

**5<sup>th</sup> Evaluation Committee Meeting**  
**5 July 2001 (9:00-12:30), Brisbane, Australia**  
Minutes

Present: Prof. G.M. Schneider (Chairman), Prof. J. Corish, Prof. O. M. Nefedov,  
Prof. U K. Pandit, Prof. G.S. Wilson, Dr. F. Meyers (Secretariat)

Absent: Prof. E. Grzywa

Secretary: Dr. J. W. Jost

**1. INTRODUCTION AND FINALIZATION OF THE AGENDA**

Prof. Schneider welcomed the members of the Committee and noted the absence of Prof. Grzywa due the death of his wife the previous week. The regrets and sympathy of the Committee and of the Bureau had been conveyed by a message to Prof. Grzywa.

Prof. Schneider noted that a list of projects completed in 2000 and 2001 had been distributed at the meeting. He then reviewed the agenda. No changes were made and the agenda was approved as distributed.

**2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 4<sup>TH</sup> EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING, RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC, USA, 10/11 FEBRUARY 2001**

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

**3. REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARY**

Prof. Schneider reviewed the content of the Minutes of the previous meeting and of the report prepared for the Bureau and Council. He noted that the Budget allocated to the Committee was sufficient for one meeting of the Committee separate from a Bureau meeting. He then noted the list of completed projects that had been provided for the information of the Committee.

Prof. Schneider reported on his meeting with Prof. Hayes and separately with Prof. Steyn and Dr. Becker in which he had reviewed the work of the Committee and discussed its future activities. He commented on the problem of continuity since four of the current members would be retiring at the end of the biennium. Selection of the new members of the Committee from the new members of the Bureau would help to provide the necessary continuity.

He then noted two major issues the Committee had to resolve. The first was how to define the quality of a project. There is a need for definition and also the need for outside expert evaluation. The second issue is how to find out what has happened to a project after it is over. In many cases, the Task Group Chairman is no longer involved and cannot provide information on, for instance, how successful the dissemination activities of the Task Group have been.

Prof. Pandit raised the issue of whether the Committee should make recommendations to the Division Committee responsible for a project. Specifically, should the Committee recommend that certain project areas continue to be funded and others not. Prof. Schneider suggested that the Committee could provide confidential reviews to the Division Committees. Prof. Wilson commented that the Division

## 5<sup>th</sup> Evaluation Committee Meeting Minutes

Presidents were very interested in advice on judging projects initially. Prof. Schneider agreed that one of the functions of the Committee was to provide criteria that the Division Committees could use in judging projects to be funded. Prof. Corish commented that the Committee could also point out general trends. The observation that certain types of projects were being approved that did not seem to be effective could be of great value to Divisions. Prof. Schneider pointed out that the Committee was the only IUPAC Body that saw and had an opportunity to review all completed projects. An important role of the Committee was therefore to provide insights based on this overview.

Dr. Jost suggested that an additional role for the Committee should be to summarize the achievements and demonstrate the effectiveness of IUPAC to its constituents in the worldwide chemical community.

#### 4. GENERAL RULES AND CRITERIA FOR RETROSPECTIVE EVALUATION OF COMPLETED PROJECTS AND COMPILATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS, COMMENTS AND HINTS

##### 4.1. PUBLICATION AND DISSEMINATION OF THE RESULTS OF IUPAC PROJECTS

The discussion of publication and dissemination focused on the need to do more than simply publish the results of a project as a report or recommendation in *Pure and Applied Chemistry*. Publication in *PAC* is not the end of dissemination, more must be done. This can include letters to news magazines, listservers, etc. Contacts in NAOs and chemical societies should be used to disseminate the results of IUPAC projects. There should be a set mechanism to disseminate results, including press releases.

##### 4.2. EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF COMPLETED PROJECTS

Prof. Schneider noted that one of the goals of the Union was "the advancement of science and its application". This should be part of the evaluation of all projects. There was then a discussion of the meaning of quality and its measurement. The Committee agreed that at the end of the list of criteria for evaluating projects there should be summary evaluation of the project of the form; "the quality of this project based on these criteria is X" where X represents an overall grade, such as excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

Prof. Wilson noted that the criteria used to judge projects should be different for different kinds of projects. As an example, he suggested that workshop organizers be asked to have participants fill out an evaluation form.

Prof. Corish proposed that when the Committee felt the need for outside evaluation of particular projects it should select its own reviewers. Prof. Wilson added that the Committee should note when areas of IUPAC activity needed review by the community being served.

The Committee agreed that one question that should be answered in all project evaluations is what is the evidence of the impact of the project.

When reviewing the project budget there should be a review not only of conformance to plan, but what trends can be seen, such as the kinds of

## **5<sup>th</sup> Evaluation Committee Meeting Minutes**

expenditures being made by projects.

### **5. ORGANIZATION OF THE FUTURE WORK OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

The Committee first discussed whether only projects approved in 2001 should be included in the first full evaluation of projects by the Committee or whether projects approved in 2000 should be included. It was agreed that all projects approved in 2000-2001 should be included.

Prof. Corish suggested that the current Committee should write a complete report summarizing its conclusions on how projects should be evaluated. The report should include the following components:

1. A Handbook of Evaluation. This would include a list of criteria and information (hints) for Division Presidents and Standing Committee Chairmen.
2. Information for Task Group Leaders
3. Advice on dissemination.
4. Advice on publication.

Prof. Corish also noted that a regular part of the Committee's work should be a list of successes (this should be a public document that includes a review of areas of IUPAC activity).

It should be made clear to the Division Presidents and Division Committees that it is their responsibility to provide a final report to the Evaluation Committee for each project.

The Committee agreed to this proposal and members were assigned to develop drafts for each of the four topics listed above. The assignments made were:

Item 1: Prof. Schneider with the assistance of Profs. Grzywa, Nefedov, and Pandit

Item 2: Prof. Wilson

Item 3: Prof. Corish

Item 4: Dr. Jost

The Committee agreed that a meeting of the current members should be held early in 2002 to prepare the final report.

### **6. EVALUATION COMMITTEE REPORT TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE IUPAC BUREAU AT BRISBANE**

The Committee suggested that the report to Bureau and Council should include a statement that the Committee will provide evaluations of completed projects to the Division Committees to aid them in the management of their programs.

### **7. DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEETING.**

The next meeting of the Committee (current members) was scheduled for 12-13 January 2002 in Research Triangle Park. The next meeting of the Committee (new members) will be in conjunction with the Bureau meeting in September 2002.