



MINUTES OF CIIRC ASSEMBLY MEETING NO. 26

MEETING NO.: 26

DATE AND TIME: October 26, 2015; 8.00 a.m.

ROOM:8.93 BLOX

ATTENDEES:	MEMBERS OF THE CIIRC ASSEMBLY: Z. Hanzalek (ZH) V. Hlavac (VH) M. Sebek (MS) - excused M. Valasek (MV) GUESTS: V. Marik (VM) O. Velek (OV) J. Urban (JU) J. Vyskočil (JV)
CHAired BY:	Z. Hanzalek
RECORDED BY:	L. Lovett

PROGRAM OF THE MEETING:

	DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBLE	ACTION
1	Possible changes to the meeting agenda	Hanzalek	approve
2	Minutes of the previous meeting and task review	Velek	approve
3	Attestation rules and procedure	Kucera	info
4	Progress on the CIIRC building	Marik	info
5	Internal budget and financial strategy	Velek Hanzalek	info
6	Web design	Hlavac	info
7	Information about the attestation progress	Kucera	approve
8	Miscellaneous	all	info
9	Next meeting	Hanzalek	info
10			
11			



1. POSSIBLE CHANGES TO THE MEETING AGENDA

The agenda was unanimously approved.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND TASK REVIEW

The MoM of CIIRC Assembly No. 25 were unanimously approved.

3. ATTESTATION RULES AND PROCEDURES

- More emphasis should be put on the results evaluation;
 - There should be technical/expert results;
 - CIIRC should stay with Web of Science;
- Other possibilities:
- request 2 letters of recommendation from foreign institutions/researchers;
 - Databases and Conferences – use of the database of conference of excellence;
 - The terminology of the attestation levels should be adjusted as there is a problem in the hierarchy ;
 - Except for the researcher, who publishes his work, there are also researchers who specialize in more practical fields/sector and their career path is not so structured;

MS – The public awareness is not working, there should be an open discussion. CIIRC cannot award the title of a Professor or Doctor.

JU – The most difficult was to get to the Web of Science

MS – The CIIRC process is the Peer Review process.

The peer review doesn't work in the Czech Republic, because the Peers are often not ethical or non-competent. It would be useful to set up a bottom threshold, from which the Peer Review would start.

Databases:

There are several databases, Google Scholar is the easiest one to get into, but it is difficult to work with. There are also Scopus, Web of Science and Google Scholar, none of them lists quality conferences.

Mat Fyz., for example, only counts magazine articles, they are less strict with quotations / referencing.

JU – discussion about Web of science – It is not used by most people, as it is too expensive; Articles at conferences published.

Professor = equivalent of Scientific Researcher

MS – suggesting to meet up with a team and discuss the assessment process in detail and openly; The assessment in the Czech republic is on a lower level then elsewhere in the world.

VK – Attestation committee also thought about including conferences/ conference databases; Documents of the Academy senate – the middle aged group of researchers has only one category.

VH – The main goal is to build the best institution, better than anywhere around.



Problems with the accounting records for accommodation when travelling. Accounting/ Audit problems? At FEL it is possible to accept an invoice from a hotel /B&B without the name of the institution on it. There should be more flexible approach, otherwise it could bring negative impact.

JU – The/my assessment was not very good, but nobody from the Attestation Committee was interested further to find out why. It is not common to pay for the Peer Review elsewhere in the world, to assess others in the field is part of the job. Why to assess a Czech institution by Czech people?

MV – In automobile engineering the articles have at least 3 assessments/reviews. The community is smaller. For example in the magazine V. System Dynamics, which is a small industry, the community is also small.

The rules should be set specifically to each field.

MS – Field specific group would be too small.

MV – The following criteria should be set up: If the assessment is negative, it should be explained further, why the work is exceptional and then use the assessment by externals.

JU – Checked the assessment criteria of ERC and the British Research Assessment Exercise and found out, that they assess the person, not the paper submitted. We should ask foreign researchers to assess. Some would be recommended by the person being assessed, some by the committee. Elsewhere in the world it is distinguished between the Principal and Senior Principal. In the Czech Republic there should also be some titles below the title of a Professor. According to a Russian scientist who works in Britain, the title Research Professor should be awarded to JU. The recommendation to expand the hierarchy is wise.

In summary – we should more focus on results.

VK – CIIRC should get letters from abroad;

ZH – The selection should be made by the Attestation committee;

There should be a database for each field.

JU – There is a suggested combination how to choose the critics;

ZH – 3 best results, the critics should review, if the results are good enough;

VK – The results should be verified by an actual data.

Next steps:

- A meeting should be set up.
- ZH – Conferences are time consuming and dependable on each filed
- VH – We should leave the assessment as it is
- MS – It shouldn't be done the same way as in other Czech towns



In summary - there should be more Titles/Groups – should we divide the Title/Group called the Researcher?

VM – The Institute should not be sectarianized, we need to maintain the highest quality. Quality has different shapes, we come to the decision, how to assess the individuals as a whole person. The Scientific Council will also need to present their opinion on this.

Tasks:

VK will set up the meeting and invite: JU, MS, ZH, TP, JV and everybody else, who is interested. This team should meet several times. Fields/disciplines, should be branched into different streams.

There should be Google Docs folder with links from the databases.

It should also say why the individuals are the best.

MS – The assessment is based on the impact of the article, which takes cca 5 years.

The conferences and Peer Review should be also discussed at the meeting.

Schedule:

OV – The mandate will expire to 3 members of the Attestation Committee.

VM – The mandate will also expire to members of the Assembly, the CVUT rector will have to appoint new members.

4. PROGRESS ON THE CIIRC BUILDING

MS – The meeting of the transfer to the new building went well, our department was presented in a way, that it was clear that we deserve it. There was a ballot and everyone except for 1 person was for the transfer/move to the new building.

VM – There will be a group with 3 members, who will decide who will go where in the new building. The mathematicians have reservation, part of the economists as well, nobody from Dejvice or Karlovo nam.

CIIRC in building A, Mathematicians in building B – CIIRC should be in a more representative space, because there will be visitors coming. OV will check the building plans approved by the hygienists, re. the windows/possible problem with the final inspection.

The construction works are progressing fast. The construction company is working hard on reducing the delays, as there is a high penalty if they miss the deadline. The Final inspection should happen as planned – we should move in in September 2016.

Furniture could be moved in in June/July 2016 already.

5. INTERNAL BUDGET AND FINANCIAL STRATEGY

(ZH) and (VH) will meet and they will continue in discussion about financial strategy.

6. WEB DESIGN

The website construction is in progress, the main problem is that the discussion forum is not working. It is important to get it working. It would help to organize a seminar about general things,



which would say something interesting about the activities of the different groups. We need to find a person, who would take charge of this and get the forum going and fulfill its purpose.

There is no standardized graphic version of the CIIRC presentations.

To all - Please send your comments about the graphic template version, which VH handed out. The graphical department on the 7. Floor could help CIIRC with the graphic.

7. INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROGRESS OF ATTESTATIONS

There were no new attestations

8. MISCELLANEOUS

CAK project:

VK – the transfer of the money will arrive any day. The amount is the same as per the agreement in the contract, which has been reviewed by rector. The contract was also sent to the members of the assembly for comments and revision.

The project CAK has been approved for next 8 years. There will be a new contract.

VM - Horizon 2020 – accepted

9. NEXT MEETING

20. 11. 2015 at 14:00h, Evropská 11