

# **Overall Report on the Conducted Evaluations of the Research and Professional Activities of the Institutes of the ASCR for 2005–2009**

## **Purpose of the Evaluation**

One of the most important tasks of the institutes and the management of the ASCR is a permanent and growing emphasis on increasing the quality of the scientific and professional activities, engagement in and improvement of the participation of the institutes in international scientific activities and quality fulfilment of further functions of the ASCR given by the relevant legislative regulations. In order to complete this task, the management of the ASCR has organised regular evaluations of its institutes since 1993. The Academic Council of the ASCR decided on 12 January 2010 to conduct an evaluation of the research and professional activities of the institutes of the ASCR for 2005–2009 after a broad discussion, including the Scientific Council of the ASCR.

## **Objectives of the Evaluation**

The Academic Council of the ASCR defined the two main objectives of this evaluation:

1. To judge the state of the art and development of the scientific and professional performance of the institutes of the ASCR, namely all the way to the level of its scientific working units, and the activities related to that on the basis of the results achieved, current trends of global science and socio-economic preferences in the interest of a permanent emphasis on increasing the quality of scientific work and on strengthening the international competitiveness of the institutes including the quality fulfilment of the other functions of the ASCR given by the relevant legislative regulations.
2. To acquire relevant and detailed background materials for decision-making on the amount of institutional support of the individual institutes from 2012, particularly for increasing the differentiation of the institutional financial support in those institutes that achieved outstanding scientific results in the evaluation period.

## **Methodology of the Evaluation**

The method of the evaluation was selected in accordance with Act No. 130/2002 Coll., on the Support of Research, Experimental Development and Innovation, as later amended, which no longer contains the institutes of research plans and presupposes institutional financing of research organisations in the form of the institutional support for long-term conceptual development based on an evaluation of the results reached by them. This act presupposes an annual budget of the amount of institutional support of the institutes on the basis of an evaluation of their results for the last five years. The amount of support for the relevant institutes is set automatically based on the share of the results achieved by the institutes in the total

amount of results of all of the research institutes. Considering that this principle is in clear contradiction with the support of the quality of science and research and is entirely inappropriate (not only) for the evaluation as well as the subsequent institutional financing of the institutes of the ASCR, a possibility that is given by Act No. 130/2002 Coll., as later amended was utilised. In Section 7 Point 6 of this act, it is stated: 'The provider may adjust the amount of support according to a more detailed evaluation using internationally recognised methodology<sup>7b)</sup>, which along with the results of the more detailed evaluation and regulations of the adjustment of the support shall be published before its provision. The provider further in the institutional support takes into account also the amount of indirect support, which has been provided to the research organisations in previous years in the form of reliefs from tax obligations.

<sup>7b)</sup> For instance, the Research Assessment Exercise.'

In accord with the legislative framework mentioned above, a basic methodological conception was adopted for the evaluation of the institutes and their scientific institutes, which was based on the system of peer review, multi-criteria assessment and in the relevant cases the use of indicator analysis. In setting this methodological conception, the 'Standard Evaluation Protocol 2003-2009 For Public Research Organizations' was utilised, which is used for evaluating research organisations financed from public means in Holland and some appropriate methodological elements were adopted from the 'Research Assessment Exercise', employed in Great Britain. The evaluative five-point scale and verbal characterisations of the individual quality levels were adapted from the assessment systems of the European Science Foundation (ESF) and ALLEA.

### **Organisation of the Evaluation**

At its 12th Session on 12 January 2010, the Academic Council of the ASCR appointed a five-member steering group for guiding the course of the evaluation. The evaluations themselves were divided into two blocks separated in time, where first an evaluation was conducted of the research activities of the fifty-two institutes oriented predominantly or entirely on research activity and a special evaluation of the specialised activities of two institutes with a focus on the infrastructure of research and development.

For the evaluation of the research orientated institutes, the Academic Council of the ASCR appointed nine evaluation commissions, one for each science section, at its 16th Session on 6 April 2010. A rule was adopted for the evaluation commissions that a maximum of one-third of their members could be employed at the institutes of the ASCR and that the president of the commission was not allowed to be an employee at the ASCR. In total, the evaluation commissions had sixty-two members, of whom only six were from institutes of the ASCR and ten were from abroad (Slovakia, Austria, France).

For the evaluation of the infrastructure orientated institutes, the Academic Council of the ASCR appointed two evaluation commissions, one for each infrastructure organisations, at its 31st Session on 28 June 2011. These Commissions had a total

of eighteen members, where the rule applied that at most one-half of the members of each commission could be an employee at the institutes of the ASCR.

## **Background Materials for the Evaluation**

### 1. Evaluation of the Research Orientated Institutes of the ASCR

On the basis of the 'Methodological Instructions for the Treatment of the Background Materials of the Institutes of the ASCR within the Evaluation of the Research Activities of the Institutes of the ASCR for 2005–2009' approved by the Presidium of the Academic Council of the ASCR at its 16th Session on 4 May 2010, the institutes of the ASCR (except for the Library of the ASCR, v. v. i., and the Centre for Administration and Operations of the ASCR, v. v. i., which were evaluated separately – see below) prepared the background materials, whose structure was divided into five thematic circles of evaluation:

- A) Quality and results of the scientific activities and the current topics in terms of the trends of global science and their innovation potential. At the same time, the response to the results and the position of the evaluated unit (institute/scientific unit) in the international context were taken into consideration for the evaluation.
- B) Importance and specific contribution of the institute/scientific unit for society in terms of the social, cultural or economic needs of the Czech Republic, or in terms of maintaining the continuity of long-term accumulated data collections, providing public services etc.
- C) Engagement of the institute/scientific unit in international cooperation, including participation in foreign projects, information networks, organisation of important international conferences etc, and the results of international cooperation and its importance for the activity of the institute.
- D) Personnel, material and organisational questions of the activities of the institute and the prospects for its development, including:
  - division of the institute into scientific units, the role of the scientific units in the conception of the institute, evaluation of the significance and quality of the scientific units by the management of the institute;
  - internal stimulation and evaluation methods and mechanisms for determining research priorities;
  - the age composition of the employees, particularly with regard to the quality and results of the scientific work of the employees with a long-term prospect of activity at the institute;
  - the institute's and its scientific units' own SWOT analysis conducted by the management of the institute.
- E) Further activities and complementary information, including:
  - participation in the resolution of grant and programme projects of the CR, with a list of the projects of particular importance in terms of the scientific conception of the institute;
  - pedagogical activity of the institute, training of doctoral students, lecture courses, preparation of textbook materials etc.;

- participation in the activities of the scientific community (membership in commissions related to activities in science and research, editorial councils, bodies of grant agencies, scientific councils, or other participation in the governance of science and its popularisation).

Based on these background materials, the following aspects and criteria of the evaluation were then assessed:

1. Quality and amount of results achieved by the institute/scientific unit, innovation potential of its results, response in the scientific community (background materials A, B, C).
2. Position of the institute/scientific unit in the international, or national, context of the field (background material C).
3. Prospects of the institute/scientific units, significance of the unit for the scientific conception of the whole institute, feasibility of the research programme, level of the leading persons of the scientific units, potential of engagement in new scientific topics (background material D).

In the evaluation of the institute as a whole, circles A–E were assessed, scientific units were assessed in circles A, B, C and D (here only the subpoint – SWOT analysis). Considering the distinct thematic and field diversity of the institutes and their scientific working units, the institutes and their scientific units were divided into two types – Type I and Type II. For the institutes of Science Areas I and II and part of the institutes of Science Area III, the decisive criterion was the quality of the results of the scientific activity and their significance in the international context of the given scientific field (thematic circles A and C). For the majority of the scientific units of the institutes of Areas I and II, the evaluation of the significance in the national context (circle B) is not important or meaningful (the institutes and scientific units of Type I). For some institutes of Science Area III, particularly some of their scientific units, or even some specialised units of the individual institutes of Science Areas I and II, the significance of their scientific activity in the national context is decisive (the institutes and scientific units of Type II). Some institutes categorised part of their scientific units in Type I and part in Type II.

Considering the two different types of institutes/scientific units, also the weight of the individual criteria was adjusted in the following manner:

Thematic Circle	Number of points/or weight (%)	
	Type I	Type II
A	50	30
B	5	40
C	20	5
D	20	20
E	5	5
TOTAL	100	100

The following five-point scale was set for the evaluation of the institutes and their scientific units:

#### *1 - Excellent*

Type I: The quality of the research and results achieved in the evaluation period are on the peak level on the international scale, have a fundamental importance for the development of the field, jointly shapes its current global trend. The institute/scientific unit is considered as important on the international level.

Type II: The quality of research and results achieved in the evaluation period are on the peak level on the national or European scale, have a fundamental significance both for the development of the field and the development of the culture and society in the Czech Republic. The importance of the institute/scientific unit is considered to be essential in its field on the nation or European level.

#### *2 - Very Good*

Type I: The quality of research and results achieved in the evaluation period are significant on the international level; on a national scale they have a fundamental impact on the development of the field. The institute/scientific unit is recognised on the international level, in national comparison it is the foremost representative within the field.

Type II: The quality of research and results achieved in the evaluation period are significant on the national or European level; on the national scale they have a significant impact on the development of the field and contribute to the development of the culture and society in the Czech Republic. The institute/scientific unit is recognised on the nation or European level.

#### *3 - Good*

Type I: The quality of research and results achieved in the evaluation period are competitive on the national scale and only to a limited extent participates in the development of the field also on the international level. The institute/scientific unit of the institute is considered on the national scale as important within the field.

Type II: The quality of research and results achieved in the evaluation period are competitive on the national or European scale, but only to a limited extent contribute to the development of the culture and society in the Czech Republic. The institute/scientific unit of the institute is considered to be good within the field on the nation or European level.

#### *4 - Satisfactory*

Type I: The quality of research and results achieved in the evaluation period are on a satisfactory level, but they do not reach the qualities of the results listed in the previous categories, they only build on the long-term trend of the field. The quality of the institute/scientific unit is only on the national level.

Type II: The quality of research and results achieved in the evaluation period are on a satisfactory level, but they do not reach the qualities of the results listed in the previous categories, they only build on the long-term trend of the field.

## 5 - Unsatisfactory

Type I: The quality of research and results achieved in the evaluation period are unsatisfactory, the existing scientific and/or methodological approach was not correct, the research should be stopped. The institute/scientific unit is considered as from below average to unimportant even on the national scale.

Type II: The quality of research and results achieved in the evaluation period are unsatisfactory, the existing scientific and/or methodological approach was not correct, the research should be stopped. The institute/scientific unit is considered as below average to unimportant.

## 2. Evaluation of the Infrastructure Orientated Institutes of the ASCR

On the basis of the 'Methodological Instructions for the Treatment of the Background Materials of the Institutes of the ASCR within the Evaluation of the Professional Activities of the Infrastructure Institutes of the ASCR for 2005–2009' approved by the Academic Council of the ASCR at its 31st Session on 28 June 2011, the infrastructure institutes of the ASCR (Library of the ASCR, v. v. i., and Centre for Administration and Operations of the ASCR, v. v. i.) prepared background materials, whose structure was divided into eight thematic circles of the evaluation:

- A) The quality and results of the professional activities and activities for the infrastructural functions of the ASCR.
- B) Evaluation of the position of the institute in the national and supranational context.
- C) Participation in the support of the activities of the scientific community – the organisation of conferences, membership in commissions related to the activities in science and research, editorial councils, grant bodies, scientific councils, or other participation in the governance of science.
- D) The extent of foreign cooperation, including participation in foreign projects.
- E) Participation in the resolution of grant and programme projects of the CR, application and other activities.
- F) Pedagogical activity – the training of doctoral candidates, lectures, preparation of textbook materials, other educational activity.
- G) Popularisation activity.
- H) The level of the management of the institute (method of management of the institute with its material and human resources) judged based on its own SWOT analysis.

Based on these background materials, the following aspects and criteria of the evaluation were then assessed:

1. The quality and amount of results achieved by the scientific unit; the response in the scientific community.
2. The quality, extent and desirability of the infrastructure activities provided; the innovation potential of the activity, response to the infrastructure activities provided in the scientific community.

3. The position of the institute in the national and supranational context.
4. The prospects for the institute and its organisational units, potential for engagement in new infrastructure activities and increasing the level of the existing activities.

For the infrastructure orientated institutes of the ASCR, the quality, extent and desirability of the infrastructure activities provided for the needs of the scientific community were significant criteria. The different position of the KNAV of the ASCR and CAO of the ASCR in terms of the professional focus and extent of activities provided was reflected also in the different weights of the individual aspects:

Aspect	KNAV of the ASCR	CAO of the ASCR
1	35	10
2	30	60
3	20	10
4	15	20
TOTAL	100	100

The following five-point scale was used for the evaluation of the infrastructure institutes:

*1 - Excellent*

In the long term, the institute has achieved outstanding results; it is considered as important from the national supranational points of view; its activities have a fundamental importance both for the support of the research institutes of the ASCR and for the development of the society in the Czech Republic.

*2 – Very Good*

The institute achieves very good results; in national comparison it is the foremost representative of the support of the science and research infrastructure; its activities have a significant impact on the support of the research institutes of the ASCR and contribute to the development of the culture and society in the Czech Republic.

*3 - Good*

The institute achieves quality results; in national comparison it is a foremost representative of the support of the science and research infrastructure; its activities have a limited impact on the support of the research institutes of the ASCR and the development of the culture and society in the Czech Republic.

*4 - Satisfactory*

The institute does not reach the qualities listed in the previous categories; the professional and other infrastructural activities provided are beneficial in a limited extent for the research institutes of the ASCR

*5 - Unsatisfactory*

The institute is considered as from below average to unimportant. Its activities need to be reorganised in a fundamental way.

## **Course of the Evaluation**

### **1. Evaluation of the Research Orientated Institutes of the ASCR**

The preparatory session of the nine evaluation commissions took place on 10–12 May 2010 with the attendance of the Vice-Presidents of the ASCR and representatives of the steering group. The first tasks of the evaluation commissions were to stipulate from its centre a raconteur responsible for the individual institutes and to agree with the directors of the evaluated institute based on their proposal the division of the institutes into scientific units and their inclusion in Type I or II. The background material documents were available to the evaluation commissions in electronic form via an electronic interface on 16 June 2010. The Academic Council of the ASCR approved the foreign reviewers, including possible alternates, on 13 July 2010. In close synergy with the evaluation commissions, the secretaries of the commissions began the process of addressing the foreign reviewers with requests to prepare the evaluations of the scientific units on 1 September 2010. The foreign reviewers had the opportunity to select themselves, which units of the institute to assess considering their professional focus. If the list of approved foreign reviewers and their alternates was exhausted and it was necessary to address other reviewers, the evaluation commissions selected and in plenary session discussed other suitable reviewers with the required specialisation. A total of 665 expert opinions on the scientific units were acquired from foreign reviewers, thus on average 1.64 expert opinions per unit. The preliminary results of the evaluations (profiles of the scientific units, proposal of the evaluations of the institutes) were submitted by the evaluation commissions by 20 December 2010. In their formulation, both the expert opinions from the foreign reviewers and its own evaluation based on a study of the background materials of the institute were used.

The next phase of the activity of the evaluation commissions was the implementation of an onsite evaluation at the individual institutes with the attendance of the foreign reviewers, vice-presidents of the ASCR and representatives of the steering group. To ensure a unified approach, the steering group approved the document 'The Course of the Onsite Evaluations at the Institutes of the ASCR' on 6 December 2010. The onsite evaluations at the institutes took place from 10 January 2011 to 25 February 2011. On 3 January 2011, the preliminary results of the evaluation from the evaluation commissions and the expert opinions of the foreign reviewers in their verbal expressions were made accessible through an electronic interface to the directors of the institutes. The onsite evaluations were attended by 147 foreign reviewers, hence 62 % of the total number of reviewers, who had prepared an expert opinion and were invited to the onsite evaluation. With the help of external record-keepers, minutes from the course of the onsite evaluation that were signed by the director of the director of the institute and the representative of the evaluation commission, who guided the onsite evaluation, were prepared.

The results of the evaluation were submitted by the evaluation commission by 14 March 2011 in the form of two protocols – profiles of the scientific units and the final evaluation of the institute. The Vice-Presidents of the ASCR in cooperation with the members of the Academic Council from the relevant field judged the results of the evaluations prepared by the evaluation commissions and in justified cases proposed an adjustment of the overall evaluation of the research units (with a specification to



within 0.5 of a point). These adjustments and the positions of the Academic Council of the ASCR were adopted at the 27th Session of the Academic Council on 23 March 2011 and were subsequently made accessible to the directors of the institutes, who responded to these materials after discussion in the councils of the institutes by 7 April 2011. Objections to the evaluations contained in the positions of the directors were then discussed individually with the Vice-Presidents of the ASCR and the representatives of the steering group. The final modifications of the evaluations were approved at the 32nd Session of the Academic Council of the ASCR on 19 July 2011.

## 2. Evaluation of the Infrastructure Orientated Institutes of the ASCR

The joint foundational session of the evaluation commissions of the KNAV of the ASCR and CAO of the ASCR took place on 10 August 2011 with the attendance of the President of the Steering Group. At the impetus of the evaluation commissions, the directors of all of the institutes of the ASCR were asked to complete a simple, structured questionnaire on the utilisation of the infrastructure activities provided by the KNAV of the ASCR and the CAO of the ASCR. The complete background materials were made accessible to the evaluation commissions on 1 September 2011. The evaluation commission of the KNAV of the ASCR did not request to visit the evaluated institute, whereas the evaluation commission of the CAO of the ASCR at one of its sessions called on a representative of the management of the evaluated institute, including the heads of all of the evaluated divisions, to acquire complementary information on the background materials of the institute that had been submitted.

The results of the evaluations in the form of the final protocols on the evaluations of the professional activities of the institutes of the ASCR were submitted by the presidents of the evaluation commissions on 14 October 2011. The Academic Council of the ASCR expressed its consent with the results of the evaluation at its 35th Session on 8 November 2011. The institutes after discussions in their councils responded to the results of the evaluation by 21 November 2011. The Presidium of the Academic Council of the ASCR took the responses of the institutes into account on 22 November 2011.

### **Results of the Evaluation**

In fifty-two research orientated institutes of the ASCR, a total of 395 scientific units were evaluated, of which 116 (29 %) at institutes of Science Area I, 201 (51 %) at institutes of Science Area II and 78 (20 %) at institutes of Science Area III. The number of the evaluated units of the individual institutes, included in the categories Type I (332 units, 84 %) and Type II (63 units, 16 %), is given in the following table.

Name of the Institute	Evaluated Units	of which Type I	of which Type II
Astronomical Institute of the ASCR, v. v. i.	4	4	0
Institute of Physics of the ASCR, v. v. i.	14	14	0
Institute of Geophysics of the ASCR, v. v. i.	5	5	0
Institute of Geology of the ASCR, v. v. i.	5	5	0
Institute of Mathematics of the ASCR, v. v. i.	6	6	0
Institute of Photonics and Electronics, ASCR, v. v. i.	6	6	0
Institute of Atmospheric Physics, ASCR, v. v. i.	6	6	0
Institute of Physics of Materials of the ASCR, v. v. i.	8	8	0
Institute of Plasma Physics of the ASCR, v. v. i.	5	5	0
Institute of Geonics of the ASCR, v. v. i.	6	6	0
Institute of Computer Science of the ASCR, v. v. i.	4	4	0
Nuclear Physics Institute of the ASCR, v. v. i.	9	9	0
Institute of Hydrodynamics of the ASCR, v. v. i.	2	2	0
Institute of Scientific Instruments, ASCR, v. v. i.	7	7	0
Institute of Rock Structure and Mechanics, ASCR, v. v. i.	6	6	0
Institute of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics, ASCR, v. v. i.	3	3	0
Institute of Information Theory and Automation, ASCR, v. v. i.	8	8	0
Institute of Thermomechanics of the ASCR, v. v. i.	12	12	0
<b>Total of Institutes of Science Area I</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>0</b>
Institute of Biophysics of the ASCR, v. v. i.	9	9	0
Biology Centre of the ASCR, v. v. i.	15	15	0
Institute of Biotechnology of the ASCR, v. v. i.	7	7	0
Institute of Botany of the ASCR, v. v. i.	10	10	0
Institute of Systems Biology and Ecology of the ASCR, v. v. i.	8	8	0
Institute of Physiology of the ASCR, v. v. i.	3	3	0
Institute of Microbiology of the ASCR, v. v. i.	23	23	0
Institute of Analytical Chemistry, ASCR, v. v. i.	7	7	0
Institute of Inorganic Chemistry, ASCR, v. v. i.	6	6	0
Institute of Vertebrate Biology of the ASCR, v. v. i.	5	5	0
Institute of Experimental Botany, ASCR, v. v. i.	17	17	0
Institute of Experimental Medicine, ASCR, v. v. i.	10	10	0
J. Heyrovsky Institute of Physical Chemistry, ASCR, v. v. i.	8	8	0
Institute of Chemical Processes, ASCR, v. v. i.	9	9	0
Institute of Macromolecular Chemistry, ASCR, v. v. i.	5	5	0
Institute of Molecular Genetics of the ASCR, v. v. i.	23	23	0
Institute of Organic Chemistry and Biochemistry, ASCR, v. v. i.	25	25	0
Institute of Animal Physiology and Genetics, ASCR, v. v. i.	11	11	0
<b>Total of Institutes of Science Area II</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>0</b>
Institute of Archaeology of the ASCR, Brno, v. v. i.	4	0	4
Institute of Archaeology, ASCR, Prague, v. v. i.	4	0	4
Institute of Ethnology of the ASCR, v. v. i.	5	1	4
Institute of Philosophy of the ASCR, v. v. i.	12	6	6
Institute of History of the ASCR, v. v. i.	6	0	6
Masaryk Institute and Archives of the ASCR, v. v. i.	2	0	2
Economic Institute of the ASCR, v. v. i.	1	1	0
Oriental Institute of the ASCR, v. v. i.	3	0	3
Institute of Psychology of the ASCR, v. v. i.	4	4	0
Institute of Slavonic Studies of the ASCR, v. v. i.	3	3	0
Institute of Sociology of the ASCR, v. v. i.	9	0	9
Institute of Art History of the ASCR, v. v. i.	5	0	5
Institute of Czech Literature of the ASCR, v. v. i.	4	0	4
Institute of the Czech Language of the ASCR, v. v. i.	8	0	8
Institute of Contemporary History, ASCR, v. v. i.	5	0	5
Institute of State and Law of the ASCR, v. v. i.	3	0	3
<b>Total of Institutes of Science Area III</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>63</b>

The overall results of the evaluation (marks) of the scientific units are presented in the following table. The average mark achieved by all the evaluated units was 2.1.

Evaluation Commission / Science Area	# of units	Marks – Number of Units							
		1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	5
EC 1	45	11	2	22	0	9	0	1	0
EC 2	43	9	0	20	0	13	0	1	0
EC 3	28	4	0	12	0	7	0	4	1
EC 4	60	14	7	22	7	10	0	0	0
EC 5	103	18	12	32	14	15	8	4	0
EC 6	38	5	6	14	11	2	0	0	0
EC 7	17	0	3	7	4	3	0	0	0
EC 8	26	5	1	17	1	2	0	0	0
EC 9	35	6	2	16	3	4	0	4	0
SA I	116	24	2	54	0	29	0	6	1
SA II	201	37	25	68	32	27	8	4	0
SA III	78	11	6	40	8	9	0	4	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>in %</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>41.0</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>0.3</b>

The infrastructure institutes were evaluated as follows: KNAV of the ASCR received a mark of 1.5 and the CAO of the ASCR a mark of 2.

A detailed synopsis of the results of the evaluation of the individual scientific units is provided in an independent attachment.

### **Transfer of the Results of the Evaluation into the Financing**

The transfer of the results of the evaluation into the calculation of the amount of institutional support for the institutes of the ASCR is anchored in the 'Principles of Assessing the Institutional Support of the Institutes of the ASCR for 2012 and the Framework of the Approach for the Next Period'. *This document was approved by the Academic Assembly of the ASCR at its 34th Session on 15 December 2011.*

### **Conclusion**

From a comparison of the quality of the scientific outputs from the last and this cycle of the evaluations of the institutes of the ASCR, it is evident that during the evaluated period of 2005 to 2009 a substantial increase of measurable quality occurred at the institutes of the ASCR and of the amount of scientific and professional outputs of the institutes. It arises from the bibliometric data, the conclusions of the evaluation commissions and the states of the foreign reviewer. It is nonetheless clear that not all

of the units of the institutes are contributing to the same extent to the increasing quality and number of results.

Despite the complexity and logistically demanding nature of this cycle of the evaluations of the institutes of the ASCR, it also possible to state that to conduct an evaluation all the way to the level of the individual scientific and professional units was the correct decision, because it provided for the management of the ASCR as well as the management of the institutes important background materials for the further raising of the quality of their work. On the other hand, it is necessary to state that the results of the evaluation indicated the fact that the long-term undervalued amount of state institutional support for science and research is limiting for a comparison with the results of institutes of the peak global level.

*Discussed by the Academic Council of the ASCR at its Thirty-Sixth Session on 1 December 2011.*