

Lubomír Rulíšek, IOCB Institutional Board Candidate for 2012-2016. Program, Ideas, Priorities,...

As the only internal member of the current IOCB Institutional Board (IB) running for the re-election (that nicely correlates with the fact that I was the only one not serving the full 5-year term), I am prepared to work hard also in the next five years on behalf of the further development of IOCB. Besides the legal duties of the IOCB IB (e.g., approval of the IOCB budget, general scientific concept of its development), I would like to be involved in the activities resulting in the “ideal” IOCB as depicted in the Scientific Concept (SC) which I was one of the main authors. It means that I agree with general trends established in IOCB in the last several years (flat structure, three types of teams, regular evaluations,...). As expressed in the SC, the idea of IOCB being the well-established academic institution heading towards the prominent position (not only in the specific field, but) in the whole Czech science, having the well-balanced and multidisciplinary structure, multicultural, international and friendly atmosphere, is close to my heart and a way of thinking. This shall be achieved by implementing a system guaranteeing a healthy level of competitiveness that is the necessary prerequisite for a good science, but not prohibitive for internal (intramural) collaborations and open scientific environment. My views about few important issues that are likely to be on the agenda of the next IB are the following:

Evaluation:

IB shall not take direct part in the evaluation (due to the conflict of interests). It shall, though assist in setting up the guidelines for the International Advisory Board. I slightly prefer that IAB will rate the scientific teams (e.g., A-F) and the teams rated as “not satisfactory” (let us say E-F) will compete for the positions with the new applicants. This avoids setting up the benchmarks and thresholds *a priori*.

Research-Service Teams and Service Teams:

While the Research (Scientific) teams undergo the regular evaluations, and the number of positions is essentially limited by the level of institutional support (limited personnel cost), no rules exist for the research-service teams and service teams. The current IB failed to come up with such rules (and I am one of the guilty ones). A certain idea (denoted “*numerus clausus*”) was presented in the SC, but it needs further discussions and practical implementation.

Longer-term Visions and Gilead Sciences Royalties:

This IB is probably the last one that will serve its full term under rather exceptional and luxurious conditions when 80% of our budget originates from the royalties brought in by inventions made by Prof. Holý and co-workers. We have to save for the future, and we have to start saving now! We have to cut all redundant expenses and make sure that each crown is either well-invested or saved for the future.

Internal Financing:

I would like to assist in forming the system of “some” internal accounting system that would be in no way prohibitive for the productive groups, administratively cheap, but would prevent wasting resources.

Fundamental (basic) vs. Applied Research:

Fundamental research should be the priority. I am not aware of many successes of well-planned applied research in the academic world. Rather, I believe that many commercially successful discoveries were side-products of the top-quality fundamental research. We are the research institute, not the company! I definitely do not like the idea of the conducting any Phase I clinical trials using our own resources. Of course, this does not mean stopping the need for e.g. IOCB-TTO that actively searches for the practical applications of our research efforts.

Size of the Institute:

It shall not increase above the current level. The evaluation process for the research teams, and something of the “*numerus clausus*”-like principle for the research-service, and service teams shall guarantee that.

Director:

I have been (during the last year) very open in saying that IOCB deserves two or three strong candidates with competing programs and visions to run for the next director of the one of the “flagship” institutes of the Academy of Sciences.