

Národní
filmový
archiv

HR Excellence in Research

GAP ANALYSIS



Spolufinancováno
Evropskou unií



Ministerstvo
školy, mládeže
a tělovýchovy

GAP Analysis (Charter and Code Checklist)

Basic information

- **Case number:** 2025CZ351278
- **Name of organisation under review:** National Film Archive, Prague
- **Organisation's contact details:** Závěšova 502/5, Prague 4, 14000, Czech Republic
- **Date of endorsement of charter and code:** 27/08/2025

GAP Analysis Overview

The European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers serve as the basis for this analysis. The aim is to assess the organisation's current status and identify gaps in implementation.

Legend for implementation assessment:

- ++ Fully implemented
- +/- Almost fully implemented
- -/+ Partially implemented
- -- Insufficiently implemented

List of abbreviations and terms used:

CAWI: computer-assisted web interviewing (online questionnaire)

DKRVO: long-term development plan for a research organisation

GAP analysis: so-called gap analysis, "where we are vs. where we want to be"

GEP: Gender Equality Plan

OTM-R: recruitment system (Open, Transparent, and Merit-based Recruitment)

Open science: involves the free and transparent sharing of scientific articles, raw data and research methods. This approach allows anyone to easily verify or build upon the results, which significantly accelerates human knowledge and enhances the credibility of the research itself.

R&D: science and research

PILLAR 1 – ETHICS, INTEGRITY, GENDER AND OPEN SCIENCE

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
1.	Ethics and Research Integrity	-/+	The NFA has a relevant and binding regulatory framework comprising, in particular, Internal Directive No.7 <i>Code of Ethics for NFA Employees (2026)</i>, Internal Directive No. 35 <i>NFA Internal Whistleblowing System</i>, and Internal Directive No. 5 <i>On the Management of Research and Development Results</i>. The international context is supplemented by the FIAF Code of Ethics. These documents set out binding ethical principles and employees' reporting obligations, a mechanism for anonymous reporting with whistleblower protection, the management and ownership of research data and results, and international professional standards of integrity in the field of film archiving. The following gaps have been identified: • The NFA's Code of Ethics is conceived as a general labour law document — it covers employee integrity and non-discrimination, but not the specifics of research practice; explicit provisions on plagiarism, authorship rules and conflicts of interest in research are either entirely absent or scattered across other regulations • The NFA Ethics Committee is mentioned in the documentation but has not yet actually been established. • 97.9% of researchers state that they are familiar with the ethical rules governing their work.	• Update the Code of Ethics as a document combining general labour law principles with research-specific principles: add a separate section on research integrity covering authorship and co-authorship, the prohibition of plagiarism, research data management and conflicts of interest in research. • Adopt a charter and promptly establish the NFA Ethics Committee: define its composition, remit, investigation deadlines and the obligation to provide feedback to the complainant. • Implement R&D Information & Training Resources for the R&D sector on the wiki/intranet — covering rules on authorship and co-authorship, research data management and key principles of research integrity — which are accessible and regularly updated for all researchers.

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
			92 % of staff report that they have not encountered any breaches of the rules on authorship and co-authorship in the last three years. However, 31.3 % of researchers do not know where to find the rules on authorship and co-authorship.	
2.	Freedom of Scientific Research	-/+	The NFA has a relevant framework for the freedom of scientific research, comprising in particular Internal Directive No. 7 <i>Code of Ethics for NFA Employees</i>, Internal Directive No. 5 <i>On the Management of Research and Development Results</i>, and the <i>Long-Term Development Concept for the NFA Research Organisation 2024–2028</i>. The Long-Term Development Concept for the Research Organisation serves as a policy document for the NFA in accordance with statutory requirements — it defines the focus and outputs of research activities, but does not constitute a research strategy in the operational sense. These documents set out the principles for the free and responsible conduct of professional activities, the rules for the publication, ownership and sharing of results, and the conceptual framework for research development. The following gaps have been identified: There is no separate normative document explicitly guaranteeing researchers' academic freedom — the freedom to choose their topic, methodology and collaborators; existing documents refer to it indirectly and without procedural support: there are no processes for the transparent	- Adopt the R&D Strategy as a binding document: maintain a participatory approach and supplement it with an explicit guarantee of freedom to choose topics, methodology and collaborators, and with a transparent definition of legitimate restrictions. - Adopt the Rules for Research Activities as a binding internal regulation: formally enshrine freedom of research whilst defining the processes for approving restrictions and resolving conflicts between research freedom and operational requirements. - Implement a proactive system for informing researchers about grant opportunities and publishing rules

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
			approval of restrictions, nor mechanisms for resolving conflicts between research freedom and the institution's operational constraints. • There are no 'Rules for Research Activities' in the form of a binding internal regulation; de facto freedom depends on informal agreements and a culture of bottom-up initiative, rather than on an institutionally guaranteed framework • 56.3 % of researchers state that they do not have enough time during their working hours to devote to research activities • 52.1% of researchers state that they do not have sufficient information about research funding opportunities • 45.8% of researchers state that they are unaware of the NFA's main research priorities • 20.8% of researchers state that they are unaware of the rules governing the publication or sharing of results	
3.	Open Science	-/+	The NFA has a relevant regulatory framework for the field of open science, comprising in particular Internal Directive No. 5 <i>On the Management of Research and Development Results</i> and the <i>Long-Term Concept for the Development of the NFA Research Organisation 2024–2028</i>. These documents set out the rules for the publication, sharing and protection of research results and data, as well as a strategic commitment	• Adopt an R&D Strategy incorporating an open science policy: define commitments regarding open access and FAIR data. • Update binding internal regulations to specifically address open access, the FAIR principles and the licensing of research outputs • Adopt the Rules for Research Activities as a binding internal regulation covering the entire research cycle from inception to

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
			to open access to research results and the development of infrastructure. The following gaps have been identified: • Neither an explicit open access policy nor binding provisions on FAIR data principles are enshrined in any binding regulation; Internal Directive No. 5 covers the handling of results in general, rather than as a targeted open science standard; the Long-Term Development Concept for the NFA declares an intention but does not constitute a binding policy. • The implementation dimension of open science is lacking: the NFA does not have templates for research data management (DMPs), an institutional repository, rules for licensing outputs, or support for the reproducibility of research results. • 20.8% of researchers state that they are unaware of the rules for publishing or sharing the results of their research • However, 81% of researchers state that they have access to support for publishing or sharing outputs	completion — including obligations regarding research data management, the publication of outputs and compliance with open science commitments at each stage of the project. • Establish a dedicated role to support open science • Integrate the topic of open science into training programmes and onboarding for new researchers.
4.	Gender Equality	+/-	The NFA has a comprehensive regulatory framework for gender equality, comprising in particular the NFA Gender Equality Plan 2025–2030 (GEP), the Concept for the Prevention of Negative Phenomena in the Workplace 2026–2030, Internal Directive No. 7 <i>Code of Ethics for NFA Employees 2026</i>, and Internal Directive No. 35 <i>NFA Internal Whistleblowing System</i>.	• Define the mandate and operating rules of the NFA Ethics Committee and the ombudsperson through a participatory process involving researchers and staff. • Implement training on Theme 4 of the GEP (gender in science and research) as part of

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
			These documents set out the strategic objectives and measures for gender equality across five thematic areas: the prevention and resolution of negative phenomena in the workplace, including gender-based violence; the prohibition of discrimination and equal treatment; transparency in recruitment procedures and remuneration; and mechanisms for reporting and the protection of whistleblowers. The following gaps have been identified: • Thematic area 4 of the GEP (integration of the gender dimension into research and educational content) has not yet been implemented: training for researchers and project staff on gender in science is planned. • Key institutional GEP instruments are in the process of being established (NFA Ethics Committee, ombudsperson) • Q26: 47.9% of researchers report having encountered discriminatory or otherwise inappropriate behaviour in the last three years; Q27: only 17.4% of those who addressed the situation consider the way it was handled to be satisfactory — preventive and reporting mechanisms do not tend to function effectively.	educational support and onboarding for new researchers.

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
5.	Embracing Diversity	-/+	The NFA has a relevant regulatory framework for promoting diversity, comprising in particular Internal Directive No. 7 <i>Code of Ethics for NFA Employees, the Concept for the Prevention of Negative Phenomena in the Workplace 2026–2030</i>, Internal Directive No. 22 <i>On the Recruitment Procedures, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (2018)</i> and Internal Directive No. 35 <i>NFA Internal Whistleblowing System</i>. These documents regulate the prohibition of discrimination and equal treatment in all employment relationships, the prevention and resolution of discrimination, bullying and inappropriate behaviour in the workplace, a structured and multi-stage recruitment process, and mechanisms for reporting breaches. • 85.4% of researchers report that they are treated with respect by both colleagues and superiors • 97.9% confirm that individual working conditions taking account of personal circumstances can be agreed • 89.4% of researchers state that they have the same access to training and professional development as other staff The following gaps have been identified: • An OTM-R policy serving as an overarching document for open and merit-based recruitment does not yet exist.	• Adopt the OTM-R policy as a binding framework for non-discriminatory and merit-based recruitment: include rules for candidates with non-linear career paths, career breaks and specific needs. • Implement guidelines on addressing unconscious bias within the OTM-R policy and introduce compulsory training for selection panels.

6.	The Researcher	-/-	The NFA, through Internal Directive No. 30 <i>On the Scientific Board</i>, Internal Directive No. 7 <i>Code of Ethics for NFA Employees 2026</i> and the <i>Long-Term Development Concept for the NFA Research Organisation 2024–2028</i>, regulates the expert evaluation of research activities by the Scientific Board, general principles of professional development and equal treatment, and the strategic framework for the development of research capacities. However, these are strategic and analytical documents — they lack explicit, binding rules for the recognition of researchers as a specific professional category, their career paths and cross-sectoral mobility. The following gaps have been identified: • The institutional definition of the research role does not correspond to the actual scope of research activities at the NFA. Formally, 2.9 % of staff are classified as researchers; however, in the questionnaire survey, 51 respondents self-identified as researchers on the basis of functional criteria (their own academic outputs, project work, authorship contributions, curatorial research). • Researchers are not formally defined as a specific professional category in any binding regulation • There is no career framework defining levels R1–R4, no competency model and no criteria for career progression.	• Update the definition of the research role within the NFA’s organisational structure to reflect the operational reality. The NFA has begun redefining the job descriptions of all staff and has introduced a process for their periodic updating, which creates the conditions for a future formal definition of the research role. • Adopt the Rules for Research Activities as a binding procedural regulation covering the entire research cycle from inception to completion: including rules on funding, obtaining authorisations, preventing duplication, cooperation during audits and a mandatory handover protocol. • Adopt the R&D Strategy, with its overarching research priorities, as a reference framework for professional development and grant-seeking. • Implement a proactive system for informing researchers about grant opportunities.
----	----------------	-----	---	--

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
			- Requirements regarding a researcher's professional conduct are largely absent: rules governing knowledge of and compliance with funding conditions, securing permits, preventing duplication, or transparent communication of changes and project terminations are not systematically regulated in any binding legislation. 45.8% of researchers state that they are unaware of the NFA's main research priorities; 52.1% lack sufficient information on funding opportunities; Q10: 33.3% do not know where to obtain information on research and its rules; information on grant calls is disseminated exclusively through informal channels.	
7.	Free Circulation of Researchers	-/+	Explicit, binding rules for the systematic recognition of mobility in evaluation and career progression, administrative support for both outgoing and incoming researchers, and proactive information on mobility opportunities are largely lacking. The following gaps have been identified: - Researchers' mobility (geographical, inter-institutional, inter-sectoral, interdisciplinary) is not taken into account in evaluation and career progression - English versions of key regulations and information resources for incoming foreign researchers do not yet exist.	- Implement explicit recognition of mobility (geographical, inter-institutional, cross-sectoral, virtual) as a career asset in the definition of research posts, with transparent approval criteria and formal consideration in performance appraisals. - Publish English versions of key internal documents and ensure a mechanism for their regular updating.

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
8.	Sustainability of Research	-/+	General ethical and strategic documents codify the responsibility and societal relevance of NFA staff's activities in general and declaratory terms, without a specific link to the sustainable conduct of research that takes into account the environmental and societal impacts of research activities. <i>Long-Term Development Concept for the NFA Research Organisation 2024–2028</i> declares a commitment to the societal relevance of research and a responsible approach to research activities. Internal Directive No. 7 <i>Code of Ethics for NFA Employees</i>, enshrines the general responsibility of staff for the impacts of their activities on the organisation and society.	Update the R&D Strategy to include a separate commitment to research sustainability, taking into account the environmental and societal impacts of research activities.

PILLAR 2 – RESEARCHERS’ ASSESSMENT, RECRUITMENT AND PROGRESSION

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
9.	Researchers’ Assessment	-/+	Since autumn 2022, the NFA has been conducting mandatory annual one-to-one interviews for all staff; these appraisals are structured. The process is institutionally supported: managers have access to guidance documents, group workshops on conducting appraisals and HR consultations. 85.1% of researchers state that they receive regular feedback from their Head of Department 80.9% state that the feedback helps with their professional development 70% state that they have access to career development support, mentoring or consultations (Q40) 90% state that they feel they have equal access to training opportunities The following gaps were identified: - Individual interviews are a general assessment tool applicable to all staff. The NFA wiki explicitly states that these appraisals do not replace “research plans drawn up in collaboration with the Research Support Department” — the research dimension of the assessment is deliberately set aside as a separate process, which is, however, not formalised by any binding methodology. - There is no binding methodology specific to the research role for the regular assessment of the research performance of existing staff. - The topics for individual interviews are recommended, not mandatory — research	Adopt a binding Researcher Evaluation Methodology, incorporating qualitative peer review as the primary tool, explicit criteria for curatorial, filmographic, technological and database outputs, and the responsible use of metrics.

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
			performance, recognition of diverse outputs (curatorial, filmographic, database-related) and a researcher's career progression are therefore not a guaranteed part of the annual appraisal; the extent to which they are taken into account depends on the approach of the individual line manager. • 40.4% of researchers state that they do not consider the link between performance and remuneration to be clear • 40.4% consider remuneration for publishing activities to be inadequate • 27.7% of researchers state that their professional development is not reflected in their role or job description The NFA has initiated a redefinition of the job descriptions of all staff as part of a process of periodic updates in the context of annual appraisal interviews.	
10.	Recruitment	-/-	Internal Directive No. 22 <i>On the Recruitment Procedures</i> establishes standards for the selection process for senior positions and provides a reference framework; its application to research posts is subject to a decision by the CEO. The NFA's Gender Audit (2024) confirmed that selection panels systematically ensure gender representation. However, Internal Directive No. 22 applies mandatorily only to senior positions under the direct management of the CEO. There is, in fact, no systematic regulatory framework for the recruitment of research staff, and selection procedures for research positions may not follow a standardised process at all. The following gaps have been identified:	• Adopt and publish an OTM-R policy establishing a mandatory standard for selection procedures; • Introduce a Recruitment Procedure Methodology, including a job advertisement template with the mandatory elements of the OTMR toolkit and rules for publishing open vacancies. • Implement mandatory advertising of research posts on the EURAXESS platform and other relevant channels with the aim of systematically reaching out to international candidates.

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
			The NFA does not have an OTM-R policy or standardised job advertisement templates containing full information on the post, working conditions, career prospects and the selection timetable; there is no requirement to advertise on or EURAXESS, nor are systematic e-recruitment tools in place.	
11.	Selection	-/-	<i>The Code of Ethics for NFA Employees 2026</i> and the <i>NFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (2018)</i> enshrine a prohibition on discrimination in the assessment of candidates on the basis of any characteristics protected by law. <i>The Concept for the Prevention of Negative Phenomena 2026–2030</i> systematically addresses the prevention of discrimination with zero tolerance, including in the context of recruitment and assessment. These documents enshrine the prohibition of discrimination when assessing candidates, the requirement for multi-member panels with documented minutes, and the principles of equal and fair assessment. The methodology of the selection process itself — assessment of overall potential, addressing unconscious bias and providing feedback to candidates — is not subject to binding regulations; the same limitation on the scope of Internal Directive No. 22 applies here as well. The following gaps have been identified: - There is a lack of binding criteria for assessing candidates' overall professional potential - Selection panels are not systematically trained in managing unconscious bias; there is no binding standard for providing objective	- Implement binding criteria in the OTM-R policy for assessing overall professional potential (competence, creativity, relevance of experience) regardless of length of experience; introduce a standardised assessment form for evaluating candidates. - Introduce a Recruitment Procedure Methodology, requiring selection panels to be briefed on the principles of OTM-R and on addressing unconscious bias prior to every selection procedure for research staff; establish a binding standard for feedback to candidates: all candidates must be informed of the outcome, and objective feedback must be provided to interview participants upon request.

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
			feedback to candidates following the conclusion of the selection process.	
12.	Career Progression	-/+	Internal Directive No. 31 <i>On the Remuneration Regulations</i> establish pay grading based on the type of work and experience, and provide for the possibility of a personal allowance for consistently excellent long-term performance or the undertaking of tasks on a larger scale. The system of annual individual interviews (from 2022) facilitates discussion of career goals and development plans; at least in some parts of the department, it operates in a structured manner and includes a review of the previous year as well as planning for the next. However, there is no overarching career framework for researchers defining a structured career path, promotion criteria and formal recognition of non-linear career paths. The following gaps have been identified: • No formal career framework (career regulations) with measurable criteria for progression and competencies is in place. • Non-linear career paths, mobility and hybrid trajectories are therefore not recognised as equivalent criteria for career progression. • 40.4% of researchers do not know how their remuneration is determined • 31.9 % do not perceive the NFA as offering scope for professional growth and career development for researchers.	• Create a catalogue of positions and job roles for researchers, defining the scope of duties, competencies and requirements of each post • Implement explicit recognition in the career framework of non-linear career paths, mobility and hybrid trajectories as equivalent criteria for career progression.

PILLAR 3 – WORKING CONDITIONS AND PRACTICES

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
13.	Working Conditions, Funding and Salaries	+/-	<i>Collective Bargaining Agreement (2018)</i> enshrines flexible working hours, benefits and employee representation through a trade union. Internal Directive No. 30 <i>On the Scientific Board</i> enables researchers to participate in the strategic assessment of research. The NFA's Wiki tools put flexible working conditions into practice. GEP 2025–2030 systematically develops the work-life balance pillar as an institutional priority. Internal Directive No. 31 <i>On the Remuneration Regulations, the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Cultural and Social Needs Fund</i> and the wiki tools form a comprehensive framework for remuneration and social security. 93.8% of researchers state that they have the option to utilise flexible working arrangements 97.9% confirm that individual terms and conditions taking personal circumstances into account can be agreed. 56.3% of researchers state that they do not have sufficient time during their working hours to devote to research activities; 59.3% of them compensate for the lack of research time by working outside working hours, and the same proportion devote less time to research than they would like. 29.2% of researchers state that they lack the technical equipment and facilities necessary to carry out their work to a high standard, or the methodological and administrative support required for the preparation and implementation of research activities.	- Update the Internal Work Regulations and the Collective Bargaining Agreement to include binding provisions on flexible forms of work in accordance with GEP Axis 1. - Implement the role and service standards of the Research Support Department in the Rules for Research Activities: define responsibilities, clarify the interface with researchers, and proactively provide information on available methodological and administrative support.

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
			- The Scientific Board exists as an advisory body with researcher participation, but their influence on operational decision-making is limited. 62.1% of researchers state that they are dissatisfied with the level of their remuneration, whilst 40.4% do not know how their remuneration is determined.	
14.	Stability of Employment	+/-	<i>Collective Bargaining Agreement (2018)</i> enshrines fundamental guarantees of employment stability, the conditions for termination of employment and the right of the trade union to participate in decision-making. 88.4% of all NFA staff are employed on permanent contracts — the level of job stability is high. The GEP 2025–2030 includes measures to support parents’ career continuity upon their return from maternity and parental leave.	Incorporate specific provisions for junior research posts (R1) into the job catalogue: onboarding conditions, career support and retention measures.
15.	Contractual and Legal Obligations	+/-	<i>Internal Work Regulations, the Remuneration Regulations and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (2018)</i> form a comprehensive, binding framework covering working conditions, remuneration and social protection. Internal Directive No. 36 <i>On the Cyber Security</i> and Internal Directive No. 5 <i>On the Management of Research and Development Results</i> regulate data protection, cyber security and the rules for handling research results. The NFA Wiki (New Employees, New Employee Onboarding Processes, Employee Benefits) provides key information for new employees.	Publish English versions of key documents (Code of Ethics, Internal Work Regulations, Information for New Employees) on the organisational wiki.

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
			87.5% of researchers state that they have access to the necessary information on health and safety at work, data protection and the handling of sensitive information. These documents govern working conditions, employees' rights and obligations, the structure and rules of remuneration, social protection and benefits, data protection and cybersecurity, as well as rules for the handling of research results. The gaps identified are minor and relate to the availability of information and language accessibility: • Key internal regulations and employment-related documents are not available in English	
16.	Dissemination and Exploitation of Results	-/-	The NFA has a general regulatory framework for the dissemination and exploitation of results, comprising Internal Directive No.7 <i>Code of Ethics for NFA Employees 2026</i>, the <i>Long-Term Development Plan for the NFA Research Organisation 2024–2028</i>, and Internal Directive No. 30 <i>On the Scientific Board</i>. General ethical and strategic documents have been introduced which regulate the R&D sector in a piecemeal manner; however, they do not provide specific solutions for areas defined by the principles of open science, citizen science, knowledge transfer, commercialisation, intellectual property, popularisation and communication. Communication activities aimed at the public (in the context of the NFA, such as exhibitions, media contributions, popularisation texts, etc.) are not included in staff appraisals or performance assessments and are not regarded as scientific outputs; this activity therefore remains, to a certain extent, institutionally invisible.	• Update the R&D Strategy to include an open science policy as an overarching framework for the dissemination, access and use of results. • Update Internal Directive No. 5 On the Handling of Research and Development Results: incorporate open access and FAIR data policies, including conditions for exceptions, and add a chapter on intellectual property — rules on ownership, access, use, compensation and recognition of authorship for internal technical outputs. • Implement the role and service standards of the Research Support Department in the areas of disseminating results, knowledge transfer and supporting commercialisation.

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
				Implement internal and educational support covering the popularisation and communication of research to the public, and potential approaches to citizen science and co-creation.

PILLAR 4 – RESEARCH CAREERS AND TALENT DEVELOPMENT

No.	Principle	Implementation	GAP / Implementation impediments	Initiatives undertaken / New proposals
17.	Valuing Diverse Research Careers	-/+	The NFA has a general regulatory framework for the valuation of diverse research careers, comprising Internal Directive No.7 <i>Code of Ethics for NFA Employees (2026)</i>, Internal Directive No.22 <i>On the Recruitment Procedures (2025)</i>, Internal Directive No. 30 <i>On the Scientific Board</i>, and the <i>Long-Term Development Strategy for the NFA Research Organisation 2024–2028</i>. These documents enshrine equal treatment and respect for the professional role of staff, transparent evaluation of candidates and strategic support for staff development. However, these are exclusively general references without any procedural implementation — an explicit evaluation framework recognising diverse career paths, types of outputs and forms of mobility is absent from the NFA’s documentation. Researchers themselves articulate the need for broader recognition of outputs and actively define what should be understood as a research contribution. The following gaps have been identified: • The evaluation of the quality of research work in the NFA does not, in fact, cover the broad spectrum of outputs that the principle requires to be recognised (curatorial care of collections, making collections accessible, popularisation, knowledge transfer); • Research activity leading to non-publication outputs is not recognised as research activity in the evaluation • There is a lack of a formal career framework that recognises mobility (geographical, cross-sectoral, interdisciplinary, virtual) and non-linear career	• Create a catalogue of research staff positions and job roles, setting out the scope of duties, competencies and requirements of each post, alongside a competency model defining levels R1–R4, which explicitly recognises diverse career paths and forms of mobility as equivalent criteria for progression. • Implement qualitative peer review in the Researcher Evaluation Methodology as the primary tool, and establish explicit criteria for non-traditional outputs — curatorial, filmographic, database, programme and popularisation work. • Implement the role of senior researchers (R3/R4) as mentors for junior staff (R1/R2), formalised in the job descriptions. • Update the R&D Strategy to include an expanded definition of eligible research outputs corresponding to the profile of a memory institution and align it with the evaluation methodology.

			paths as equivalent criteria for career development; • The institution does not provide career guidance or mentoring for junior researchers from senior colleagues • The responsible use of metrics and qualitative peer review as the primary evaluation tools is not enshrined in any document	
18.	Career Development and Advice	-/+	The NFA has implemented a partial regulatory and operational framework for the area of career development and advice, comprising in particular the NFA Staff Training and Professional Development System, <i>the Collective Bargaining Agreement (2018)</i> and a system of individual interviews set out on the NFA wiki. There is a lack of an explicit, binding career development strategy specifically targeted at research staff regardless of contract type, as well as a lack of systematic individual career plans and structured career guidance. 78.7% of researchers state that they have the opportunity in their work to learn from more experienced colleagues and share experiences with them, indicating a functioning informal peer-learning culture which could be built upon through formalised mentoring. The following gaps have been identified: • There is no specific career development strategy for researchers; career planning is carried out in an unsystematic manner and depends on the individual supervisor; • An individual development plan, as a standardised tool specifying the professional training required to achieve career goals, has not been introduced; career planning forms part of annual one-to-one reviews, but their content and	• Create a catalogue of research staff positions and job roles, defining the scope of duties, competencies and requirements of each post, and setting out transparent criteria for progression between career levels R1–R4 as a basis for career guidance. • Implement a standardised template for an Individual Development Plan (IDP) linked to the annual appraisal interview; ensure that this is available to every researcher, regardless of the type of contract. • Implement an R3/R4 → R1/R2 mentoring programme formalised in the career regulations, with rules governing the assignment of mentors and the minimum frequency of meetings. • Ensure the systematic availability of coaching and career guidance for all researchers, not just senior staff.

			formalisation vary from department to department. • There is no dedicated role of career adviser or mentor for the personal and professional development of researchers ; coaching has historically been offered primarily to senior staff, rather than systematically to all researchers. • There is no formal link between career guidance and transparent criteria for career progression — researchers highlight the need for clear conditions for progression between career levels and for access to mentors from among senior colleagues.	
19.	Continuous Professional Development	-/+	NFA has a functioning system of training and professional development in place; individual interviews include career planning, and the Long-Term Strategy provides strategic support for career development. However, there is a lack of a formalised career development strategy for researchers, individual plans as a binding tool, and institutional mentoring and guidance for career progression both within and outside the institution. • 78.7% of researchers state that they are satisfied with the opportunities for training and professional development • 91.5% of researchers state that they are allowed to take part in training if they express an interest; • Q36: 89.4% state that they have the same access to training as other staff. There is no formal system for the validation and recognition of non-formal learning and competences acquired through practical experience, particularly in the context of mobility; qualifications and skills are not	• Create a catalogue of research staff positions and job roles defining the scope, competencies and requirements of each post, and a competency model as a formal framework for the career development strategy for researchers. • Implement individual development plans (IDPs) for researchers as a binding tool linked to the annual appraisal interview. • Adopt a methodology for evaluating researchers that is mandatorily linked to training and professional development: include a development section in the appraisal interview linked to the IRP and ensure that development activities and their benefits are an explicit part of performance appraisal.

			assessed according to a uniform methodology, but depend on the judgement of the individual supervisor. Teaching, supervision and professional guidance are not recognised in any document as a fully-fledged part of a researcher's career; the teaching commitments of early-career researchers are not systematically balanced against their research workload, nor are they taken into account in performance appraisals. The involvement of senior staff in mentoring junior researchers (R1/R2) is not counted towards their workload nor recognised as a professional activity	
20.	Supervision and Mentoring	-/+	NFA has a partial implementation framework for supervision and mentoring, consisting primarily of the System of Individual Interviews and the System of Training and Professional Development for NFA staff. These documents enshrine respectful and non-discriminatory leadership and a key implementation mechanism (individual appraisals) ensuring evaluation, feedback and progress monitoring. The Individual Interviews System ensures regular annual contact between staff members and their line managers, the assessment of work performance, feedback and the setting of objectives for the coming period. In the Research Support Department, an informal consultative mentoring scheme for researchers is effectively in place. In addition to individual appraisals, operational meetings are held to assess the status of research outputs currently in progress. Internal Directive No. 7 <i>Code of Ethics for NFA Employees (2026)</i> enshrines the principles of respectful and non-discriminatory leadership and knowledge sharing. 85.1% of researchers state that they receive regular feedback on their work from their line manager, whilst	● Incorporate into the catalogue of positions and job descriptions for research staff the role of senior researchers (R3/R4) as mentors and supervisors for R1/R2 researchers, including access to professional training for the performance of this role. ● Implement an R3/R4 → R1/R2 mentoring programme linked to individual development plans. ● Update the Researcher Evaluation Methodology to include a uniform standard for incorporating the research dimension and mentoring into assessment interviews across all departments, so that this does not depend on the individual approach of the Head of Department.

			80.9% state that this feedback helps them in their professional development. However, there is no explicit, binding framework for the structured supervision of junior researchers, nor is there a formally defined role for a mentor: • A structured and regular relationship with a supervisor is not formally defined • The roles of senior staff (R3/R4) as mentors, career advisers and knowledge transfer coordinators are neither formally defined nor supported by training to fulfil these roles. • Whether and how individual department heads emphasise the research dimension and mentoring in appraisal interviews is not clearly known even at the central HR level — there is no uniform standard. • There is no formal designation of a contact person or persons to whom junior researchers can turn regarding the performance of their duties, nor is there a mechanism for evaluating the quality of supervision itself.	
--	--	--	--	--