

Evaluation of research and professional activity of research-oriented institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for the period 2015–2019

Final Report

Name of the Institute: Institute of Archaeology of the CAS, Brno, v. v. i.

Evaluated teams and their leaders:

1. Research Centre for Slavonic and Medieval Archaeology (Lumír Poláček)
2. Research Centre for Palaeolithics and Paleoanthropology (Martin Novák)
3. Research Centre for the Roman Period and the Migration Period (Balázs Komoróczy)

Part A: Evaluation of the institute

Strengths:

The Institute has a well-known and established profile in archaeology covering a broad field from early hunter-gatherers to mediaeval times. All three teams have well-known experts with distinct regional and chronological specialisation. The Institute has three research centres, an additional branch in Opava for North Moravia and Silesia, as well as the famous visitor centre in Mušov. Additional infrastructure is organised in several service departments to provide state-of-the-art facilities in some aspects (library, archive, conservation).

The main research focus of the teams and related established centres is well embedded in the Institute's overall profile to conduct basic research in the history of Central Europe, particularly in the broader territory of the Middle Danube region, Moravia and Czech Silesia.

The teams have the opportunity to work with in part unique archaeological materials and sources collected within their own fieldwork, especially from the important sites of Dolní Věstonice/Pavlov, Mušov and Mikulčice.

The Institute is engaged in national and international as well as interdisciplinary collaborations represented in the publication record, joint projects, international conferences and exchange internships. The recently established joint doctoral program with the Masaryk University in Brno is expected to show important impact in educating and integrating young scholars, at least on a national level.

Weaknesses:

The Institute is conducting basic research in an international scientific environment, but has to deal with regional rescue archaeology on the one hand and an inappropriate funding situation on the other hand. Therefore, the Institute depends massively on external funding via project grants. The integration of international young scholars and PhD students needs to be increased in the future.

Opportunities:

The long tradition of excellent research in archaeology in the Czech Republic and in the CAS in particular offers the best institutional framework to intensify collaborative research in the future. We recommend the strengthening of collaboration with other CAS institutes in Prague and especially with the Institute of Archaeology. The interdisciplinary collaborations with the natural sciences are an integrative part in international archaeological research and are expected to be more and more important in the future. The potential success in excellent international funding programmes will also depend on the available analytical facilities, such as laboratories as well as experts in the various highly specialized disciplines of bio- and geoarchaeology. Intensified collaboration between Brno and Prague, including the Department of Natural Sciences and Archaeometry of the Institute of Archaeology in Prague, could lead to a national and cross-institutional establishment of archaeological sciences in the Czech Republic, which would require substantial funding.

The internationally well-known research centres of the Institute and their famous archaeological sites cover a wide range of human history. Their undoubted impact on gaining new knowledge with primary data provides the opportunity for further international collaboration, the integration of young scholars and the raising of international visibility. We therefore suggest the testing of new recruiting strategies of MA and PhD students during the coming evaluation period. The recommended integration of the younger generation in the Institute's management (perhaps also including female archaeologists) would support new models for raising attractiveness within the global context of archaeology.

Threats:

The Institute is an organisation licensed under Act No. 20/1987 Coll., which requires staff and facilities to undertake activities in cultural heritage management which are outside the main research focus. The Institute's responsibility in the administrative territories of the South Moravian, Moravian-Silesian, Olomouc, Zlín and Vysočina Regions is leading to all kinds of professional rescue archaeology work, including coordination, management and conducting of fieldwork as well as expert reviews and official statements dealing with the protection of archaeological heritage in all aspects.

Within this specific context of responsibilities, required by law, the funding of the Institute and its teams, some of which are very small, appears insufficient. New and fresh scientific input through younger scholars and students is recommended.

Main criterion: 1. Quality of results (H1.1-H1.5)

H1.1	Quality of selected outputs of Phase I
The outputs are generally of good quality, but the international visibility should be enhanced through submission to major international journals.	
H1.2	Contribution of workers on the outputs reached
The contribution of the workers is essential for the success and output of the institute overall. All workers have contributed to the outputs selected.	
H1.3	Quality of all outputs and results
Outputs and results are of good and increasing quality	
H1.4	The most valuable discoveries and findings in the fields, their importance for the field
The study of human adaptation to the worsening climatic conditions in the Palaeolithic; the contextualization of archaeological material in the area of classical and medieval studies; advances in our general knowledge of the periods under investigation; the strong focus on citizen science and public dissemination	
H1.5	Contribution of the participation of the authors in large collaborations
The research contribution in large collaborations is already high and visible in several international events, publications, and project collaborations.	

Main criterion: 2. Societal relevance (H2.1-H2.5)

H2.1	Societal relevance of outputs and results pursuant to CAS and institute mission
The work of ARUB is of high societal relevance for the area under investigation and for the Czech public but in the future could be increased to embrace a wider Central European stage through further internationalization, for which the Institute already has plans.	
H2.2	System functionality for knowledge transfer into practise, its usefulness for society. The impact of the institute's activity on proper practice in society in the area of social sciences and humanities

<p>Knowledge transfer into society (open science) takes place in the Brno Institute and has a special focus on the areas of Moravia and Silesia. The activities of the Institute enhance the proper practice of archaeology. The dissemination includes exhibitions, public lectures and publications, and the presentation of relevant sites, e.g., the Archaeopark Pavlov, Dolní Věstonice.</p>	
H2.3	Relation to practice
<p>The inclusion of the general public is already in practice and demonstrated via a wide range of public outreach activities.</p>	
H2.4	Participation in AV21 strategy
<p>The motto of the AV21 strategy, <i>Top research in the public interest</i>, is clearly a focus of the Institute, as seen by the outreach activities and in the assessment of the individual teams (see below)</p>	
H2.5	Cooperation with regions of the Czech Republic
<p>There are already well-established collaborations within the CAS and with universities, particularly with the Masaryk University Brno. Co-operation could be intensified with the Prague institutes of the CAS and the Czech universities in general. There is a branch office in Opava, but its role requires definition, especially as a new building is planned.</p>	

Further criterion: 1. Position in international and national context (D1.1-D1.3)

D1.1	Comparison of the teams and the institute with similar international and national institutes
<p>The researchers have the potential to reach the highest standards nationally and in part internationally after the completion and implementation of the restructuring process.</p>	
D1.2	Scope and quality of international and national cooperation and the role of the institute in such cooperation; engagement in broad international cooperation
<p>National and international collaborations have increased significantly since the last evaluation but could be further increased on the European level. In particular, the small number of young scholars (PhD students and young postdocs) is surprising in relation to the high quality of the research and the availability of first-class sites.</p>	
D1.3	Participation of the workers in scientific community activities (organizing of conferences and workshops, invited lectures, awards)
<p>The staff engage regularly in scientific community activities, but the funding should be increased so they can engage in more activities on the international level.</p>	

Further criterion: 2. Vitality, sustainability and strategy (D2.1-D2.9)

D2.1	Direction in line with the perspective of the planned research directions
<p>The direction is mostly in line with the planned research directions</p>	

D2.2	Assessment of the previous research objectives and their achievement
The previous research objectives have been achieved	
D2.3	Assessment of implementation of recommendations from past evaluation
The recommendations have almost all been implemented.	
D2.4	Success in receiving grants
Because competition for international grants is so high, the Institute should be supported administratively in respect of these grants through the central offices of the CAS, perhaps by dedicated staff with experience in submitting applications and winning grants.	
D2.5	Adequacy of instrumental equipment
The equipment is mostly state of the art but maintaining and enhancing it should be a focus for the period 2020-2024, as well as increased collaboration with the Prague institute, especially in sharing high-cost infrastructure and research facilities for conducting analyses in the archaeological sciences.	
D2.6	Effectiveness of management
The management of the various research bases seems to be very effective. The director's presentation during the virtual evaluation did not reflect the management effectiveness or successful strategy for the Institute, entirely due to technical problems. Nevertheless, the available documents for the evaluation suggest solid management, which could benefit from the integration of the younger generation in the future.	
D2.7	Assessment of professional structure, development strategy and the strategy of keeping best scientists, age structure, career and qualification growth
The age profile has been lowered due to the influx of students from the MU Brno, but the low level of salaries is problematic if the best scientists are to be engaged and retained.	
D2.8	Creating work-life balance conditions, assessment of approach towards possible gender issues
We have no information to support comment on this point.	
D2.9	Relation of the institute with regard to the integration, development and sustainability of the research centre funded by the National Programme of Sustainability II.
This question is not considered for this discipline.	

Further criterion: 3. Cooperation with universities and participation in education (D3.1-D3.6)

D3.1	Scope of cooperation with universities on national and international level
The Institute mainly co-operates with the Masaryk University Brno and could perhaps also co-operate with other Czech universities on a national level. There are several well-established and successful collaborations at the project or team level, including those with an international dimension.	
D3.2	Effectiveness of joint research centres

The effectiveness appears high, although an intensification of collaboration with CAS institutes as well as with other Czech institutions and museums could increase visibility.	
D3.3	Success rate in supervision of PhD students
The recruiting practice could in future include the wider European and world-wide context, which requires the support of the CAS regarding programmes and grants. International summer schools could form one part of the necessary strategy to raise the attractiveness for young international scholars.	
D3.4	Participation of PhD students in the outputs
Participation has been increasing because of the collaboration with MU Brno, which formed an important aspect in the successful development of the Institute during the evaluation period.	
D3.5	Participation of the institute in master or bachelor studies
Participation is high but further courses could be jointly developed to increase its impact. A new agreement with MU Brno is expected to strengthen the integration of BA and MA students in the future, at least on a national level.	
D3.6	Assessment of cooperation intensity with universities in the form of teaching
The co-operation with the Masaryk University Brno is promising (see above)	

Further criterion: 4. Outreach activities (D4.1-D4.3)

D4.1	Sufficiency of media strategy and activities in the area of research popularisation
The endeavours of the Institute should be supported by the CAS centrally through the media strategy and in some areas could be brought to a more international level, although the virtual exhibitions, presentations and media events are already impressive and state-of-the-art.	
D4.2	Publishing activities and its quality
The publishing activities in general are of good quality, including the publication of books and (in some teams) articles in high impact international journals, which strengthen the Institute's visibility.	
D4.3	Participation in professional organisations in the area of research and development
The researchers participate in professional organisations but should be encouraged to increase their participation on an international level in order to raise their visibility, given their well-deserved reputation as scholars.	

Other comments of the commission:

The commission recommends:

- An international advisory board should be established, with a view to helping the Institute define and realise its goals, both academic and public-facing.
- Implementation of international summer schools with the support of the CAS, to bring students and other young scholars to participate in the Institute's fieldwork on its sites of world importance.
- Support by the Academy in the application process for international grants, especially on the EU level.
- Continuation of the ongoing improvement strategy by supporting more cross-cultural and diachronic topics and intra-institutional synergy in the Institute's research profile.
- Continuing improvement of infrastructure for analytical and synthesising research.
- There should be a clear strategy for the operation in Moravian Silesia.

Part B: Evaluation of teams

1. Research Centre for Slavonic and Medieval Archaeology

Strengths:

- A focus on key issues of the medieval history of Central and Eastern Europe;
- The ability to evaluate extensive archaeological assemblages, comprising material from older large-scale excavations plus new, systematic and well-documented fieldwork;
- The value of assemblages from the primary power centre in Mikulčice, offering a unique opportunity to study the entire range of specific questions connected with medieval centres;
- Strong technical and analytical support for research, including archaeobotany, archaeometry and analytical and conservation specialisms.

Weaknesses:

- too heavy a burden because of the Monuments Act, which requires staff to attend to issues of heritage protection;
- the shortage of junior researchers, particularly PhD students and post-doc researchers, and the need for generational exchange between researchers and technical staff;
- the lack of international, especially European, projects and the lack of publications in high-impact periodicals.

Opportunities:

Strengthened collaboration with the Prague Institute.

Threats:

Too little external funding in the future due to high competition, limited institutional funding.

Main criterion: 1. Quality of results (H1.1-H1.5)

H1.1	Quality of selected outputs of Phase I
High but could be increased. The total number of outputs during the five-year period is 72, with 16 outputs evaluated during Phase 1. Of these, two falls in Quality group 1, nine in Quality group 2, and five in Quality group 3. There were none in Quality groups 4-5.	
H1.2	Contribution of workers on the outputs reached
The outputs would not be possible without the full engagement of the researchers.	
H1.3	Quality of all outputs and results
Of high quality nationally, and increased efforts to publish internationally and with interdisciplinary dimensions (e.g. in the American Journal of Physical Anthropology, or Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences, on Mikulčice and other early medieval sites). The team is also concerned to publish not only in Czech but also in German and English,	

thus increasing the international visibility of the research (4 monographs published in German and English during the period evaluated).	
H1.4	The most valuable discoveries and findings in the fields, their importance for the field
Bioarchaeological studies of the physical habitus of early historical populations, their nutrition, residential mobility and social structure. Basic work to link these populations into a wider Central European framework.	
H1.5	Contribution of the participation of the authors in large collaborations
Already efforts such as in Bednar et al on Moravian and Silesian strongholds of the tenth and eleventh centuries in the context of Central Europe; such efforts should be increased and encouraged in the future.	

Main criterion: 2. Societal relevance (H2.1-H2.5)

H2.1	Societal relevance of outputs and results pursuant to CAS and institute mission
The outputs are of high societal relevance and pursuant to the mission of both the CAS and the Institute as the research outcomes contribute to the basis for the better understanding of the current geopolitical situation of East-Central Europe.	
H2.2	System functionality for knowledge transfer into practise, its usefulness for society. The impact of the team's activity on proper practice in society in the area of social sciences and humanities
The team is highly engaged in knowledge transfer activities and proper practice in the area of social sciences and humanities, e.g., with several international exhibition projects on Mikulčice or Great Moravia and with the research base in Mikulčice presenting cultural and educational programmes to the interested public.	
H2.3	Relation to practice
The endeavours and investigations are practice-orientated; the team contributes to the digitizing and archiving activities of the institute.	
H2.4	Participation in AV21 strategy
In the framework of the Institute's activities, with e.g. <i>Lifestyle and Identity of the Great Moravian Nobility</i> or <i>The role of Centres in Transitional Society</i> .	
H2.5	Cooperation with regions of the Czech Republic
Such cooperation could be increased within the CAS to formulate precisely defined research focuses, and to make use of synergies, especially with the Centre for Medieval Studies and the Institute of Archaeology, both in Prague.	

Further criterion: 1. Position in international and national context (D1.1-D1.3)

D1.1	Comparison of the team with similar international and national institutes
The team has good potential but needs to be supported to reach a higher national and international level to be able to be compared to teams in neighbouring countries.	

D1.2	Scope and quality of international and national cooperation and the role of the team in such cooperation; engagement in broad international cooperation
Co-operation with excellent European partners is good but should be made more international by means of more high-profile international projects and participation in grant applications.	
D1.3	Participation of the workers in scientific community activities (organizing of conferences and workshops, invited lectures, awards)
There is vital activity which should be further supported, especially to increase the international visibility of Mikulčice as a Central European centre for research.	

Further criterion: 2. Vitality, sustainability and strategy (D2.1-D2.9)

D2.1	Direction in line with the perspective of the planned research directions
In general, the direction is in line with the planned research directions, but the team should be more focused in the future on clearly defined research goals.	
D2.2	Assessment of the previous research objectives and their achievement
The previous objectives have mostly been fulfilled, and especially the bioarchaeological focus led to the publication of several studies in impacted natural science journals.	
D2.3	Assessment of implementation of recommendations from past evaluation
The recommendations have been taken into account and partially implemented, as visible in the generational exchange and the efforts to participate in international projects	
D2.4	Success in receiving grants
The success rate should be increased via further institutional support from the CAS. The implementation of a project support office in 2018 was an important step to increase the success rate in the future.	
D2.5	Adequacy of instrumental equipment
The equipment is adequate	
D2.6	Effectiveness of management
The management seems to be very efficient now	
D2.7	Assessment of professional structure, development strategy and the strategy of keeping best scientists, age structure, career and qualification growth
The structure of the team goes in hand with the overall institutional development with a generational exchange and the integration of three PhD students and the successful cooperation with MU.	
D2.8	Creating work-life balance conditions, assessment of approach towards possible gender issues
We lack information to comment on this point.	
D2.9	Relation of the team with regard to the integration, development and sustainability of the research centre funded by the National Programme of Sustainability II.

Not applicable to this research team

Further criterion: 3. Cooperation with universities and participation in education (D3.1-D3.6)

D3.1	Scope of cooperation with universities on national and international level
The cooperation should be widened to embrace the broader European context, however strong collaborations with the University of Vienna, the Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe, Leipzig (GWZO), and the Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Mainz (RGZM) could already be established.	
D3.2	Effectiveness of joint research centres
Very effective due to the establishment of the cooperation in the field of doctoral studies	
D3.3	Success rate in supervision of PhD students
The success rate is high due to the increased collaboration with the Masaryk University.	
D3.4	Participation of PhD students in the outputs
Such participation should be increased to guarantee the influx of younger researchers.	
D3.5	Participation of the team in master or bachelor studies
The team's participation should also be increased to create further influx and a long-lasting impact for the next generation of researchers.	
D3.6	Assessment of cooperation intensity with universities in the form of teaching
University teaching should be increased but with no further bureaucratic burden for the involved scientists.	

Further criterion: 4. Outreach activities (D4.1-D4.3)

D4.1	Sufficiency of media strategy and activities in the area of research popularisation
The team is very much committed to outreach activities especially with the web application, the Virtual Scientific Model of Great Moravian Mikulčice.	
D4.2	Publishing activities and its quality
The publishing activities should be further increased and bundled with the other institutes of the CAS concerned with medieval studies.	
D4.3	Participation in professional organisations in the area of research and development
The team participates in an adequate number of professional organisations nationally and internationally.	

Other comments of the commission:

2. Research Centre for Palaeolithics and Paleoanthropology

Strengths:

- rich and diverse Palaeolithic and palaeoanthropological material;
- well-qualified, excellent researchers;
- a flourishing research tradition;
- a major portfolio of discoveries;
- clear definition of research topics;
- excellent output on the international level (publication in high-impact journals);
- outstanding and well-known research outcomes;
- important international collaborations.

Weaknesses:

- low level of integration of young international scholars;
- staff shortage;
- low number of PhD candidates and post-docs;
- project funding instability.

Opportunities:

- to become the leading Central European facility to study early humans;
- national and international collaboration;
- response to fast growing research trends.

Threats:

- inadequate funding in relation to the range of research topics undertaken;
- danger that the research competitiveness of the team will decline without a boost to the staff numbers;
- the absence of a development strategy.

Main criterion: 1. Quality of results (H1.1-H1.5)

H1.1	Quality of selected outputs of Phase I
The total number of outputs during the five-year period is 108, with eight outputs evaluated during Phase 1. Of these, one falls in Quality group 1 and seven in Quality group 2; none in Quality groups 3-5.	
H1.2	Contribution of workers on the outputs reached
The research team seems to contribute greatly to the overall output of the whole Institute, especially in terms of high impact interdisciplinary publications in journals such as Quaternary International.	
H1.3	Quality of all outputs and results
The quality is very high, with publication in high ranking international journals, covering anthropological and environmental as geoscientific topics.	
H1.4	The most valuable discoveries and findings in the fields, their importance for the field

Contribution to the knowledge of the genesis and evolution of the modern human population through the discoveries and work on the Moravian Upper Palaeolithic sites (Dolní Věstonice, Pavlov).	
H1.5	Contribution of the participation of the authors in large collaborations
The authors are steadily increasing their participation in large collaborations, reflected e.g. in Škrdla et al (2015), with well established co-authors authors from Australia and France.	

Main criterion: 2. Societal relevance (H2.1-H2.5)

H2.1	Societal relevance of outputs and results pursuant to CAS and institute mission
The outputs significantly increase our knowledge about the evolution of modern humans in a holistic setting in evaluating human environment interaction	
H2.2	System functionality for knowledge transfer into practise, its usefulness for society. The impact of the team´s activity on proper practice in society in the area of social sciences and humanities
The team is very committed to participation in knowledge transfer activities, e.g., with the Archaeopark Pavlov project, to create a state of the art exhibition of the time of the mammoth hunters.	
H2.3	Relation to practice
The relation to practice is very high, the team is highly skilled interdisciplinarily and contributes highly to the digitizing and storage strategies of the overall institute.	
H2.4	Participation in AV21 strategy
The teams endeavours go hand in hand with the AV21 strategy, e.g. with <i>The Paleolithic site of Pavlov: GIS application as a comprehensive tool in archaeological data management and analysis</i> ” project in the framework of the AV21 Strategy- Memory in the Digital Age”; with M. Novák as a principal investigator.	
H2.5	Cooperation with regions of the Czech Republic
Co-operation, especially with Prague on archaeological sciences, could be increased in selected fields of archaeological science. The team is also highly committed to collaborate with not only the Masaryk University in Brno but also with heritage institutions in Moravia and beyond.	

Further criterion: 1. Position in international and national context (D1.1-D1.3)

D1.1	Comparison of the team with similar international and national institutes
The team is very well embedded in international research and compares well with other international teams in Poland or Austria with high standards of field research.	
D1.2	Scope and quality of international and national cooperation and the role of the team in such cooperation; engagement in broad international cooperation

The co-operative relationships are already on a very high international level and include collaborations with the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Leipzig (DE), the Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History in Jena (DE) and the Eberhard Karls University of Tübingen, Department of Paleoanthropology (DE), to name but a few.	
D1.3	Participation of the workers in scientific community activities (organizing of conferences and workshops, invited lectures, awards)
The workers are highly engaged in scientific community activities, and the number of lectures and presentations of the team members in an international framework is impressive.	

Further criterion: 2. Vitality, sustainability and strategy (D2.1-D2.9)

D2.1	Direction in line with the perspective of the planned research directions
The direction of the team is in line with the planned research directions, however the burden of rescue excavations and the persistent lack of funding keeps the team diverted from its research focus.	
D2.2	Assessment of the previous research objectives and their achievement
The previous research objectives have been fulfilled and resulted in a high number of impacted publications.	
D2.3	Assessment of implementation of recommendations from past evaluation
The recommendations have been mostly implemented, with an increase of international collaborations, high ranking publications and the generational change in the team.	
D2.4	Success in receiving grants
<p>The team succeeded in receiving grants from the Czech Science Foundation and the Czech Academy of Sciences.</p> <p>The success so far on an international level was low due to high international competition and perhaps the lack of professional support by the central administration of the CAS. However, several applications on a European level are already in preparation.</p>	
D2.5	Adequacy of instrumental equipment
The equipment seems adequate, but its enhancement has to be part of the goals for the next period.	
D2.6	Effectiveness of management
The management seems to be highly effective.	
D2.7	Assessment of professional structure, development strategy and the strategy of keeping best scientists, age structure, career and qualification growth
The activities of the team go hand in hand with the strategy of the Institute but are hampered by the funding situation.	
D2.8	Creating work-life balance conditions, assessment of approach towards possible gender issues

A focus in the period 2020-2024 should be on these issues to also enhance the attractiveness of the workplace in Brno and to stay competitive in a European context as measures of gender equality are mandatory now for participation in applications to the EU.	
D2.9	Relation of the team with regard to the integration, development and sustainability of the research centre funded by the National Programme of Sustainability II.
Not applicable to this research team	

Further criterion: 3. Cooperation with universities and participation in education (D3.1-D3.6)

D3.1	Scope of cooperation with universities on national and international level
Collaboration with the MU Brno and the Anthropos Institute is good, but collaboration on both the national and international levels should be strengthened, with a special focus on recruiting young scholars.	
D3.2	Effectiveness of joint research centres
They are very effective due to the cooperation with the Masaryk University.	
D3.3	Success rate in supervision of PhD students
The success rate appears high due to the participation in lecturing and teaching by team members at several institutions in the Czech Republic.	
D3.4	Participation of PhD students in the outputs
Participation has already been a focus of interest and has led to the integration of a few young researchers, especially in the fields of Paleoanthropology & Archaeozoology, but could be increased.	
D3.5	Participation of the team in master or bachelor studies
Participation appears to be already high due to the collaboration with MU Brno, with constantly increasing numbers in the supervision of students.	
D3.6	Assessment of cooperation intensity with universities in the form of teaching
Teaching could be increased in the following period, if the bureaucratic burden allows, to help recruit enough students for future research. Dedicated new programmes, such as international fieldwork summer schools, could support the recruiting process and raise the international visibility of the team.	

Further criterion: 4. Outreach activities (D4.1-D4.3)

D4.1	Sufficiency of media strategy and activities in the area of research popularisation
The team seems very dedicated to dissemination strategies, as can be seen in the Archeopark Pavlov project, where the team regularly organizes lectures, guided tours and public workshops.	

D4.2	Publishing activities and its quality
The team publishes in highly ranked international journals with internationally renowned specialists from all over the world (e.g., France, Australia).	
D4.3	Participation in professional organisations in the area of research and development
The team should be encouraged and supported to increase participation, especially by the younger members. The established members are already very active in national and international research associations and editorial boards.	

Other comments of the commission:

- Since the retirement of a leading member of the team a few years ago, it is important that the Institute ensures that staff numbers are maintained and excellence fostered. Increased financial support could further enhance the efforts of the team to maintain the high quality of their research and ensure state of the art equipment for future research.

3. Research Centre for the Roman Period and the Migration Period

Strengths:

- success in achieving additional funding;
- existing links to top foreign research workplaces;
- openness to modern research trends and to implementation of advanced computational techniques in archaeological research (SQL database, agent based modelling, network modelling, etc.);
- thanks to the pedagogical activities of the team leader, appropriate involvement of students in the research strategy at various levels;
- sophisticated and sustainable strategy of outreach activities.

Weaknesses:

- ongoing generational turnover in terms of personnel and thematic restructuring;
- still a developing team with the need for future confirmation of professional qualities on the international level (a need for a gradual increase in quality and size);
- the need to involve more members in the publishing activities of the team.

Opportunities:

- the chance to coordinate research themes and topics within a European context.

Threats:

- the thematic restructuring has not been very successful;
- insufficient technical capacities (e.g. conservation, analytical) and absence of coordination of their use at the institutional level;
- the conditions for larger, thematically conceived cross-cutting projects at the institutional level are absent;
- The unit is too small to support applications for exceptional and demanding projects (e.g., ERC grants).

Main criterion: 1. Quality of results (H1.1-H1.5)

H1.1	Quality of selected outputs of Phase I
The total number of outputs during the five-year period is 53, with six outputs evaluated during Phase 1. Of these none lie in Quality group 1, two in Quality group 2 and four in Quality group 3; none in Quality groups 4-5.	
H1.2	Contribution of workers on the outputs reached
The workers contributed well to the output achieved.	
H1.3	Quality of all outputs and results
The team contributed to the enlargement of knowledge on Roman provincial history, especially military history.	
H1.4	The most valuable discoveries and findings in the fields, their importance for the field

Research on Roman military intervention in the territory north of the Middle Danube and the related Roman-German interactions.	
H1.5	Contribution of the participation of the authors in large collaborations
The authors have participated in large European collaborations and published interdisciplinary results in impacted journals such as the European Journal of Human Genetics and Quaternary International.	

Main criterion: 2. Societal relevance (H2.1-H2.5)

H2.1	Societal relevance of outputs and results pursuant to CAS and institute mission
The relevance of the outputs lies in the knowledge gained about Roman-German interaction on a provincial basis and is pursuant to the CAS and Institute missions.	
H2.2	System functionality for knowledge transfer into practise, its usefulness for society. The impact of the team´s activity on proper practice in society in the area of social sciences and humanities
The team is very committed to participation in knowledge transfer activities with a focus on Roman archaeology in general and raising awareness about metal detecting in the framework of citizen science.	
H2.3	Relation to practice
The relation is high due to the ongoing fieldwork activities and the participation of the team in the long-term storage activities of the institute.	
H2.4	Participation in AV21 strategy
The team seems devoted to the AV21 strategy, and is striving for high quality research through its funding attempts in the project “ <i>Conflicts between Barbarism and Civilisation in the Middle Danube Region during the Roman Period</i> ”, (Strategy AV21, “Europe and the State: Between Barbarism and Civilisation”, 2017) with the main output being an extensive popular science publication.	
H2.5	Cooperation with regions of the Czech Republic
Further co-operation should be encouraged, although especially interdisciplinary cooperation already exists with the Institute of Geology, Institute of Archaeology, Czech Academy of Sciences, and with the Department of Geology at the Palacký University, Olomouc, to name but a few.	

Further criterion: 1. Position in international and national context (D1.1-D1.3)

D1.1	Comparison of the team with similar international and national institutes
As there is an ongoing building-up of the team, it is difficult to compare to other institutes, and the team is very small for the scope of activities stated.	
D1.2	Scope and quality of international and national cooperation and the role of the team in such cooperation; engagement in broad international cooperation

<p>The scope and quality of cooperative relationships and the role of the team therein are constantly increasing with interinstitutional cooperation at both the national and international level in matters relating to the Migration Period („Tracing Langobard migration through aDNA analyses”. The main organisers of the project are P. J. Geary (Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton), W. Pohl (Universität Wien) and D. Caramelli (Dipartimento di Biologia, Università di Firenze).</p>	
D1.3	Participation of the workers in scientific community activities (organizing of conferences and workshops, invited lectures, awards)
<p>The team is very active in scientific community activities and in organizing conferences and lectures, especially in the field of digital modelling of archaeological data, which also resulted in the participation of M. Vlach in the “Network for Agent-based Modelling of Socio-ecological systems in Archaeology (NASA)” under the Scientific Research Network (WOG) programme implemented by the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO).</p>	

Further criterion: 2. Vitality, sustainability and strategy (D2.1-D2.9)

D2.1	Direction in line with the perspective of the planned research directions
<p>The direction is in line with the perspective of its long-term conceptual focus and the embedding of the research within archaeological sciences. However, the focus was limited by the ongoing generational turnover.</p>	
D2.2	Assessment of the previous research objectives and their achievement
<p>The previous research objectives have been achieved, but the objectives and topics have been slightly changed to research that is more integrated with archaeological sciences.</p>	
D2.3	Assessment of implementation of recommendations from past evaluation
<p>The recommendations from the past evaluation have been partially implemented and mostly fulfilled, and the development of research into protohistorical topics has become nationally and internationally recognized.</p>	
D2.4	Success in receiving grants
<p>The team has been successful in receiving national grants and has been involved in greater European grant activities. However, the team seems to be too small with too many research topics to develop larger European grant applications.</p>	
D2.5	Adequacy of instrumental equipment
<p>The equipment is adequate, but an improvement in capacity for conservation and analytical facilities is important.</p>	
D2.6	Effectiveness of management
<p>The management seems effective for this small unit.</p>	
D2.7	Assessment of professional structure, development strategy and the strategy of keeping best scientists, age structure, career and qualification growth
<p>The team is restructuring, and the age structure improved with younger scientists being brought in, yet the HR situation still seems problematic due to the smallness of the team.</p>	

D2.8	Creating work-life balance conditions, assessment of approach towards possible gender issues
Possible gender issues should be considered in the coming period although the team has become more gender balanced.	
D2.9	Relation of the team with regard to the integration, development and sustainability of the research centre funded by the National Programme of Sustainability II.
Not applicable.	

Further criterion: 3. Cooperation with universities and participation in education (D3.1-D3.6)

D3.1	Scope of cooperation with universities on national and international level
The co-operation with the universities in Brno and Prague has proven to be successful, with the integration of younger scientists into the team, but there is scope for more engagement.	
D3.2	Effectiveness of joint research centres
The joint research centres have proven to be successful with the cooperation with the Masaryk University.	
D3.3	Success rate in supervision of PhD students
Due to the activities of the team leader and intensive teaching, the success rate in the supervision of PhD students appears high.	
D3.4	Participation of PhD students in the outputs
PhD students already take an increasing part in the outputs of the team.	
D3.5	Participation of the team in master or bachelor studies
A number of BA and MA students are integrated in the projects.	
D3.6	Assessment of cooperation intensity with universities in the form of teaching
Due to the now intense co-operation with the MU Brno and intensive teaching by members of the team, an intake of local students has been achieved, but the collaboration with Prague, especially in the field of anthropology, should be intensified.	

Further criterion: 4. Outreach activities (D4.1-D4.3)

D4.1	Sufficiency of media strategy and activities in the area of research popularisation
The team is very active in regard to research popularisation and also in raising public awareness with their metal detecting initiative. A further focus is on communication through printed and digital media (team's website, Facebook page, Instagram account, YouTube channel).	

D4.2	Publishing activities and its quality
The team produced good publications and started to publish interdisciplinary research in high impact journals, but it needs to produce more studies in top international journals.	
D4.3	Participation in professional organisations in the area of research and development
The participation of the senior team members is already high but should be further supported amongst the younger team members, for example via joint conferences for master's students together with MU and Prague.	

Other comments of the commission:

- Improving the capacities of the institute for conservation and analytical facilities is important.
- There is a lack of specialists in anthropology and other scientific disciplines, and they would strengthen this team, although there are good collaborations with anthropologists in the Charles University in Prague.

Commission 10 - History and archaeology
Evaluated teams No.: 1, 2, 3

Commission Chair: Prof. Gary B. Cohen

Commission Deputy Chair: Pavel Vařeka

Commission Members:

Peter Bugge

Alessandro Catalano

Maciej Gorny

Anthony Harding

Barbara Horejs

Dušan Kováč

Hana Píchová

Alain Soubigou