

Meeting of the Scientific Board of the Central European Institute of Technology, Masaryk University

Date, venue	8 th March 2018, Brno, University Campus Bohunice, A35/211
Participants	J. Nantl (chair), M. Bareš, J. Mayer, K. Říha, R. Štefl, M. O'Connell, M. Zvonař, V. Bryja, T. Kašparovský, J. Doležel, M. Králíčková, M. Kiess, J. Friml
Guests	M. Pokorná, E. Handlířová, N. Kostlánová, J. Šilarová, M. Marcolla
Excused	J. Koča, J. Leichman, P. Plevka, O. Fojt, R. Zbořil, P. Martásek, P. Tomančák, A. Tiran, L. Kunz, P. Hobza
Minutes prepared by	E. Handlířová
Approved by	J. Nantl
Comments by	-

Agenda

- 1) Strategic Plan Implementation (Status Report 2017)
- 2) Activity Plan 2018
- 3) Budget of the Institute
- 4) Junior Group Leaders' Evaluation 2017 (Report)
- 5) Dissolution of the Vanesa Tognetti Research Group
- 6) Any Other Business

Minutes

Introduction

The Scientific Board reached the quorum: 13 members are present out of 23 members of the board.

J. Nantl welcomed the members of the CEITEC MU Scientific Board and namely new member of the board, Tomáš Kašparovský, newly appointed dean of the Faculty of Science of the Masaryk University. Jaroslav Leichman and Andreas Tiran want to step down from the board because of change of their positions and arrangements. Based on this, J. Nantl will invite new members to the board during the spring 2018.

The agenda has been distributed, together with background materials, in advance. There were no proposals from the members regarding amendment of new agenda point. Based on the rules of organization, the spring meeting is dedicated mainly to reporting of previous year and budget planning.

1) Strategic Plan Implementation (Status Report 2017)

See Annex 1 and PPT

J. Nantl: CEITEC MU is operated based on the Strategic Plan up to 2020 (also: the strategy) that has been also consulted with the board members and approved by the rector of MU on 3rd January 2017. The strategy inter alia specifies key performance indicators (see Annex 1 and PPT for detailed information).

In general, implementation is ongoing as planned with selected activities that are delayed. There were 53 measures/activities defined for 2017 out of which 75 % was fulfilled according to the plan (or even finished), 21 % is delayed and 4 % of activities was not even launched.

Among the most important achievements of the year 2017, J. Nantl mentioned the Teaming project (1st phase), opening of two new research groups, hiring of new head of bioinformatics and preparation of HR Award application (Gap Analysis). CEITEC MU reached 33 % of international employees in 2017 (having 34 nationalities on board) and also increased quality of publications.

Regarding research productivity, CEITEC MU is above national average. See section “*Research Report 2017*” in the PPT presentation for concrete data.

J. Nantl also outlined that CEITEC MU set up an alliance of life science institutes in EU-13 member states – the Alliance4Life (alliance4life.ceitec.cz/). We are expected to contribute to policy recommendations to the European Commission. It is meant as a permanent structure that should speak up for quality science in new member states.

An important step in the recruitment area was hiring new head of bioinformatics, Panagiotis Alexiou, that comes from the University of Pennsylvania. He has a dual appointment, as facility head and as group leader.

Debate:

M. Bareš appreciated that CEITEC MU is able to open new groups but also dissolve groups that do not perform well, or do not fulfil conditions as defined by internal rules, and asked if this is applied each year.

J. Nantl: In the long term perspective, there is a clear plan of opening new groups but also closing group, in order to keep the size of the institute. Opening of new groups will also correct current situation when CEITEC MU has high proportion of senior group leaders and quite a low proportion of junior group leaders. This is just opposite of normal situation at other research institutions.

J. Friml: If there is no increase of publication performance, it means decrease. What CEITEC MU should focus on is increase of publications where CEITEC has first or corresponding author. This is in positive correlation with international visibility of the institute.

K. Říha: We should look on data if we increase a proportion of high tier publications that are really produced at CEITEC MU, having corresponding authors from CEITEC MU.

J. Nantl concluded that developing more comprehensive approach for analysis of research performance is one of institute’s current activities and goals that is to be discussed also on the ground of the board meeting at the autumn 2018.

Conclusion(s):

- a) The Scientific Board has taken note of the Status Report of the Strategic Plan of CEITEC MU implementation.
- b) Publication data will be reviewed from the perspective of proportion of high tier publications with corresponding authors from CEITEC MU. This aspect is to be included into reporting for the management and the board.
- c) More comprehensive analysis of research performance will be presented to the board at the autumn meeting.

2) Activity Plan 2018

See Annex 2

J. Nantl: This year, we need to focus on vision 2030, including prediction of size and the budget of the institute in the period when current mode of financing will end. Also, we continue in preparation of the application for the second phase of the Teaming project (PASSAGE). We want to be awarded with the HR Excellence in Research Award – this aim is also connected with formal adoption and implementation of the career system (as it has already been discussed by the board in 2017). There will be also new group leader position opened in 2018, based on results of the ERA Chair project proposal, it could be senior group leader position. In 2018, there will be evaluation of research excellence of the whole consortium. We also need to work on future operation of the CEITEC PhD School. Last but not least, the CEITEC management would like to focus also on cultivation of internal culture at CEITEC and formulation and unification of governance rules (IT policy, space

allocation policy, rules of operation, etc.). Please refer to the Annex 2 and the PPT for detailed information regarding the activity plan for 2018.

Debate:

(No comments or remarks by the board members have been raised.)

Conclusion(s):

The Scientific Board takes note of the Activity Plan of the Management for 2018.

3) Budget of the Institute

See Annexes 3a, 3b

J. Nantl: In overall, when looking on budget 2017 spending, we are on 89 % of the budget plan 2017 facing no major problems. The underspent part was caused mainly by delays in starting the new operational programmes focused on investments. We have also experienced problems with the CzechBioImaging project that is coordinated by the IMG AV CR. See Annexes 3a and 3b for detailed information on the budget spending 2017.

J. Nantl: In overall, the total budget (including university tax) is planned to be 744,5 mil. CZK. 69,5 % goes for research. Research groups get almost 50 % of all money that is planned for 2018. Investment costs are planned to be app. 17 %. 25 % is dedicated to cover institutional costs. App. 7 % of the budget is planned on personnel costs of the management and administration which is reasonable level (e.g. compared to benchmark institute of GMI that has 8 %). Please refer to the Annexes 3a and 3b for detailed information.

Debate:

M. Kiess commented that tax paid to the university could be considered as a part of “administration costs” and raised a question what does CEITEC MU get for that tax.

J. Nantl compared the tax paid to the university to the licence fee. We get that we are a part of the university which is a big asset, especially for the newly established research centre such as CEITEC. The support of the university is for example financial backing and political backing. Of course, the support could always be more efficient and that is what we are discussing with the rector and deans.

M. Kiess asked if CEITEC plays a role model for the university or how it is perceived by other university parts.

J. Nantl: With the level of competitiveness, it is beneficial for the university to have some fields organized in the form of the institute that is purely focused on research. Faculties need to balance education and research roles. On the other hand, CEITEC MU aims to cooperate with the faculties on building one campus community. When considering all aspects and opportunities, having CEITEC at the Masaryk University is win-win situation for all parts. As for the relation with the faculties, there is a need to have clear boundaries.

M. Králíčková supported the perception of “win-win situation”. Having such research centre opens a possibility to open truly excellent and international study programmes. Universities such as Charles University and Masaryk University need more international study programmes.

Conclusion(s):

The Scientific Board takes note of the budget report 2017/2018 with no objections.

4) Junior Group Leaders' Evaluation 2017 (Report)

See Annex 4

J. Nantl informed the board members on the junior group leaders evaluation that has been organized in 2017 by the International scientific advisory board of the CEITEC consortium (also: ISAB). The recommendations by the ISAB has been further commented by K. Říha as the Deputy Director for Science and N. Kostlánová as the Scientific Secretary. All evaluated junior group leaders had an opportunity to comment on the final results. Final decision was made by J. Nantl as Director.

P. Plevka, O. Slabý and K. Tripsianes were promoted to senior group leaders. In case of D. Blažek, there was a consent that he should get two-year prolongation period (within two years, there will be repeated evaluation with final decision). In the case of V. Tognetti, the ISAB recommended dissolution of the group. See Annex 4 for detailed information.

Debate:

K. Říha commented that the prolongation of D. Blažek group means he has a potential; he does quality research but did not have published his results yet. It means that ISAB has reason to believe he is good but it has not been demonstrated by independent publication.

Conclusion(s):

The Scientific Board takes note of the junior group leaders evaluation 2017 results with no objections.

5) Dissolution of the Vanesa Tognetti Research Group

See Annex 5

Related to the agenda point on evaluation of junior group leaders, J. Nantl presented proposal on dissolution of the Vanesa Tognetti research group (see Annex 5 for reasoning of the proposal).

As intended, the Research Group would be abolished as an organizational unit within CEITEC MU as of 31st December 2018, and the employment contract of the current Group Leader with the Institute would thereafter last under the terms of the contract, as currently valid, i.e. until 31st December 2018.

Under Article 11 (3, c) of the Rules of Organization of CEITEC MU, the Scientific Board is expected to give advice about the dissolution of the group in the way of formal vote.

Debate:

M. Kiess raised a question on future of current PhD students of V. Tognetti.

J. Nantl: Our options are limited based on the fact that these are the students of the faculty and there is no formal agreement with the faculty on place. Therefore, it is up to the chairman of the study programme.

Conclusion(s):

The Scientific Board takes note of the proposed termination of the Vanesa Tognetti group with no objection.

(By unanimous approval of the Board.)

Annexes

PPT:

2018-03-08_CEITEC_MU_Scientific_Board_final

Background materials:

1_CEITEC_MU_Strategic_plan_2020_Status_report_2017_SB_rev

2_CEITEC_MU_Activity_Plan_2018

3a_Budget_2017-2018_comments_2018-02-28

3b_Budget_2017-2018

4_Evaluation_Junior_GL_2017

5_CEITEC_SB_Dissolution_RG_Tognetti_final

Next meeting

8th November 2018, 1 p.m. (A35/211)