



**CZECH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES**  
**INSTITUTE OF GEOLOGY**

Kancelář AV ČR  
Odbor podpory vědy  
Národní 3  
117 20 Praha 1

Your letter: AVCR 3405/2021 OPV

Our No.: GLU-770/2021

Prague, 1 June 2021

**Comments on the course of the evaluation & the Final report of the Evaluation of research and professional activity of research-oriented institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences for the period 2015–2019 (Institute of Geology of the CAS, v. v. i.)**

In compliance with the letter of 13 May 2021 (File No. AVCR 3405/2021 OPV), we hereby submit comments on (i) the course of the Evaluation and (ii) the Final report.

- (i) The Evaluation process was following the outlined Methodology of Evaluation.
- (ii) We studied the Final report thoroughly and do not ask for its reassessment. We wish to acknowledge the work of the whole commission not only in the course of the on-line session but also in the preparation of the Final report. We appreciate all comments including those made during the online session already. Also, we are very pleased that the Evaluation arrived at a positive conclusion in the case of the Institute of Geology.

To make the debate on the completion of Phase II of the Evaluation complete, we, however, feel prompted to briefly mention a few points, which have a bearing on the Final report in its particular details, but partly also in its whole message. At the same time, we are convinced that these do not rank among general comments on the Methodology of Evaluation; as such, they are formulated in separate paragraphs below.

- 1) We find the evaluation at the team level insufficiently balanced in places (we do not dispute the validity of the team ranking but the diversity of approaches among evaluators contributing to the final wording of the report). This resulted in several imprecisions in comparing the results of the individual teams, hence also inconsistencies in the verbal assessment of their work. An example to illustrate the point: in section D3.3 (Success rate in supervision of PhD students), Team 1 received the ranking “to be improved” while Teams 2, 3 and 4 were ranked “good” to “very good”, or “two PhD dissertations defended”; in reality, Team 1 supervised altogether 11 PhD students in the

---

**165 00 Praha 6 – Lysolaje, Rozvojová 269**

Tel.: 00 420 233 087 211

ID: 67985831, VAT ID: CZ67985831

e-mail: [inst@gli.cas.cz](mailto:inst@gli.cas.cz)

<https://www.gli.cas.cz>

period under evaluation (of which 3 defended their theses) and 4 and 8 MSc students and BSc students, respectively (all of them defended their theses – see the “Report on the research activity of the team” on p. 21). These figures are the highest of all teams (see tables “Supervision of students” in the reports of the respective teams).

- 2) As suggested by some conclusions in the Final report, its preparation was based on the on-line presentations, while the detailed reports on the teams and the Institute were rather overlooked in many aspects. These include detailed information on teaching activities but also other aspects.
- 3) Gender Issue. Although we absolutely support the philosophy of equal opportunities, admission of new staff is guided primarily by quality as the ultimate decisive criterion. Quality as such is, however, not created by discrimination (either positive or negative) of any groups of population. We have been striving for a gender-balanced representation of scientific workers for many years. Anyway, the achievement of this goal depends on the interest of female and male scientists in the positions offered. The admission process is transparent and non-discriminatory.
- 4) The text displays minor misprints, but especially “cumbersome” formulations which sometimes make the understanding of the comments difficult: e.g., the text in section D2.5 “SEM TESCAN Vega 3XMU; Powder X-ray, Bruker D8 X-ray diffraction; saw+grinder, Struers; Microspectrometer, Transform spectrometer, electron probe microanalyzer, JEOL JXA 8230 Electron Probe Microanalyzer” should be preferably formulated as “SEM TESCAN Vega 3XMU; JEOL JXA 8230 electron probe microanalyzer; Bruker D8 powder X-ray diffractometer; Struers saws+grinders; S&I Raman microspectrometer; Nicolet infra-red spectrometer”. The same is advisable for the text in section D3.3 “Very good (but only 2)”, although we do not see these formulations so essential to be discussed in detail.
- 5) Comments on the overlaps of some research themes with those of other institutes are understood as quite significant. The topics solved by an interdisciplinary-orientated institution, such as the Institute of Geology, must be unavoidably related to the activities of other institutes dealing with geosciences. In such cases, however, desirable synergic collaboration takes place rather than an overlap in activities as such. On the other hand, a certain degree of relevance of this comment can be admitted for selected parts of Team 4.

Despite our comments above, we take the liberty to conclude that a complex feedback, as provided by international evaluators, is of high value for the Institute of Geology. It will be considered in defining the future research strategy of the Institute as a whole as well as the individual teams.