

Pilotní ověření návrhu nové metodiky hodnocení výzkumných organizací

Pilot Test of New Evaluation Methodology of Research Organisations

**Samostatný doplňující dokument 9:
Komentáře hodnocených a výzkumných jednotek
k metodice hodnocení a pilotnímu ověření**

***Background document 9:
Evaluated Units' and Research Units'
Feedback on Methodology
and Pilot Test***

The document summarizes feedback to the Methodology and pilot test received from evaluated and research units. The document was prepared by Andrea Weinbergerová, Hana Bartková and Vlastimil Růžička from the received responses to ten submitted questions.

List of content

Q-1.	Do you consider the structuring of the self-assessment report and formulation of questions to be answered as adequate? What was in your opinion missing and what was redundant or possibly leading to confusion?.....	3
Q-2.	Do you consider the formulation of five criteria as adequate; in particular is it in your opinion useful to distinguish between the research excellence and research performance?	8
Q-3.	Is 1 to 2 per cent of outputs selected for grading reasonable for assessing excellence in research?	11
Q-4.	What is your opinion about the bibliometric report, do you consider the given indicators as easily understandable? What information is in your opinion missing and what information is redundant or possibly leading to confusion?	14
Q-5.	How you compare the proposed "Metodika" with earlier version of the R&D evaluation (the coffee grinder and its recent modification)?.....	18
Q-6.	Are there any further comments and/or suggestions you would like to add regarding the future "Metodika"	21
Q-7.	In your opinion, to what extent has the panel reached a correct view on performance in your research organisation?	24
Q-8.	In your opinion, to what extent are the panel's conclusions and recommendations useful for the management of your institution?	27
Q-9.	Please provide an estimate of time and HR investment in preparing submissions for the pilot testing. How many working days and how many people (in FTE) were involved (please provide an estimate for the administrative staff and for researchers)?.....	29
Q-10.	Only for RU-s that received on-site visits: Please provide your comments on the merit, usefulness, and agenda of the visit (up to 250 words).	32

Tento dokument byl zpracován v rámci Individuálního projektu národního pro oblast terciárního vzdělávání, výzkumu a vývoje „Efektivní systém hodnocení a financování výzkumu, vývoje a inovací, CZ.1.07/4.1.00/33.0003“. Projekt byl realizován Ministerstvem školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy a financován prostřednictvím Operačního programu Vzdělávání pro konkurenceschopnost z Evropského sociálního fondu a státního rozpočtu České republiky.

This document has been prepared as a part of the Individual National Project for the area of Tertiary Education, Research and Development „Effective System of Research Financing, Development and Innovation, CZ.1.07/4.1.00/33.0003“. The project was realised by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports and financed by the Operational Programme Education for Competitiveness of the European Social Fund and state budget of the Czech Republic.

Dokument „Evaluated Units' and Research Units' Feedback on Methodology and Pilot Test“ neprošel jazykovou korekturou.

Q-1. Do you consider the structuring of the self-assessment report and formulation of questions to be answered as adequate? What was in your opinion missing and what was redundant or possibly leading to confusion?

Natural Sciences, Engineering and Technology

1. The structure of the self-assessment (SA) report and appropriate formulation of questions is not optimal. Several questions are overlapping or their sequence should be reversed. For example, the Q015 - Fields and foci of research of the EvU should precede the Q014 - Description of research activities, objectives and achievements over the evaluated period of the EvU to describe the main fields and foci of research and afterwards to explain the research activities and finally to summarize the achievements over the evaluated period. The research strategy question for the oncoming period (Q034 - Research Strategy of the Evaluated Unit for the period 2015-19) is surprisingly placed between questions about existing research infrastructure and existing membership of the national & global research community on the level of RU. I guess that the (future) research strategy should be either the final point of the self-assessment report or the point following the background information on the EvU (e.g. activity report).

Secondly, we propose to shorten the SA report. The answers should be short, concise and scientifically relevant. That means, the questions should be well-defined and targeted. Some topics are too general and/or there are many subquestions. For example, it is written in SA report-form that Q012 consists of 4-subquestions. However, in reality there is not the only one question in each of subquestions, but usually two, three or even four. Similarly, Q013 have many subquestions as well. Furthermore, the societal relevance part of SA form should not play the same role in evaluation as the scientific quality of RU (number of peer-reviewed papers, patents, projects, collaborations). Such part should be diminished (if not removed) and the individual questions should be clearly specified. Therefore, we propose to emphasize the question about research strategy and future plans. From our point of view, the concise developmental plan and research vision of RU and EvU, like it is used is the final part of the evaluation report used by Czech Academy of Science - evaluation 2010-2014, there are more informative and provide better understanding of the scientific quality or research potential than some kind of "public relations chatter" in societal relevance of SA form.

Finally, we would like to highlight that the structure of the self-assessment report should straightforwardly reflect the scientific quality criteria used for evaluation. The SA report contains about 60 questions (many with subquestions or several paragraphs and tables) plus SWOT analysis while the panel evaluation consists of 5 criterion (two mutually overlapping). From our point of view it is not well balanced. For example, we answered in three paragraphs on the subquestion Q013d (What are the educational components for the training of PhDs?) which probably play very minor role in the research and development evaluation of the EvU. Similarly, we do not see the reason/importance of the Q013b) How does the EvU help early-career researchers to make their way into the profession? on the final R&D Evaluation.

Furthermore, we would remove or minimize all sections relying on "soft self-evaluation" that cannot be verified outside the RU/EvU/RO. In the case of any real impact on the budget and prestige, these sections will never contain any relevant critical information. Typical example is "Q053 - Competitive positioning in the national context".

2. It was very detailed, some questions might be joined to be answered easily. We found some questions/parts as "private", unsuitable for self-assessment– e.g. SWOT analysis.
Some questions were quite complicated to understand.
3. In my opinion a considerable amount of data was required and we can ask if all the data have been necessary for an objective assessment of RU.
4. The columns Q18, Q30 and Q35-Q44 should be greatly reduced (see comments at point 2)
5. Submission Guidelines should be written as precisely and unambiguously as possible (e.g. "A short narrative (250 to 500 words) should be submitted clearly explaining why RU considers the outputs excellent in the context of its

research activity, objectives and achievements.” It would be better to state directly that ONE short narrative is demanded for ALL excellent outputs together).

The first part of questions (Q001-Q034) dealing with “Research environment” can be shortened and/or simplified (e.g. statistics concerning PhD students or Inbreeding). Status of PhD student has to be defined in time horizon (just for 4 years or until thesis defence?). Also some financial statistics can be simplified (e.g. dividing Income from Contract Research into different categories in Q050).

SWOT analysis is redundant if not addressed and reflected in the Evaluation report. “Convicting evidences” demanding to support Collaboration with non-academic actors in Q055 can be also omitted (problematic and time consuming issue).

6. Without a clear and detailed definition of content (especially Q012 - Q015, Q034), can the panels get very diverse concepts of responses in texts, which does not allow an objective comparison of the evaluated units. It is hard to believe that in a “smartly” written text panellists would uncover real lack of quality. In addition, even the explanatory texts in the evaluation confirm that the panellists themselves prefer to rely on spreadsheets in the reports; parts that do not tend to be manipulable. Not even this and a clear definition of the content of the text guarantee to produce a credible assessment. The assessment will always depend on the staffing of the panels, which is critical for the whole methodology.

Find below three examples. Especially the first of them is not very favourable to peer review evaluation.

a) Under the criterion Research environment RU14 was evaluated A, RU16 and RU29 identically C. This was based on the evaluation of the texts that were essentially of the same character; and both, the provided documents and the differences in the tables can be considered negligible. Such a difference in assessment is alarming...

b) RU16 was (justifiably) criticised for the length of post gradual studies and the criticism is in the context of the science evaluation relevant. Studies led by the rest of the RUs suffer from the same shortcomings; however, this obvious fact remained by the relevant panels unnoticed.

c) Under the criterion Societal relevance gained RU29 with its clear and long-term links outside the academic centres (especially in practice) evaluation B/C. RU16 was very nicely evaluated C, although its co-operation with practice and the public is rather marginal. Shall we express our opinion, based on economic benefits, the difference between RU29 and RU16 is much more significant.

Based on the wording of questions Q014 and Q015 (or Q015 and Q034) these can be considered as redundant. Unclear seems to be the purpose of remaining questions Q013a, 13c and 13d (the issue of accreditation of subjects - these do not require additional "evaluation" as the evaluation of quality in R & D activities is not related). SWOT analysis should not be a part of the self-evaluation report for it will always be just a part of statements that is an entity willing to provide; a full (true) analysis is an internal document. In particular the identification of “strong” and “weak” and recommendations with respect to “opportunities” should be based on a peer review. This is at least how one of the benefits of IPN evaluation was presented to us. Renowned evaluators will provide a valuable analysis for management at EvU / RU levels and superior institutions. Similarly redundant seem to be questions Q046, 053, 054 and 059; responses should be parts of the evaluation. To play the nowadays popular gender card we also consider redundant.

The requirement for data tables and methodology of their creation has to be defined clearly and prominently.

7. The structure of the self-assessment report is designed more for the organization of basic research, not for organizations of applied research. The proposed 5% of the amount of funds available for future development of research organization allocated on the basis of the Methodology is for the organization of our size, inadequate amount of administrative burden involved.
8. Notes by the EvU have already been handed over to IPN team through prof. Kratochvil in the beginning of the summer. The main observation is that the structure of the evaluation report should be much simpler without a SWOT analysis and a series of questions that should rather be addressed to the Accreditation Committee during the process of post gradual programs accreditation. Also division of faculties to RUs does not seem as appropriate to us. A number of questions in the evaluation focus more on management issues of the EvU, thus more on a possible means to influence the scientific achievements rather than on the actual performance, concrete contributions of scientists from EvU to knowledge.

9. Discrepancy in periods of overview should be avoided i.e. one time interval for all components of the evaluation is to be applied (no problem for pilot testing). Period must be as fresh as possible – the evaluation of RIV must be accelerated.

- 2010-2014 staff, PhD students, funding
- 2009-2013 research output

Missing indicator - research productivity, number of results/outputs per RU employee (or RU researcher), small RUs cannot compete with large academia institutions if only totals of research outputs are compared.

10. Bibliometric data should be provided already for writing the self-assessment report. Publications should have been structured from the beginning to Jimp, Jsc, Jrec and Jostatní¹.

Some items (questions) cannot be objectively checked, it depends on the text drawn up by the authors (eg. research planning, career development).

SWOT analysis should not be included in the self-assessment report, the evaluated unit will not emphasize its weaknesses.

Some items should be defined more precisely, especially the various sources of funding. Several financial flows at VSCHT are not divided into faculties (EvU) and absolutely not into evaluated units (RU).

Workers division to men and women category is pointless, does not belong to the evaluation and could even be considered discriminatory.

Money from Ministry of Education Youths and Sports is and will be allocated to the whole university and from there to the faculty (EvU). Another division of funds to RUs is artificial and unnecessary. The smallest evaluable part should be a faculty.

The portal for data entry was not user friendly; maybe it would be better to split the questions to separate sheets.

11. The amount and formulation of questions are appropriate and adequate topic. Period covered some specific Excellent results should at all times use. (eg. patents, technology)
12. Too many questions. It was evaluated outdated period (2009-2013). Some of questions were inappropriate (SWOT analysis).

Humanities

1. Structure and length of the self-assessment report was adequate in our opinion, the report contained all relevant information. Although some questions were not pertinent to our research unit (e. g. PhD. students formation, alternative funds of financing etc.), we generally consider the form of the report to be suitable enough to provide objective information. For being redundant, resp. collisional is considered the request to provide contractual relations to others subjects. Contract texts contain information about other subjects, not only about the research unit, and these cannot be provided to the third party without approval of contractual partners. We recommend relinquishing of this request henceforth.
2. Monitored indicators in Metodika are similarly structured, which we find user friendly. A detailed breakdown allows a better orientation in what is effectively monitored and therefore a better answer. User friendly is the use of "tabular answers" and following one indicator in several upcoming specified subsections of "textual answers". We didn't observe any redundant requirements or potentially ambiguous tasks.
3. We have no major objections to the received evaluations and expressions; they quite accurately describe our strengths and weaknesses in the field of science and research. We are aware of some of them; some of them are more or less new to us.
4. We find the structure of the self-assessment report more or less adequate. The formulation of some questions is quite unfortunate; and the assignment of some questions was broadly speaking misleading. In questions no. 9 it

¹ Jimp article published in impacted journal and abstracted in WoS, Jsc article abstracted in SCOPUS, Jrec article published in a peer-reviewed journal, and Jostatní other articles

was determined beforehand that the FTE of researchers will be counted as ½ of individuals (headcounts). The resulting figures do not reflect the reality for 1) they do not reflect part-time jobs (e.g. 0.4 or 0.8); 2) they automatically imply the conclusion that academic staff has 50% of the time allocated to scientific activities. In fact, this is not the case; First of all it is not possible to approach this issue so mechanically, and we doubt that it is possible to accurately determine the ratio. Question no. 17 (Age of Researchers) has no corresponding value. It does show the age structure of the workplace, but it would be perhaps more useful if a qualifying structure of various ages would simultaneously be visible (e.g. the number of associate professors and professors in the category of 30-39 years). As problematic we find all questions in criterion 5 "The social importance / impact". Although we do not put in a question the importance of the debate over the social impact of humanities (and science in general), we do not believe that it can be easily defined and expertly measured. This is also due to the absence of generally accepted methodology, according to which such measurements should proceed. Answers to questions of this type are always highly subjective, and we don't understand based on what criteria the "social significance" of this or that industry or research department should be evaluated.

5. The structure of the self-assessment report is appropriate. Only some questions were not clearly understood or straight away put in a way that prevented an objective assessment of the situation:
 - a. A question no. 9, where FTE of the researchers could not have been entered as it corresponds to reality, because of fixed setting of a ½ number of individuals (headcounts). Therefore, the result is inadequate. It was not possible to take into account part-time and even the fact that not all academic staff has 50% of their time allocated to scientific activities (a grading based on the qualification structure or even individual answers would be needed).
 - b. A question no. 17 – is controversial, because although the age structure of the workplace can be an interesting information it does not bring any additional value itself – it would have to be related to the qualification structure of the workplace (a professor in the age group 40-49 years has quite a different meaning for the development and prospects of a workplace than a professor in the category over 70 years. Likewise, an expert assistant in the age group 20-29 years is, in terms of development and prospects of a workplace, quite a different member of the team comparing to an expert assistant in the category of 50-59 years, etc.).
 - c. For criterion no. 5 "The social importance / impact," it is obvious that this is a sector subject to a purely subjective assessment. Nevertheless, we consider important and beneficial that the methodology tried to include also these criteria into the evaluation. We believe that the mission of the universities is also to act outside the academia sphere, to cultivate and enrich public life. In the humanities is this benefit, of course, difficult to measure. Still it should be a part of the evaluation - the question perhaps remains the form of such an evaluation.
6. I consider the self-assessment report and formulation of questions to be answered as adequate. In my opinion so called "the research excellence" leads to confusion or misunderstanding. Why? It implies, that we should list only few best outputs, but the evaluating commission encouraged us to fill as relevant as possible for evaluation, in order to show the plasticity of research performance of the present RU.
7. Missing: International conferences and similar events. Collaboration, organisation of scientific events under the patronage of the institute.

Confusion: Requirement of being a global leader in the case of a clearly declared emphasis on the research into national history, albeit in the international context.

A-E scale classification: The overall RU evaluation expressed in terms of B, B/C and C categories (in the Overview of the quality levels reached by the RU) is an understatement in comparison with the verbal formulation in The Research Unit evaluation report, Code of the RU: AVCR_HU_61, the text starting from page 3. It is not entirely clear in which way the criteria of the A-E scale were set. Which foreign RUs might serve as a model for A in the humanities?

8. We consider quite inadequate the Criterion V Societal relevance. It is not possible to answer the questions responsibly. Moreover, the panelists would use the identical answers for RU 6.1 and 6.2. to deliver different evaluations (quality level B and D). It shows on inadequately constructed questions and their zero predictive value

in the sense of description of the prestige and potential of the RU. Such evaluations of individual RUs then devalue themselves.



Q-2. Do you consider the formulation of five criteria as adequate; in particular is it in your opinion useful to distinguish between the research excellence and research performance?

Natural Sciences, Engineering and Technology

1. The criteria of the research excellence and research performance are inadequate and inaccurate because they overlap each other. In addition, the appropriate weight of each criteria on final decision was not known. We do not see any proportion in evaluation of the effectiveness of the appropriate RU, i.e. how is the RU research performance related to (i) the budget of the RU, (ii) number of employees and to the level of synergy between research and education (e.g. involvement of students in projects, the effect of research activities on the quality of education including employability of the graduates).

Furthermore, we recommend to modify used criteria. New criteria should provide an adequate distinguishing between research excellence and performance. As inspiration can serve the Phase II evaluation of the research and professional activities of the institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for 2010–2014:

a) Quality of the results. To this aim quality profiles from Phase I will be complemented by detailed bibliometric information on the complete list of outputs and the specification of the contribution of the assessment unit members to them.

b) Societal (economic, social and cultural) impact of the research taking into account Educational activities, Collaboration with business sector, Outreach and editorial activities, Research services (libraries, databases, collections, infrastructures).

c) Involvement of students in research.

d) Position in international as well as national contexts reflecting the scientific reputation and visibility in international comparison, Ability to attract foreign researchers, Comparison with other similarly oriented institutions in the Czech Republic.

e) Vitality and sustainability determined by funding (structure of resources, effectiveness of research), Management (organizational structure, methods of hiring, career system), Employees (age and qualification structure, mobility), Success in grant and project applications.

f) Strategy for the future.

2. Yes, adequate. The distinguishing is necessary.
3. The criteria are in principle adequate. To distinguish between excellent scientific results and performance certainly makes sense, but under clearly defined rules. It is necessary to define what is in fact excellent research – if it is publication with high impact factor rather than patent or technology transferred into praxis.
4. The weak point is „II. Membership of the national and global research community“. Essentially, an active researcher is usually trying to minimize those „memberships“ in boards or committees. Thus, a researcher being active in committees might not be active in research. Another weak point here is the counting of “visitors”, which is anyway difficult to prove and does not really say anything. Also the counting of „collaborations“ is rather questionable. Considering the development of the Czech Sciences after 1989, one should instead appreciate an Institute that is able to compete internationally when sciences is done „in house“.

Within the framework of this evaluation it certainly makes sense to distinguish between the research excellence and research performance.

5. The formulation of five criteria is adequate (the first one, “Research environment”, is probably the most problematic to evaluate). The research excellence and research performance should be distinguished. The question is how to compare research excellence in basic (outstanding papers) and applied (patents, licences) research.

Evaluation of research excellence seems to be the most problematic point of this pilot testing (Some Panels did not follow rules stated in “Metodika”, see also Point 7 below).

6. Criteria II, III, IV and V can be considered understandable and justified, but the division of Research Excellence and Research Performance faces a serious problem for industrial research with its results which are within the field often excellent and confidential, thereby hindering their own evaluation. In technical / scientific fields is the current setting useful essentially only for the evaluation of academic outputs (publications) and therefore may be discriminatory.

Shall the evaluation Research Excellence be maintained, then it is necessary to guarantee (at least for the evaluation based on nominated books) an evaluation in the context of the results achieved by the evaluated units in the research, which is presented as an excellent and to which the publications are linked. (See also q. 3).

Technical note 1: It cannot be a priori assumed that all excellent results will be in English. As seen from comments to crit. III in evaluation RU29, the methodology has not been able to cope with that. Will the methodology be able to cope with it in future so that the solution will not have a negative impact to the evaluated units?

Technical note 2: It would always be appropriate in the context of comments in the evaluation of Research Excellence to provide a broader rationale / analysis, because the evaluation can be influenced by subjective views of reviewer / panel. The evaluation is very prone to error (as can be illustrated by the experience from the pilot evaluation).

7. As already mentioned, questions and criteria are set mainly on basic research organizations. The Czech Republic's major industrial country, the criteria should be set so as to be supported an excellent research (usually basic remote implementation) and also research supporting realizable innovation and therefore competitiveness of our economy.
8. The proposed five evaluation criteria will hopefully provide a comprehensive view of the RU or EvU, which is in terms of allocation of public money certainly positive. Nevertheless, to distinguish between an excellence and an average associated with a great diligence are these criteria unnecessarily complicated and confusing (some items in the self-assessment report are for this distinction not relevant). For an evaluation of the performance intensive parameters that take into account the size EvU are missing.
9. Evaluation of RU's results (excellent research results/outputs but not the process/performance) should be done in two equivalent categories: basic research, application research. Distinguishing between research excellence and research performance may be misleading and exact differentiation may not be defined.

For newly established RUs it is important to assess the dynamics of the development of research activities and achievements in the period under review to determine the potential for future development of RU. We have 20 RIV results in period 2009 – 2013 and 60 RIV results 2009 - 6/2015.

10. Five criteria are reasonable. Distinguishing an excellent research is right.
11. I do not know whether I understand the term "research performance" power research unit, how much money do I get one inserted crown (euros) in research? Yes, it is necessary to separate the excellence of performance. Five criteria are certainly sufficient. (Assumptions: properly selected segment, sufficient detail the criteria set, correctly selected review panel)
12. It has not been clear criteria. It has not been clearly defined rules. It useful to distinguish between the research excellence and research performance, but if they are clear rules.

Humanities

1. Formulated criteria cover various aspects of research and we consider them to be suitably selected. The assessment of excellent outputs is equally considered to be a positive element if we understand the excellent research to be a unique research which is un-substitutable by other research institutions.
2. We consider adequate defining five criteria and meaningful distinguishing between Research Excellence and Performance Research. We also find beneficial to separately track (within the criteria of Membership of the National and Global Research Community and Research Overall Performance) research activities correlated with national, respectively international framework. Such a definition makes sense not only for evaluators, but also for evaluated RU (within the meaning of awareness of the mentioned).
3. In our opinion were the criteria formulated accordingly. The boundaries between excellent research outputs and those "normal ones" are often thin, but with a formulation of excellent outputs for reviewed years we had no major problems.
4. The five criteria we consider adequate. To distinguish between "a rough output research" and "an excellent research" is undoubtedly useful. Doubts are raised by the evaluation criteria of "excellence". RU nominated concrete results, but we believe that from the Methodology it is not clear based on which criteria are then these results reviewed.
5. The five selected criteria appear to be adequate, as well as the resolution between "a rough output research" and "an excellent research". As not thought-out (or poorly specified) remain evaluation criteria of "excellence". Nominated RU results were therefore evaluated using an unclear method.
6. I consider the formulation of criteria as adequate except of excellence. I do not think, It is very useful to distinguish between excellence and performance. The evaluating commission during their visit considered such an understanding as an "obsession" with excellence in research. They recommended, that there should be listed all relevant outputs for evaluation. Since we do not possess a criteria for what makes output into an excellent output, we cannot reasonably talk about excellent research in general. See the evaluation report for the present RU.
7. It follows from the evaluations contained in Chapters III „Scientific research excellence“ and IV „Overall research performance“ that the foreign evaluators were not fully able to objectively judge the research environment in the Czech Republic (in particular, the interconnectedness of institutions and of their research programmes) because they were not sufficiently informed; hence, the evaluation may have been partially distorted. The criteria III and IV mingle together and it is not easy to address them separately.
8. Besides the comment in Question 1 on inappropriate questions in Criterion V (see above) we can state that it is very difficult to determine the global leader in humanities (A Quality Level is hardly reachable for any humanities field).

Q-3. Is 1 to 2 per cent of outputs selected for grading reasonable for assessing excellence in research?

Natural Sciences, Engineering and Technology

1. A selection of 2 % of outputs for grading seems to be a reasonable fraction for assessing excellence in research. However, for huge RU with hundreds of papers should be difficult to fit in 2 % with limitation of the maximum number of selected excellent papers. As alternative could be a selection of best 5-10 papers of each year within reported period.
2. I am not able to comment. May be 5% is better.
3. Yes.
4. 1 to 2 per cent of outputs are certainly not sufficient for grading excellence in research. In the years 2008-2012 we had 1138 research outputs (mainly publications). However, the evaluation methodology IPN allowed us to present only 20 results in five years at maximum (i.e., an average of 4 results per year). Our annual production is 165-185 publications in the impacted journals (app. 15-20 % from this amount are excellent results – see our yearly overviews of excellent results on our web page.
5. We suggest increasing the number of selected outstanding outputs to the level of 5 per cent (minimum and maximum values, i.e. 3 and 20 items, can be retained).
6. Regardless the number of records in RIV² we believe that there should be a room for a presentation of a certain number of specific research topics / areas [TOPIC (s)] in which the evaluated entity could declare the excellence, which would then be documented by 3-4 major outputs.
7. We believe, for smaller organizations, this share of outputs has insufficient explanatory power. The choice should always be a mix of outputs - publications, patents, realization outputs based on collaboration with industry partners.
8. Certainly there is no need to leave a larger choice. From our experience, the evaluation highlighted in particular the work of currently popular areas or within the field close to activities of the panel members. Perhaps the evaluators would come to the same choice if they could have freely chosen from all outputs of the EvU.
9. It should be just only an indicative requirement for selection of outputs for assessing excellent results.
10. Yes, the choice of 1-2% of outputs for the evaluation is appropriate. Nevertheless, there is no sharp interface between the selected excellent and other valuable results. A big problem is setting of criteria for what is and what is not an excellent result. Most excellent results are usually selected based on citations of the publications and the IF factor of the journal. Evaluation results will be influenced by subjective opinion of the evaluators.
11. Amounts to 3% of output should certainly be enough to verify the excellence of any research including nontechnical RU.

² RIV = Czech information system for R&D

12. What is this excellent research? Impacted article, patent? The invention which is used? Assessable only on clear criteria.

Humanities

1. Assessment panel members alone referred to the percentage as to insufficient in their evaluation report. In our opinion, it would be advisable to assess all outputs which were formulated as excellent ones in the sense of No. 2 answer during the given period.
2. Generally speaking, 1-2 percent of the total production is not a sufficiently representative sample to do qualified conclusions if these selected evaluated works won't represent at least five / six or more outputs. A smaller sample is susceptible to the application of random elements, especially for those teams, where various methodologies are applied, and their outputs are thus qualitatively hardly comparable. After all, in the methodology also other quantitative restrictions in many other requested data (typically linked to the RU FTE) are applied, which can affect especially smaller units in a negative way.
3. Very often it depends on specific years or on the number of solved research tasks and projects, and that makes the answer relative. For the observed 1-2 years is 1-2% appropriate. For the current situation in science and research at our institution it is probably insufficient.
4. 1-2% results nominated as excellent may be sufficient if it is a large research organization, and thus corresponding to 10 to 20 outputs. Our RU could nominate 6 results. In the evaluation report which we received, it is specifically stated that this is "too limited number to provide a just picture of the RU's publications." At the same time there is a further, more technical problem, that already for these 6 results it was a problem (due to the limited space) to provide thorough explanation of the selection. In the case of nominating 10 or more outputs the technical support would have adequately take this into account.
5. 1-2% of results nominated as excellent is for a small RU insufficient. Our RU could nominate only 3 results, which is for any comprehensive evaluation totally inadequate. Only little room was left to justify the selection.
6. I consider the formulation of criteria as adequate except of excellence. I do not think, It is very useful to distinguish between excellence and performance. The evaluating commission during their visit considered such an understanding as an "obsession" with excellence in research. They recommended, that there should be listed all relevant outputs for evaluation. Since we do not have a clear criteria for what makes output into an excellent output, we cannot reasonably talk about assessing excellence in research. See the evaluation report for the present RU.
7. 3 to 4 % would be more convincing; the weight of evaluation according to 1 to 2 % of outputs cannot objectively capture the overall performance of the institution evaluated.
8. The number of outputs may be reasonable. However, the Criterion is inappropriate for humanities as the main output in individual fields of research are conclusively monographic books, often in national languages. Foreign panellists may hardly determine their scientific benefits. They, on contrary, strengthened the importance of partial texts in international periodicals. Foreign language articles – could they reveal the recent knowledge for international milieu – are only partial representation of the creative potential of the authors. For humanities, especially with the connection to the national reference framework, would be suitable to divided this Criterion into two parts (1-2% of monographs, 1-2% of foreign articles). It would determine the potential of the research

of individual RUs more precisely. Another problem is the evaluation of the research of the Czech language, literature and history. The panellists, not speaking Czech, are not able to review it and a priori consider it second rate and without international context, although it is fully recognized by foreign researchers in the Czech language and literature. We consider it necessary to take into account the specific research of the national culture which is indispensable for every nation and cannot be measured on the international scale. As a matter of fact, foreign researchers may enrich the study of the Czech culture only exceptionally. The fact that the Institute of Czech studies together with bohemistic working places of the Charles University are the leading research units in the world is omitted in the evaluation. We do not also share the opinion of the panellists, that an article in periodicals is more important output than a monograph. It may be so in sciences – not in humanities where articles usually represent partial, often preliminary research on a particular topic which is later completed in a synthetic way in a monograph.

Q-4. What is your opinion about the bibliometric report, do you consider the given indicators as easily understandable? What information is in your opinion missing and what information is redundant or possibly leading to confusion?

Natural Sciences, Engineering and Technology

1. The bibliometric report (BR) should be concise, well-arranged and unambiguous for any reader.. Current version of BR via "Metodika" is somehow confusing due to insufficiently introduced/explained graphs and tables. There are graphs and tables without detailed or adequate explanation/discussion.
2. We found this report as something that is not important to know in details. It has no influence on our work - for example the number of patents in social sciences etc.
3. In my opinion, it is necessary to compare comparable, eg. departments (RU) with a similar areas of activities, then bibliometric data have a predictive value.
4. The bibliometric report is far too long (9 pages) and information on amount and type of research outputs is highly repetitive. For our RU, the main data are the numbers of impacted papers and possibly patents. The citation analysis appears to be useful and the final number „Mean Field Normalized Citation Impact for the Research Unit“, seems to provide a good measure of the citation impact. On the other hand, highly cited papers (within the first years) are often those which are trendy, but not necessarily innovative. Papers with high innovative aspects often reach their citation maximum years later. Thus, this analysis might be helpful, but still has very limited meaning.
5. Too much effort is needed to understand the bibliometric report and to extract some useful information (but still it is possible).

Concerning the results, the principle problem is how the publications from WoS database are divided between individual Disciplinary Areas and Categories (Indicators from A1 to A4). The similar analysis done directly in WoS by using the search function provides the different results: for similar number (61000) of Czech publications (for 2009-2013 period) about 97300 journal categories (fields) is obtained (on average 1.6 categories/paper) but with a different distribution (e.g ChemEng 842, MechEng 310, EnviEng 374 compare with corresponding values 968, 2849, and 2259 in Table A4). Plausible distribution of publications between fields (categories) is needed to obtain correct Czech Republic and RU statistics.

The bibliometric results are strongly affected by the fact whether or not RU is correctly allocated in the Research Field (this allocation is suggested by the distribution of outputs in Table B1). Different criteria are applied for example in Natural Science and Engineering Fields. However, most of actual research has multidisciplinary character and surely not all RU will be evaluated as multidisciplinary ones. How this fact was (and will be) reflected in the evaluation process?

The most useful indicators are those focused on research quality (A6, A7, A8 for Czech Rep., and C4,D1,D2 for RU). For the quantitative indicators in F1 also the relative values (related to FTE of researchers) should be done. Indicators F2, F3, F4 showing "shares of the Field total in CR" can be meaningful only if credible values for "Number in the Field (CR)" are used (compare data in F2-F4 with those from A3 and A4).

6. A weakness of the bibliometric report (the table in Q045) is that it does not sufficiently clearly distinguish among the types of journal publications, in particular Jimp. The amount of Jimp can be only estimated by calculating C5 and D2, because the indicator C2 apparently includes conference papers as well, which does not give it corresponding value (purposeful behavior could easily achieve better results). Technical note: risk of confusing panellists is illustrated by the evaluation report for RU16, Criterion IV first two sentences (the reality is

6% of Jimp, not from all J). In the case of RU16 is in C5 apparently missing Chemické listy (<http://www.chemicke-listy.cz/en/index.html>).

A suitable performance indicator would be the number of publications (especially Jimp) per capita or even better related to the FTE. The contribution of RU to a publication should also be taken into account.

A suitable indicator would be to evaluate publishing activities in rapidly growing areas.

Technical note: ambitions of Citation Impact Indicator can be seen in providing better alternatives to the current score evaluation of outputs. The indicator, however, appears to include self-citations as well (WoS filters only self-citations in relation to the first author), which can produce misleading results, especially when the group / unit extensively cites its own work. Another potential pitfall is that the indicator does not distinguish RU's contribution to highly cited works.

7. Bibliometric report is for organization of our type interesting statistic rather than key document review.

8.

- Indicators A6 and A8 carry similar information - A6 is unnecessary.
- A7: we recommend to describe the calculation procedure and the absolute values for the world and for EU-28
- D1 and D2 - it would be appropriate to mention also the comparison value for the Czech Republic
- It is surprising that our RU focused on Materials Engineering had, based on the analysis, a greater percentage of publication in CZ publications in WoS for Industrial Biotechnology than for the Materials Engineering itself.

Surprising and slightly declining confidence in the analysis is the fact that Germany has a lower citation impact (measured in the EU28) than our RU.

9. Bibliometric report is quite understandable.

Indicator G3 - missing "RU share of Field total".

10. The bibliometric report was very incomplete, we expected a lot more from it.

Publications in journals must be structured from the beginning to Jimp, Jsc, Jrec and Jostatní.

Data are not based on the adjusted FTE (Full Time Employee Equivalents (FTE) of Researchers), or at least on the number of employees, so it is not clear how the evaluation committee was able to compare the performance of RUs with other teams in the Czech Republic and the EU. A comparison of the evaluated RU with similar ones in the Czech Republic is missing or at least a comparison with average values of RU operating in the same field should be implemented (data would have to be related to the FTE to be comparable).

Data do not reflect the proportion of workers of the organization at various outputs.

Bibliometric data contained in the report are inaccurate and should be checked by workers of the evaluated unit.

E.g. in our RU Bibliometric Report_REV Indicator G1 mentioned 16 patents for the years 2009 to 2013, but the indicator G2 mentions only 6 patents.

In another RU Bibliometric Report_REV there are 7 patents in G1, whereas in G2 and G3 none. A similar situation is in the indicator F: F1 and F3; certain numbers of outputs are mentioned, but in F2 and F4 are suddenly nulls only.

Some indicators are useless, i.e. it is not clear what can be deduced from them. E.g.:

- Indicator A2. Relative size of the fields within the Disciplinary Area - WoS and R&D IS.
 - Indicator A5. Mean number of authors and addresses per WoS publication with 20 or less authors.
 - Specification of articles with more than 20 authors.
 - Indicator B1. RU publications - percentage share of all Czech scholarly publications in the main fields
 - Indicator G2: IPR-related outputs of the RU – Shares of the Field total in the CR
11. Bibliometric report and the data it processed are relatively easy to understand. Escapes me but the specific meaning of such processed data for each a particular RU. For whom are primarily determined by bibliometric data? Some data may be misleading.
 12. For me bibliometric data were not understandable. I do not know the meaning of such processed data for RU. I'm not sure if they are comparable to the various RU?

Humanities

1. Bibliometrical report is undoubtedly a useful instrument, however, it is significantly restrictive in terms of use in our research unit (and most probably in the field of human science in general) since it derives its results only from international databases (Web of Science etc.). In our opinion, this does not provide relevant information about a research unit (such as ours) whose research is focused mostly on Czech context (although it has several international aspects).
2. Bibliometric report is very formal and provides a lot of data that seem to repeat for all RU of a certain scientific field without significantly touching the one that is evaluated (Indicators A) in the report. In some cases it does touch the RU, but the information is so shady that it says nothing (see, e.g. B1). Very surprising is the fact that the report seems to have the same form for humanities institutes as for science, although the ways of publishing in these workplaces are significantly different. Among the apparently redundant data belongs the number of RU outputs listed in WoS - in fact the humanities are captured there only very randomly and sporadically. These numbers bring nothing and mentioning them has form of pseudo-professional ballast. (In some places, this is actually admitted in the report itself - see eg. A6 , A7, A10, C4, C5, D1, D2, part E1, E2. At other places the report works with WoS head-on, which is beyond the exactness - indicator C2-3). Indicators G1-G3 relating to patents are also unlikely to be represented in the humanities and is unfair that they are stated in their bibliometric report.

It is surprising that Metodika is not trying to find an appropriate quantification indicator that would document at least some of the features of the application of social science and humanities institutes in the Societal relevance. A broad range of research reports prepared for various ministries and government bodies is available as well as educational software (both easily detectable from RD & I IS, on which the report was also based). An easily quantifiable and interesting indicator of societal benefits and of the reception in the society would surely be for example the number of public libraries for which were the reviewed publications purchased (easily identifiable from the Union Catalogue of the Czech Republic).

A note to indicators that are applicable within the RUs operating in our RO: A significant indicator is B2, but in this case a percentage ratio of workers of the RU compared to a total number of employees of an EvU should be included. Significant is also indicator C1, but only in comparison to other RUs, which is not mentioned. A limited comparability has also the indicator E1. An actual contribution of the bibliometric report can be thus seen in the indicators F1-F4. In these, however, as a purely formalistic appears to be the indicator "RU share of total field". Much better evidence would have to replace this indicator by monitoring the number of each type of publications per evaluated worker, both in RU, and also in the entire field of science. This would create a solid basis for comparing quantitative results. Of the total 25 indicators for a RU from our RO are seven of them applicable and useful, which is not a lot.

3. The main disadvantage of bibliometric report for Humanities and for historical sciences in particular is that the historical institutes can very hardly achieve a similar level in international journals (with a high IF factor) as natural sciences can do. Most of the institutes are focused on research in a specific area of Czech history and most authors write on topics that are generally overlooked in international periodicals. Possibilities to publish in high impact historical journals are in the Czech Republic limited.
4. We find the bliometric report clear and understandable.
5. Bibliometric message is clear and lucid.
6. It is not easily understandable; therefore I can hardly give any comments.
7. The bibliometric report does not account for the specific character of publication outputs in the humanities, which are not so much focused on the journals with impact factors.

8. Bibliometric report may show performance of the RU, however it is insufficient for evaluation of the international position in the humanities. It is implied by the report itself by stating many times "Insufficient WOS coverage of humanities". Such report may serve as a source for financial support for faculties, but it cannot render the performance of individual research fields – e. g. it is not possible to distinguish the performance of Czech, Roman or English studies from the Register of R&D results (RIV). In relation to other workplaces in the Czech Republic and in the world only overall performance of literary and linguistic disciplines within the faculty (e. g. if a large faculty is one EvU, Korean studies would be put together with Polish and Czech studies) is evaluated. As a matter of fact, it would be only possible to evaluate a fictive RU, not individual real workplaces of the faculty. For the EvU, it will not be possible to use the evaluation methodology as an instrument for control and management.

Q-5. How you compare the proposed “Metodika” with earlier version of the R&D evaluation (the coffee grinder and its recent modification)?

Natural Sciences, Engineering and Technology

1. The proposed “Metodika” is much more time-consuming than the earlier versions of R&D evaluation in Czech Republic without adequate benefits. Selected form is time-consuming not only for researchers but also for the administrative staff (economical/personal/pedagogical). It is definitely much more difficult to collect all necessary information.

Anyway, we appreciate the peer review/panel evaluation report in form of “outer feedback” to our work and achievements. However, selected kind of SA evaluation is in this form strongly dependent on the selection of sufficiently good panellists [However, who will select them? Who could guarantee their absolute impartiality?]. We prefer somehow purely numerical evaluation (“coffee grinder” type) with clear and transparent criteria every year rather than the panel/peer-review evaluation process. Simultaneously, we see no persuasive reason or logic argument why the funding of Czech science should rely (even partly) on the decisions of foreign panellists. Their decision could influence the future of R&D in Czech Republic and its focusing in deferent scientific fields. In conclusion, we prefer strongly current type of R&D evaluation (so called “coffee grinder”) with clear and transparent criteria every year rather than the new panel/peer-review evaluation methodology repeated in longer period (four or five years). In addition, the introduction and implementation of new methodology of R&D evaluation will be more expensive and needlessly decreases the budget related to science funding.

2. The earlier version we found more strict and objective – you are familiar with number of points and you know the result (income) for your institution depending from the number of these points.
3. I don't know earlier version of the R and D evaluation unfortunately and for this reason I can't compare them.
4. In contrast to so-called “the coffee grinder”, the proposed methodology IPN properly includes not only bibliometrics, but also other research-related activities of RU.
5. “Metodika” is more complex and fairer than “coffee grinder”, which takes into account only bibliometric indicators and provides them with sometimes incorrect weights. We support its launching in the Czech Republic.
6. At least for technical and scientific fields we find the valid methodology based on more exact annual evaluation more objective and also easier in both, in terms of data delivery and control. In addition, in a case of the reviewed methodology as a major risk can be seen the length of its validity or as the case may be its effects, especially in cases of [mistakenly / wrongly] negative evaluation, which may affect the operation of the evaluated RU for a too long period of 4-5 years.
7. The comparison is very difficult, because we do not have any information on the financial impact of evaluation using the Methodology on our research organization. However, an increase of administrative burden is considerable.
8. We believe that the recently used methodology (“the modification of methodology by prof. Málek's”) is more suitable, at least for natural and engineering sciences. There is no dependence on the composition of the panels and on their subjective assessment, yet it is far less time consuming for researchers and management of institutes and faculties,, yet it is capable of capturing both average performance and excellence.

9. The proposed "Metodika" is much more comprehensive than its recent modifications but still rather unbalanced in favour of basic research vs. applied research. Reduction of applied research rating is considerable.

Administrative burden is much higher for researchers as well as for administrator.

10. The previous version of R & D evaluation (the coffee grinder) is simpler and is based mostly on objective data, which are verified. There is no requirement for a self-assessment report. The proposed "Metodika" has several indicators, but some of them are un-verifiable. The authors of self-assessment report are motivated to improve a number of factors (e.g. a description of science management, and human resource management). These subjective indicators are afterwards evaluated by external reviewers, who do not know much about the reality of R & D in the Czech Republic.
11. The new "methodology" pilot project has no more significant added value to the original version of the R & D evaluation.
12. I do not know a previous evaluation.

Humanities

1. The proposed methodology is much more elaborated than the existing one and it enables much more refined evaluation, not only a mere evidence of number of achieved outputs. As a positive aspect can also be considered that the evaluation will cover a longer period of time than only a year. In the case this methodology were introduced in the Czech research, the task of ensuring the objectivity of evaluation and evaluators would be of great consequence.
2. A transition from the evaluation that uses extremely concise quantifying indicators and transforms them directly into financing of individual departments performed by the Ministry of Educations, Youths and Sports into a structured system of "peer review" can only be welcomed. It is also possible to see advantages compared to the evaluation framework applied by the Academy this year.

Monitored indicators of the Evaluation of Academy of Sciences of CR ("Evaluation ASCR") were structured in larger units, with particular focus on verbal evaluation (even 10 pages of text). In the institution it was necessary to define an internal structure of certain documents submitted in extensive texts. We noted that first versions prepared by the respective leading RUs (we were evaluated in 6 RUs) showed some disparity (some information was described with unnecessary details, others omitted). We find more detailed structuring of the questions in METODIKA more user friendly (see the first answer), same as the possibility to verify the understanding of a question in the attached manual. (For the Evaluation ASCR we had to rely on consultation days or on the FAQ in the application where the documentation was to be found). The METODIKA methodology did not follow teaching activities of the Institute, which is probably still an important part of the scientific work of academics (in the rating these were watched maybe on the contrary too thoroughly). Unlike in previous evaluation, the SWOT analysis was not included in the Evaluation ASCR. When it comes to the bibliometric outputs, so already now (prior the conclusion of the evaluation) it is publicly discussed that next time these will have to be different, because it appeared that finding uniform criteria for the evaluation of outputs from different fields of science failed.

3. The new methodology provides evaluation in broader aspects and takes into account the multiple activities of a research organization. The parameter for the evaluation is not simply a sum of points for publication activities, which is especially for Humanities very far from an objective attitude. For us it is difficult to understand why were for example workshops and conferences excluded from the R & D evaluation. These were excluded regardless if they were international or local events. Sharing information through them is one of the basic principles of scientific work. A higher contribution of many regional papers comparing to the international impact journals was already mentioned above.
4. In comparison with the previous, currently still valid methodology of evaluation of R & D, we see "Metodika" undoubtedly as a more complex (multiple evaluation criteria) way of evaluating, on the other hand, also as much more complicated and in a number of points vaguely worded. The existing methodology is more specific

in the fact that it focuses on "fixed data" that are easily verifiable, and in this respect also more objective. The proposed methodology gives a lot of room for different interpretations. Firstly, there is a strong subjective element of self-assessment and then just as subjective element of the assessment of the self-assessment report by the members of the evaluation panel. For example, according to what criteria is an excellence of post gradual studies or a social impact of the activity RU measured?

5. Compared with the Methodology for evaluation of R & D, the proposed methodology appears to be substantially more complex and in large measure more adequate for evaluating research organizations/teams, because it implements criteria that are missing in the current methodology, and which are still, in our view, essential for obtaining an adequate profile of a research organization/team. This of course makes the proposed methodology much more difficult, much more time consuming and some criteria more subjective, for their being less quantifiable. Should the methodology be based solely on self-assessments without direct on-site visits of panel members at RUs, it could be too subjective, and therefore inadequate. For this purpose it is necessary to come with a lot of ability to self-reflection of the research organization/team (which should be in an academic environment a natural thing to do).
6. It is the first serious attempt to discuss the evaluation process and it should not be overemphasised in case of the RU.
7. If this evaluation takes place once in every five years and if it is done in the written form only, it will be acceptable, provided that the reservations expressed in this feedback questionnaire have been taken into account.
8. In comparison with the proposed "Metodika", the "coffee grinder" seems to be more precise and transparent instrument for the evaluation of the research in humanities. The delivered evaluation does not offer any relevant data about either individual research areas of the Faculty of Arts of the USB, or about the Faculty itself, or about its scientific level in both Czech and international context.

Q-6. Are there any further comments and/or suggestions you would like to add regarding the future “Metodika”

Natural Sciences, Engineering and Technology

1. In the Czech Republic, there is also used similar evaluation tool called The evaluation of the research and professional activities of the institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences (CAS). Such evaluation covers 5 years intervals. From our point of view the CAS self-evaluation procedure is better than “Metodika”. In general, simpler and more concise SA report is necessary. The sections that do not contain exact information that could be easily verified and evaluated by the reviewers have to be removed. Otherwise is whole SA report just an exercise in creative PR writing.
2. Very subjective system, it is possible to receive 50 different filled questionnaires (I mean mostly the questions with oral answers, not tables with number of students) from 50 employees.
3. Probably an overall simplification of the testing and evaluation method. It is necessary to compare research units which are really comparable –institutes of Academy of Sciences and universities should be evaluated separately. Teaching and working with students at universities occurs in substantially more extension, thus, excellent research is not always possible.

Sometimes it was difficult to understand weather the question is for EvU or RU. We suggest better system in the questions. Some questions we found very similar (e.g. focus of EvU, RU).

4. In order to present our activities in more detail, we attached several pdf files (as allowed by instructions) with extra comments which, however, have not appeared in the final version of the questionnaire. Thus, we do not know whether these attachments were considered by the panel. If not, their insertion should have been prohibited.

On the whole, we suspect that these evaluations are not capable to really distinguish quality differences between the successful research units. The only realistic aim of such evaluations can be to identify weak research units. In this respect, more efficient would be a pre-scanning of the research units by simple bibliometric criteria, followed by on-site visits of the 20% weakest ones, to identify the origin of their weakness.

5. Suggested philosophy and methodology of “Metodika” evaluation is OK, but its final success is impossible without:
 - i) providing Panels with the experts of sufficient quality (also experienced in evaluation),
 - ii) perfect preparation and organization of evaluation process (this pilot testing shows some narrow necks)
6. There were, and after the pilot testing there still are, concerns that the evaluation faces a risk of being affected by subjective views of panel members, which would not give much room for fairly graded comparison of evaluated units. Should the tested methodology be used in the future, it would be appropriate to limit the influence of the human factor only to evaluating plans for a further development of an RU. The evaluation of the past should only rely on objective data, free from large-scale verbal comments. An indisputable advantage would be a reduction of the administrative burden on both sides (it would be good to shorten the evaluation period as well). Most of the data is recorded in databases or state administration bodies, which are being transmitted e.g. as part of the annual report.
7. The Methodology should have the ambition to establish evaluation of research organizations on research priorities of the state.

8. The fact that the results summarized in the table at the beginning of the RU evaluation report were poorly transcribed and differed from the evaluation in the RU evaluation report did not contribute to a good perception of the new methodology.
9. N/A
10. For a future R & D evaluation we recommend to improve the current methodology of R & D evaluation (the coffee grinder). If the evaluation of research organizations requires relating the published outputs and possibly financial flows to the number of employees or to the number of adjusted part times equivalents, then the organization structure is able to provide these data and the evaluation body is able to evaluate them.

Any methodology should be freed from "essays"- the creation of texts, reasoning, that cannot be objectively verified.

Some of the data that EvU provided are in a different form already a part of the annual report and of other documents. It would be effective to unify the format of the data, so that it is not necessary to provide them repeatedly, each time in a slightly different form.

There was a lack of time for a responsible writing of the self-assessment report. Shall it still be required, it is necessary to provide more time.

11. Given my above-mentioned opinion on the "Methodology" I have no amendments. Some questions were not always entirely well understood. However, I expect a return to more emphasis on component performance data research.
12. It would be appropriate "Metodika" to simplify, shorten and clarify rules for evaluation. In my opinion it would be possible to do "Metodika" for one Excel sheet.

Humanities

1. As an aspect contradictory to the general trend of the new methodology is considered the requirement to have 50 outputs (it is not specified which) in the RIV database. It is extremely difficulty, if not impossible, to meet this criterion for a small research unit that, at the same time, carries out research in different research fields (in the case of National Archives besides history also in chemistry, information science and librarianship etc.). Research in some fields is carried out by only a few members of the research unit.
Another remark, which was articulated already during the visit of the assessment panel, pertains to the stipulated time for foreign research stays. It is impossible for an organization which does not have a status of a public research institution or a university, which is, on the other hand, an organizational constituent of the state administration to send its employees to research stays in abroad for the duration of several months or even a year. Research stays carried out in our institutions are short term (from 1 to 2 weeks), and they still do contribute significantly to the research activities. This applies also to the research stays of foreign experts in our research unit.
2. N/A
3. N/A
4. Although several minor elements of Metodika can be seen as positive and can be useful in the evaluation of R & D, we do not think that as a whole is the proposed methodology applicable. If it would be adopted in this form the entire process of R & D evaluation would become significantly more complicated and non-transparent. We don't even dare to speculate about the financial demands of it.
5. It won't be easy to implement the proposed methodology, because it is very time consuming (we assume that even financially) and in practice of an academic environment would unfortunately easily end up with a purely formal self-glorifying of research organization/teams, which would make the whole evaluation process opaque and untrustworthy. If it would be possible to guarantee continually really good feedback from the panel members, including foreign experts and if on-site visits of panel members at RUs for a better insight into their functioning would be enabled, the methodology would undoubtedly be beneficial, although considerably difficult.
6. All data should be seen always in the context of the RU

7. Higher emphasis should be put on the specific character of the humanities and its difference from the natural scientific disciplines.
8. Verbal evaluation in categories A-E is not very transparent. For example in RU 6.2 most of the Criteria are evaluated as C, however the reason is not clear enough, because the comment mentions only marginal rebukes and stimuli for improvement.

Q-7. In your opinion, to what extent has the panel reached a correct view on performance in your research organisation?

Natural Sciences, Engineering and Technology

1. From our point of view, the panel reached only partially correct view on the performance of the RU1. We suppose that better targeted and well-defined questions in SA form could improve the relevancy of the panel report and its decision. For example, we cannot agree with the result on societal relevance. However, the incorrect view is based on inappropriate questions in the self-evaluation report.

In case of RU2, we disagree with the panel decision (rating C from Criteria I, III and IV for evaluation of scientific/research excellence and performance). We suppose that panel underestimated the real RU2 research potential. In Czech Republic, there is absolutely minimal number of RUs granted by the ERC project like ours. With better targeted and well-defined questions could be improve the relevancy of the panel report and its decision.

2. Approximately 85%.
3. In principle, the view corresponding to reality.
4. In spite of some misunderstanding in the beginning (particularly concerning the numbers of the PhD students, long-term visitors, and international collaboration), the panel came to a rather good estimate of the situation. However, it appeared that the most valuable information was given to the panel during the on-site visit. The panel would have much less realistic estimate of our activities without the on-site visit.
5. Evaluation reports with resulting quality level grades provide (more or less) correct view of our performance. But still the differences in evaluation criteria applied by Field Panels are visible (even in the frame of the same Disciplinary Area - Engineering and Technology). "Calibration role" of the Main Panel was probably not sufficiently fulfilled.

Moreover, to answer correctly this question, some additional evaluation outcomes promised by "Metodika" are missing:

- i) overview panel report for EvUs with more than 1 RU, prepared by the assigned subject panel chair,
- ii) analytical report per field, prepared by the subject panel chair,
- iii) analytical report per disciplinary area, prepared by the main panel chair.

As already mentioned above, probably the weakest point of pilot testing is evaluation of the research excellence. Here is an evidence, COMPARE:

"Metodika":

"We designed a three-stage process with a clear division of roles for the panels versus referees:

- 1) The two referees assess the research outputs and assign to each submitted output a starred quality level, accompanied by an explanatory statement
- 2) The panel member(s) expert(s) in the field assign(s) the final starred quality level for each submitted output
- 3) Based on the average scores for all submitted outputs, the subject panel decides on the final starred quality level for the RU "

WITH

Evaluation report for RU_nn (explanatory text for Excellence):

"Over 140 publications in peer-reviewed journals were published in the period 2009-2013, 131 being registered in WoS, which represent 73% of the total output. Articles in proceedings represent 23%, book chapters and monographs, 4%.

The articles are mainly published in specialized journals, explaining why only 1% of the articles are in the 10% most cited journals, and 6% in the 25% most cited journals. Looking now at the average citation rate for the RU, it is lower than the world average and the EU average, except in 2010. In turn, 12% of the publications are in the 10% most cited publications and 31% are in the 25% most cited ones. A large amount corresponds to international collaborations (40-50%), first with Italy.

Unfortunately, there is no information on the number of invited lectures in international conferences.

A number of patents (7) was applied for. However, other indicators relevant to the field of engineering and/or applied aspects are not considered as high enough to overcompensate the scientific quality.

The unit could become a stronger player if they aim for higher ranked journals, as they have a good citation index.

Focusing the research on fewer topics will improve the international visibility of the unit and attract more external funding.”

THERE is no mention about evaluation of outstanding research outputs!

Referees reports on outstanding research outputs would be valuable feedback for RU.

6. Without having the possibility to compare the outcome of the evaluation with results of other entities operating in similar fields is the question not easy to answer. Nevertheless, except for uncertainties of the scores mentioned elsewhere in this text we can generally agree with various Quality levels, also because the respective levels are defined quite broadly. Explanatory texts were, however, insufficient to understand the reasons for the grading, they were rather a commented summary for the data from the self-assessment report.
7. The evaluation report is very brief, submitted relatively general assessment is not in conflict.
8. A number of formulations in the presented report correspond to the self-assessment report. Panelists thus obtained a correct picture of our RU. Another question is rating from A-E, i.e. converting all this info into a quantitative form. There is certainly a space for questioning the weight of indicators for the final evaluation at the respective criterion etc.
9. The panel has revealed weaknesses of RU performance as well as weaknesses of self-evaluation report elaboration.

The panel incorrectly assessed strategy of RU in Introduction which is in principle to develop advanced specialty chemicals for electronics and other high-tech applications and to transfer the technologies and new products to final end users.

10. The evaluation of the panel can be accepted.
11. Due to the fact that I basically agree with the assessment report, the panel has the correct view of our RU. Evaluation can improve the direction of future development RU.
12. 30 %. Incorrectly assessed - do not match the numbers of Ph.D. students, incomprehensibly "recalculated" IF of articles.

Humanities

1. The members of the assessment panel (both foreign and Czech ones) are important specialists in our research field. Most of them have been in contact with our research unit and have knowledge of its outputs. We believe that the panel members gained an objective view of our institution activities.
2. In our opinion, the view of the panel to the performance of our Institute is largely objective. Nevertheless, we completely disagree with the proposed solution in the evaluation of RU2's excellent research, i.e. a resignation to the evaluation.

The evaluation bodies should be able to evaluate the quality of all outputs submitted by an RU in terms of their scientific quality, or excellence. Therefore it is not possible to resign to make such an evaluation, as it happened in the case of RU2. Unlike in the cases of natural sciences, where a reviewer can to a certain extent rely on supporting indicators (citation indexes etc.), at this case it is necessary to personally study the text of the works. If the commission is not capable of doing so (which can be expected especially in the field of interdisciplinary

research where the history of science belongs too), the organizers of the evaluation are obliged to provide such an assessment from trustful and relevant persons in another way (as for example in the so called first phase of the evaluation of ASCR). It is not possible to rely on published reviews (for newer publications these may not even be yet published).

3. We think that the panel presented a fair and objective evaluation of our organization. Some weaknesses are in the current state of science and research organizations hard for us to remove. Based also on this evaluation we intend to work on some of the mentioned weaknesses.
4. The evaluation panel gained in our opinion quite a good image of functioning of our RU, to which of course contributed the on-site visit of panel members at our RU. Based only on a self-assessment report this image won't certainly be complete, because in a number of questions there wasn't enough space to explain all issues in detail. E.g. answers to questions regarding the post-gradual studies were by the members of the panel interpreted in different ways, which was related to the fact that the evaluators come from countries with a significantly different system of post-gradual studies. They do not know enough about the Czech system, and many details had to be explained to them on the spot. Similarly, it was with excellent outputs; the self-assessment report allowed only a very brief explanation of the selection, only the discussion with panel members could explain much more.
5. The evaluation panel gained relatively good insight into the work of our RU.
6. In my opinion the panel properly reached a correct view on performance of our RU.
7. This is difficult to say because we cannot compare our evaluation with the evaluation and categorisation of other similar institutions. There is no clear picture of how an excellent model institution should look like.
8. It is bewildering that panelists (as seen from the part "Introduction", last but one paragraph) are not aware of the university promotion rules (Ph.D. study, habilitation, professorship) which is not different for each University, but is valid in the Czech Republic by the law. It is also bewildering that the evaluation report for RU 6.2 admits that there was not enough information because there was not enough time to ask. However, it is not our fault that there were only two hours for the on-site visits and that later the panelists did not required the information via e-mail.

Q-8. In your opinion, to what extent are the panel's conclusions and recommendations useful for the management of your institution?

Natural Sciences, Engineering and Technology

1. Obtained feedback from panel's conclusions/recommendations is for RU, of course, useful anyway. Such outside view could be also inspiring for the management of the RU, EvU and RO. However, results should be handled carefully and each point should be critically analysed. There should be no external pressure on RU/EvU/RO to apply (mechanically) the panel's recommendation.
2. Approximately 60%. It really depends on the fact if this "metodika" will be in sharp use or not. If it becomes the future system of the self- assessment, it is necessary to stress this fact to every person who will prepare the answers of the questionnaire. Without knowing the fact that this will provide some benefits to EvU no objective results will be obtained. To sum it up the researchers must have good motivation for this type of self-assessment.
3. Professional evaluation of RU is always important and we can deduce conclusions and recommendations for the present and the future of our department.
4. There is not much new in the evaluation report, what the management of the J. Heyrovsky Institute does not know. Specifically, the panel addressed two issues in their recommendation:
 - a. PhD study programs: We know that our PhD study programs are quite uncoordinated. But this is due to the fact that these programs are completely in hands of universities. If our institute had the right to give PhD's directly, the situation would change immediately. Also the fact that the duration of the PhD is quite long is directly connected to this situation. Thus, as long as the Academy of Sciences has not the right to directly coordinate a PhD program, there is not really a way to change.
 - b. Societal relevance: The Institute is intentionally not emphasizing the "societal relevance": our main mission is high-quality basic research with implicitly highest societal relevance.

In general, a responsible management of a successful RU knows what the weak points are, and where changes have to be made. Evaluation like that is mainly done to justify the distribution of the financial means from the state budget towards those RU. However, for a successful RU these evaluations are contra-productive, because key researchers are forced to spend too much time in preparations of the evaluation materials. For the society such evaluations might appear necessary, but one should not pretend that these evaluations are useful for any successful RU.

On considering the development of evaluations within the last years, one gets an impression of rapidly growing "evaluation industry", which consumes increasing amount of financial means on account of funding research itself.

As noted above at point 6, more efficient and cheaper would be a pre-scanning of the research units by simple bibliometric criteria, followed by on-site visits of the 20% weakest ones, to identify the origin of their weakness.

5. The level of analysis is quite variable comparing different Panels. Some conclusions and recommendations are rather general and commonly known. Recommendations gives advises WHAT should be improved but often without saying by which means (HOW). Demanded SWOT analysis is not addressed and reflected. Summing-up, our expectations were higher (with respect to expended time and effort).
6. Conclusions and recommendations from panels brought nothing new to us, no new information, observations or suggestions. Faculty staff did not hide their disappointment with the shallowness of the texts limited to 100-200 words.
7. Panel Evaluation provided some suggestions which will be taken into account when formulating the priorities of our organization.
8. We think that the evaluation brought nothing what the management of the faculty wouldn't already know.

9. We consider panel's conclusion and recommendations very useful and consequently have already decided to take measures aimed at the enhancing of RU performance and getting better quality level in particular criteria of the evaluation.
10. The conclusions and recommendations of the panel did not provide us with much new information, most of the shortcomings we are aware of.
11. I can't assess whether the management of the institution may findings of the expert group somehow use. Management of the institution has its own evaluation tool (Apollo - research and development).
12. 20 %. Management has own evaluation. This evaluation was dependent on the correct and full completion of many tables (almost one person), and it was possible to form a mistake.

Humanities

1. The management of the evaluated research unit paid close attention to the results of assessment reports of both research units (in the field of archaeology and history and of chemistry) and these will be discussed during the management board meeting. Some proposed measures are certainly acceptable; however, the research unit is limited in several aspects by its status of a state budget organization and of an institution which comes under the force of the new act of the state civil service.
2. The conclusions and recommendations are certainly beneficial for the management of our Institute. Most of the points is the management aware of (and also mentioned them in the documents from our side); nevertheless, it is useful to have this view from an independent subject from outside of our institution.

With regard to the amount of information that was requested in the evaluation for the whole EvU, one would expect panel to provide a more detailed feedback, especially in the area of Research environment.

3. Yes, the results are for us and for the management of institution useful and are used as one of the basis for scientific-research activities in evaluation of our organization.
4. We consider panel recommendations useful. We will discuss them in the management of EvU and RU.
5. Panel recommendations are very useful for us. We appreciate that the evaluation of our RU was very thorough, adequate and receptive to differences of the respective fields as well as sincere in its criticism; and therefore certainly inspiring for our RU. We will work with the conclusions and recommendations of the panel for the respective RUs and individual departments.
6. Despite the fact that these conclusions are relevant and very useful I can only hope that will have a certain impact on the management of our institution.
7. They are useful. The results of evaluation will be reflected at preparation of RU's future scientific activities and research projects. The research project themes will be formulated with a larger regard to international overlaps.
8. As a matter of fact, the recommendations only represent the future plans of the Faculty management (full accreditations, Ph.D. studies, habilitation rights).

Q-9. Please provide an estimate of time and HR investment in preparing submissions for the pilot testing. How many working days and how many people (in FTE) were involved (please provide an estimate for the administrative staff and for researchers)?

Natural Sciences, Engineering and Technology

1. Four researchers of RU1 and RU2 were involved in the preparation of materials for the pilot testing of "Metodika". Roughly, they spent more than 30 working days while six administrative persons involved in the preparation of the appropriate parts of SA documentation spent together 5 working days. Furthermore, ca. 20 researchers of both RUs were asked for supporting information from individual research groups to complete relevantly the appropriate answers of SA report. Each of them spent ca. 1/2 of working day to provide valuable supporting information.
2. Approx 60-70 hours.
3. Each employee had to fill in a questionnaire prepared by coordinator (who wanted to simplify it for better understanding). Time for completing the questionnaire by employees is estimated 3-5 hours. The time for coordinator's work on metodics corresponds to The employment agreement.
4.
 - Management of RU (director and vice-director) - app. 100 hours.
 - Secretary of vice-director for science and education - app. 200 hours.
 - Personal manager of RU - app. 20 hours.
 - Assistant of director - app. 30 hours.
 - 10 Heads of Departments – in total app. 200 hours.

In total: administrative staff - app. 250 hours, researchers - app. 300 hours.

5. It is difficult to estimate because at the same time two evaluation processes were running in the Institute (Pilot and ASCR). Here is just a rough estimate:
For each RU (four units): on average 10 working days (FTE) of researchers
For EU: 25 working days (FTE) of researchers, 10 working days (FTE) of administrative staff
6. For the EvU: in preparing reports and documents for the self-assessment report apart from guarantors (4 employees) for the EvU and RU the rest of heads of departments (4 employees) were involved. These employees worked within 5-6 weeks of preparation in total min. 420 hours. In addition, one staffer of the dean's office worked for 4 days (20 hours in total). The documents were prepared also by the staff of the respective institutions - the time is difficult to estimate; e.g. counting with 5 workers of the institute and one working day spent would the total workload be 280 hours. Part of the guarantors' working time was dedicated to the complicated filling out of applications for the data entry and to the need to consult the definitions / content of some items in the tables. On the other hand, it can be assumed that in a real evaluation would the self-assessment report require even more attention and would be even more time consuming.
In total, six administrative staff members of the Rector's offices spent 5 working days with preparing the documents for the RU.
7. We estimate that the preparation of pilot testing Methodology lasted about 220 hours, including 70 hours of researchers, 150 hours of administration.

8. The faculty and staff members in charge of preparing the self-assessment report spent on preparing it, along with the heads of departments and faculty administration, a total of about 400 hours. Additional work required the preparation of documents by the university administration.
9. Researchers 1 people 10 working days
Administrative staff 2 people 4 working days
10. For the evaluated unit (EvU) 4 workers participated in the preparation of necessary documents, but some materials were written in co-operation with another circa 5 workers. The total number of hours of all workers of the faculty (EvU) can be estimated at about 300, i.e. approx. 37 working days. A lot of data and some of the texts were, however, received from the staff of the Rector's offices. To prepare the required documents 6 staff members for about 5 days were involved.

The self-assessment report was written up in haste and time constraints. Preparation of materials and writing the self-assessment report for a potential real evaluation would take more time, because it would have to be written more in-depth. It would be necessary to consider and formulate the text of the report more precisely. The preparation of the report would certainly involve more people.
11. I do not understand the question exactly. I suppose as I was the only RU. If I count communicating with the CTU and share repair faulty software segment is more than 60 hours.
12. In RU were involved two researchers (ratio of 90% and 10%). Approximately 40 hours.

Humanities

1. The pilot testing project alone involved altogether seven people (director of the organization, administrator, four researchers and one administrative staffer participating in the research panel visit on the workplace). All research unit members provided data for the self-assessment report. The time estimation for the whole project (i. e. participation in meetings and trainings, communication with the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, creating the self-assessment report and other materials and organizing the visit on the work place) is approx. 165 hours.
2. 3 people (2 researchers and one administrative staffer) and 40 hours
3. The time needed for providing documents and filling out forms is very difficult to estimate, because the work was spread among several staffers and was not continuous. A very rough estimate of work would be 40 man-days. 6 employees from our institution were involved.
4. In the case of a number of persons involved in the process of pilot testing it is necessary to distinguish between two basic categories. To the first one belong staffers that were contracted by the Ministry of Education, Youths and Sports for a certain number of hours. The workload basically corresponded with the determined number of allocated hours (based on a personal experience of being in the role of a guarantor of the RU and the EvU). To the second category belong persons who were assigned by the guarantor of an RU to prepare the self-assessment report in the form of sub-tasks and collecting documents. These were mostly administrative staff at the EvU or superior units (rector's office), in cases when the requested information was not available at the level of a EvU. It is not really possible to estimate a workload of these people, because these staff members had no separate time sheets for this work. We believe that the workload was within several hours only, maximum 2 FTE.
5. The workload of people more or less corresponds to the number of hours specified in their contract with the Ministry of Education, Youths and Sports. Other people were involved in the preparation of self-assessment reports by collecting documents, this was usually within a few hours only, but these hours were not reported.
6. 7 researches (4 researches, 3 PhD students), 3 days of preparation (each day approximately 6 hours, administrative staff was not included).
7. Four researchers were needed. They processed background information provided by eight other workers (the bibliography department, heads of departments, the head of library). Two administrative staff members were busy with the work. This altogether made 40 working days.

8. The self-evaluation is quite time consuming and definitely overreached the time which had been estimated by the Ministry. 30 researchers and 7 persons of the faculty management, respectively staff involved in the pilot testing spent 550 hours of work altogether.

Q-10. Only for RU-s that received on-site visits: Please provide your comments on the merit, usefulness, and agenda of the visit (up to 250 words).

Natural Sciences, Engineering and Technology

1. N/A
2. N/A
3. The evaluation by biological panel took place in a completely inappropriate time- the beginning of the holiday season, when many employees were not at work. The organization of meeting from the side of Ministry of Education was nor correct. Other question is why evaluation of Faculty of Chemistry was performed by panel of evaluators specialized in Biology. Questions of evaluators were focused on the university system in the Czech Republic and education at our RO, so the relevant people missed who could answer.
4. This visit was extremely useful and very well coordinated. The panel members admitted that during those 5 hours they learned more about our Institute than when studying the material.
5. The merit and usefulness of the on-site visits has to be judged by Panel experts. For the Evaluation Units it brings some additional burden, which is just partially compensated by the possibility to explain and discuss problematic issues.
6. The work involved 11 staffers of the evaluated RU for approx. 3 hours, not including time for preparation of the presentation of heads of departments (there are 4 institutions united in the RU). Panellists heard the presentations of the institutes (circa 20 minutes for one institute) and visited several workplaces (the brewery, the laboratory for bioreactors and the technology hall of our faculty). They stated that the meeting was beneficial for them because the personal contact and the tour through "the infrastructure" brought a different perspective to evaluation of the RU. Unfortunately, we did not learn from them anything particular in the final evaluation. For this reason, we don't find the visit beneficial. To the key question from our side, "how many states in the EU follow this methodology?" we received a surprising answer that, none! That only in England there is a similar kind of a system, but we received no further details.
7. The visit was relatively constructive. Our RO was introduced as a research organization that has the ambition to combine basic research with research leading to rapid industrial innovations. Foreign experts appreciated this approach and pointed to the deepening of unwanted barriers between basic and applied research in the Czech Republic, which inevitably leads to a reduction in innovation potential.
8. N/A
9. N/A
10. On-site visit was in our case useful; employees of the evaluated unit could complement and explain to the members of the evaluation panel facts that were not sufficiently explained in the self-assessment report.

During the visit it appeared that the evaluators had slightly worse image of the EvU than after the visit. During discussions both sides came with findings that did not cross their minds during writing the texts. Shall the self-assessment report include the "essays" the visits will be in many cases necessary.
11. N/A
12. N/A

Humanities

1. There were two foreign and two Czech assessment panel members who participated in the visit on the work place, further two representatives of the project management and one administrative worker. The program of the visit corresponded to the given requirements, the participants visited the editorial section, library and depository, they spoke to the director of the organization, administrator and two senior and one junior research worker. The visit took place in a friendly and correct manner. We consider the visit of the workplace to be a necessary part of the evaluation.
2. On-site visit during the evaluation process is certainly useful. It turned out that although Metodika was preciously prepared and the EvU provided comprehensive documentation, the evaluators came with additional questions. Also a presentation by the institution's head and management of the RU enabled to get back to the points that could have been misinterpreted by the panellists. Finally, the on-site visit is also meaningful in the terms of society (personal encounters, dialogue). In order to provide more detailed picture of the institution it would be great if at least some of the members of the evaluation committee would also visit the detached parts of the institution, shall these parts be evaluated as well. Or it would also be advisable to visit one of the bigger events organized by the institute.

2) COMMENTS TO FINAL REPORTS

The evaluation bodies should be able to evaluate the quality of outputs submitted by the RU in terms of their scientific quality, respectively their excellence. Therefore it is not possible to resign to make such an assessment, as happened in the case of RU2.

With regard to the amount of information that was requested in the evaluation for the whole EvU, one would expect that the output of the panel would be more detailed towards the whole institution, especially in the area of Research environment.

3. N/A
4. As we stated at the question no. 7, the on-site visit of panel members was useful because it helped to clarify a number of questions. We are just unsure whether the conclusions of the visit have been / could have been effectively included into the final evaluation of the RU, respectively EvU. We assume positive answer; otherwise these visits actually lose their sense. At the same time, we would like to express our scepticism whether these visits would be fully realizable in all the evaluated ROs in case that Metodika is applied on a national scale. Time and personnel demands of such procedure would be enormous.
5. N/A
6. I consider the visit as the most important part of the evaluation process. We could explain, clarify and add comments on many issues, harmonize understanding and expectation of both sides in the evaluation process. In my opinion it was indispensable part of the whole process.
7. N/A
8. It is quite difficult to comment on the on-site visit. The visit was very short and the evaluation report for RU 6.2 itself stresses that there was not enough time to ask. On contrary, the other RU 6.1. was evaluated without a visit. The identical parts of self-assessment report in both RUs are reported and evaluated in a very different way, which reveals subjective tendencies in the evaluation process. Moreover, the committee lacked a specialist who would be able to evaluate the best element in RU 6.2 – the Bohemistics.

The distribution of the disciplines into individual Research units seem to be artificial, not corresponding with the reality of the research process at the Universities. It is incorrect conclusion that disciplines like Czech Studies, Roman Studies or Mongolian Studies – although they all deal with language and literature of a particular language society – form a common, inter-netted “research unit” with common research topics, scientific aims or organizational difficulties within the university. In conclusion, this kind of Methodology seems to be invalid and useless for evaluation in humanities.

Pilotní ověření návrhu nové metodiky hodnocení výzkumných organizací
Samostatný doplňující dokument 9
Komentáře hodnocených a výzkumných jednotek
k metodice hodnocení a pilotnímu ověření

Vydává Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy, Karmelitská 7, Praha 1
Individuální projekt národní pro oblast terciárního vzdělávání, výzkumu a vývoje:
Efektivní systém hodnocení a financování výzkumu, vývoje a inovací (IPN Metodika)
www.metodika.reformy-msmt.cz

Praha 2015