

Evaluation Committee Meeting
10 August 1999, Berlin, Germany
Minutes

Present: Prof. G. M. Schneider, Chairman, Prof. J. Corish, Prof. E. Grzywa,
Prof. U. K. Pandit, Prof. C.-G. Wermuth, Dr. E. D. Becker (guest)

Secretary: Dr. J. W. Jost

1. INTRODUCTION AND FINALIZATION OF THE AGENDA

Prof. Schneider welcomed the members to the first meeting of the Committee. Prof. Jortner joined the Committee at the opening of the meeting and noted the significant role this Committee was expected to play in the new project driven system. There were no changes to the Agenda.

2. GENERAL DISCUSSION ABOUT THE SDIC AND CPEC REPORTS AND THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Prof. Schneider introduced the subject by reviewing the Terms of Reference of the Committee. He noted that the function of the Committee represents a new direction for the Union. While reports and recommendations were extensively reviewed before publication, there was no evaluation of the work of IUPAC bodies after publication. The Terms of Reference and the reports of the SDIC and CPEC leave the process and method of work up to the Committee. The major task of today's meeting will be to begin deciding how to proceed to accomplish the task it has been given, which is in its broadest sense to evaluate the impact of IUPAC's reports and recommendations on the global chemical community.

3. PURPOSE OF PROJECT REVIEWS BY EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The discussion concluded that the work of this Committee can be viewed as providing a "window" for the Division Committees, Standing Committees, and the Project Committee regarding the characteristics of a good project. Prof. Schneider noted that the new system gives the Division Committee the ability to influence the direction of projects. The information provided by the Evaluation Committee is an important part of the process of providing information to the Division Committees so that they can take on this new responsibility. The value of the work of this Committee will lie in the background built up over the years for the use of the Division Committees, Standing Committees, and the Project Committee. The Committee also felt that its report to the Bureau should include strategic plan concepts based on its review of completed projects.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The discussion on this point was long and covered many aspects of the subject. The following only summarizes that discussion.

Prof. Pandit suggested that within one year of the end of a project the Committee should review if the project has met its goals and timetable. Dr. Becker proposed that six months after the end of a project the Secretariat could provide a summary to the Committee, including those projects that are late. Prof. Pandit noted that the same information should go to the Division Committee or Standing Committee responsible

Evaluation Committee Meeting Minutes

for the project. Prof. Corish commented that the scientific/technical evaluation must be done by experts. Prof. Wermuth suggested that the impact of a recommendation or report could be measured by sending a copy to a panel of ~60 scientists to judge its value to the community. Prof. Schneider then asked if it was fair to evaluate a project on new criteria. Dr. Becker commented that the Committee is free to use its own criteria. Prof. Corish noted that a panel of experts would need to be carefully chosen. They should all be potential "users" of the material in the recommendation or report. Project proposers should describe the relevant community.

Prof. Schneider noted that criteria can be either general or specific to the project. Prof. Wermuth added that some general criteria could be usefulness, impact, and the image of IUPAC.

5. CANDIDATES FOR PROJECT REVIEW

The Committee decided to ask the Secretariat to produce a statistical report covering such items as meeting deadlines, expense vs. budget and reports. This report would be distributed to the Evaluation Committee, Division Committees, and Standing Committees. The Evaluation Committee would draw conclusions from this report in its report to the Bureau. The Committee could also suggest an appropriate continuation project. The Division Committees and Standing Committees will be asked to suggest one project completed in the previous 12 months and one completed two or more years previously for review by the Committee at its next meeting. This request will be sent to the Division Committees and Standing Committees by 15 November 1999 for projects to be reviewed at the Committee's next meeting in 2000.

6. MISCELLANEOUS (E.G. COOPERATION WITH OTHER IUPAC BODIES, ORGANISATION OF THE COMMITTEE WORK, ETC.)

The report for the Bureau should be available by the end of July 2000 to allow the Bureau to consider it at its meeting in September 2000.

7. DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

The place of the next meeting was tentatively set for Frankfurt, Germany and the date is to be selected after consideration of the members schedule, but probably in March or April 2000.