

RNDr. Václav Kašička, CSc. (PhD.), head of the scientific-service team Electromigration methods

Why I have accepted nomination to candidate for the Institutional Board of the IOCB ASCR:

1. I have been asked to accept nomination by several coworkers. I consider the work in the Board as a “service” for the IOCB and I offer my capabilities for this purpose.
2. I am strongly concerned in the current state and future development of the Institute. As a member of the Board, I’ll have a better chance to influence the relevant issues belonging to the competence of the Board.
3. I have some experience in the work in the previous Scientific Councils of the IOCB in the years 2001-2006 and I am aware that the positive changes in the current state can be performed only by achieving a wide consensus within the Board. In this context, I am ready to consider and discuss all suggestions presented and to support the rational ones.
4. In my opinion, the current state of the IOCB is rather good. I consider the recently approved Scientific Concept of the IOCB for the years 2011-2020 as a good basis for future successful development of the IOCB. However, some points, such as rules for establishment and cancellation of the scientific, junior-scientific, scientific-service and service teams and the way of their financing and the criteria for their evaluation should be discussed and specified in more detail.
5. If I am elected a member of the Board, I will support the following principles:
 - a) Rational, systematic and fair approach to the solution of all tasks and problems encountered.
 - b) Competitive but friendly and collaborative atmosphere within the IOCB.
 - c) Approximately, to keep the current ratio of personal, financial and space capacities for the main branches of organic, medicinal, bioorganic, physical and theoretical chemistry and biochemistry, as well as among scientific, scientific-service and service teams within IOCB.
 - d) Open and free both vertical and horizontal communication within the Institute. For this purpose, an internal IOCB electronic conference should be open. I believe this forum will contribute to a better foreknowledge of the IOCB staff about all relevant events and problems and it can help to solve the problems in an effective and fast way.
 - e) Positive motivation is better than “punishment”. Additional support and benefits for the best teams and some limitations but not strong penalties or even cancellation of the teams with temporary weak results.
 - f) To restore the practice of internal IOCB “survival grants” (1 year, maximum two times per five years) for the high-quality projects, which, in spite of a good evaluation from the GACR or other science foundation, did not get support from these external sources.
 - g) Combined scientometric and peer-review evaluation of both scientific and scientific-service teams. Formulation of clear and fair rules for evaluation of both types of the teams. To avoid conflict of interest in the selection of specialists asked for the peer-reviews. Currently, a lot of teams are afraid of the evaluation procedure since they do not know what parameters they have to comply with in order to pass successfully the evaluation.
 - h) In the current annual scientometric evaluation of the scientific efficiency of the scientific and scientific-service teams, to replace the non-transparent sum of the salaries of scientific workers (except the team leaders, which is problematic for a lot of people) by the openly available sum of the working capacities of the scientific workers of the teams including the team leaders.