace
	<input type="radio"/> ●	My institution/workplace offers adequate wellbeing support

## VISIONS

21.	<b>What do you think is needed to create significant positive change to research culture in your country?</b> (○ agree – ● disagree)	
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Change funding conditions
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Reduction in administration
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Greater focus on quality and less on quantity
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Wellbeing and support services / policies
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Rewards

22.	<b>Which groups / entities do you think should be responsible for driving change in research culture?</b> (○ low responsibility – ⊙ medium responsibility – ● high responsibility)	
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Research institutions
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Funding bodies
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Your institution / university
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Senior researchers
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Policy-makers / government
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Individuals in the research community
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Publishers
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Junior researchers

23.	<b>Where do you think your institution should focus first to improve research culture?</b> (○ 1st – ⊙ 2nd – ● 3rd)	
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Training in the skills needed to promote good culture (e.g. leadership)
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	A space to raise concerns, with appropriate actions then taken
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	New awards and recognition opportunities
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Published satisfaction surveys and measures
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Increased administration capacities and better administrative support
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Other, specify:

24.	<b>As an individual, what actions do you think you could take to help drive positive change in research culture?</b> ( <i>multiple choices</i> )	
	<input type="radio"/>	Setting an example
	<input type="radio"/>	Participate in organizing societal activities of your institution (PR, Green lab, seminars...)
	<input type="radio"/>	Supporting peers and colleagues
	<input type="radio"/>	Encouraging change within teams
	<input type="radio"/>	Speaking up about wrongdoing
	<input type="radio"/>	Promoting quality and celebrating success
	<input type="radio"/>	Open discussion in the community
	<input type="radio"/>	Promoting collaboration
	<input type="radio"/>	Promoting diversity
	<input type="radio"/>	Training
	<input type="radio"/>	Don't know

### SCIENCE COMMUNICATION

25.	<b>How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to science communication of your research?</b> (○ agree – ● disagree)	
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Science communication is a duty of every modern scientist
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Scientists from publicly funded institutes and universities should communicate science because they are using taxpayer's money
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Society has the right to know what research is being done at public institutions
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Science communication increases public's interest in science
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Science communication increases the visibility and reputation of the institution.
	<input type="radio"/> ●	Science communication is not important

26.	<b>Which groups / entities do you think should be responsible for driving change in science communication?</b> (○ low responsibility – ⊙ medium responsibility – ● high responsibility)	
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	PR and communication officer / department at your institution / university
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Funding bodies
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Your institution / university
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Senior researchers
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Policy-makers / government
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Individuals in the research community
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Media
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Junior researchers

27.	<b>Where do you think your institution should focus first to improve science communication?</b> (○ 1st – ⊙ 2nd – ● 3rd)	
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Training for researchers in the skills needed for effective science communication
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Commitment and support of the management of the institute / university (science communication is regarded as strategically important agenda)
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	To learn from partner institutes / universities with successful communication departments
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	To establish good relations with the press
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Increased administration capacities and better administrative support (experienced PR and communication officer / department)
	<input type="radio"/> ⊙●	Other, specify:

28.	<b>As an individual, what actions do you think you could take to help drive positive change in science communication?</b> (multiple choices)	
	<input type="radio"/>	Setting an example (to walk the talk)
	<input type="radio"/>	Participate in organizing societal activities of your institution (Open Days, Researcher's Night)
	<input type="radio"/>	Supporting peers and colleagues
	<input type="radio"/>	Encouraging change within teams (Research group leader motivates his lab members to engage in science communication)
	<input type="radio"/>	Being proactive and sharing research results with the PR and communication officer
	<input type="radio"/>	Attend science communication training
	<input type="radio"/>	Promoting science communication within the research community
	<input type="radio"/>	Other, specify:

**INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES AND MOBILITY**

29.	<b>How far do you agree or disagree with the following statements?</b> ( <input type="radio"/> agree – <input checked="" type="radio"/> partially – <input type="radio"/> disagree)	
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	English is the primary language of internal communication at my institution
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Important documents are being prepared or translated into English
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Meetings with at least one foreign employee are held in English
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Institutional website is completely available in English
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	Institutional website includes at least sections in English with the most relevant and important information
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	“Welcome Office” exists to assist researchers coming from abroad
	<input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	“On boarding” for new employees exist, i.e. guidelines on how to navigate in the organization, information about employee rights and duties, about scientific career development and trainings etc.
30.	<b>Is there anything else you want to comment / mention?</b> (free text, max 100 words)	