IST-2002- 507382

EPOCH

**Excellence in Processing Open
Cultural Heritage**

Network of Excellence

Information Society Technologies

D1.4.1: Establishment of the Review College

Due date of deliverable: 31 December 2004
Actual submission date: 24 December 2004

Start date of project: 15 March 2004
Duration: 4 Years

University of Brighton

Contents

1   Executive Summary

This report describes the process undertaken to form the review college for EPOCH and the results of the first exercise. The review college is defined in the Technical Annex to fulfil the following functions:

- as the advisory group to shape future directions of the research agenda and

- as the pool of reviewers for progress with research-in-progress as part of the program of jointly executed research, for deliverables and for EPOCH supported dissemination activities.

To be eligible for nomination individuals had to satisfy criteria which demonstrate standing in their field. Partners were advised that they could not nominate people who worked for their own organisation. Nominees could be from other partner organisations or from outside the Network so long as the nominating partner respected the opinions of the nominee. Nominations were to be confidential and only those receiving multiple nominations were to be formally approached to become review college members.

A number of constituencies were envisaged, with panels for reviews drawn from a mix of constituencies as appropriate. The review college is also a mechanism for enhancing the cohesion of the community in that it should start as a group of senior and respected individuals and through the processes of consultation and debate, it should become a major agent for developing a genuinely interdisciplinary and forward looking focus of the skills required to meet the challenges in applying technology to cultural heritage."

This report describes the process undertaken during the first 8 months of EPOCH to bring together the review college. As with much of the initial work of EPOCH there were some initial delays whilst processes were put in place. However, the initial membership of the review college has been established and operations are beginning.

2 Introduction

The technical annex defined the review college as follows

"The principle of the college is that the community, represented initially by EPOCH partners and affiliates, nominates individuals with established reputations (whether EPOCH members or not), to provide high quality advice and varied perspective. Each partner is obligated under the consortium agreement to nominate between 4 and 10 individuals to act as members of the review college. In the case of EPOCH we propose that the college is used:

- as the advisory group to shape future directions of the research agenda and
- as the pool of reviewers for progress with research-in-progress as part of the program of jointly executed research, for deliverables and for EPOCH supported dissemination activities.

To be eligible for nomination individuals will have to satisfy criteria which demonstrate experience and standing in their field. In addition partners and affiliates are restricted to nominating people who do not work for them, but whose opinions they respect.

In order to avoid disappointment initial nominations should be confidential. Where nominations from external organisations (i.e. non-members of EPOCH) are invited, their organisation will be considered as potential invitees to join the consortium as appropriate.

The following constituencies (from which the review college members will be drawn) are envisaged:

- Those involved in IST research directed at cultural heritage
- Cultural heritage professionals involved in research using technological solutions and
- Those employed in a senior executive role in running a SME or division of a larger company supplying or operating technology in these disciplines;
- Those employed in a senior executive role in running either an archaeological or related investigation; or a museum, visitor centre or historic site.

The review college is seen as a mechanism for enhancing the cohesion of the community in that it should start as a group of senior and respected individuals and through the processes of consultation and debate, it should become a major agent for developing a genuinely interdisciplinary and forward looking focus of the skills required to meet the challenges in applying technology to cultural heritage."

This report describes the process undertaken during the first 8 months of EPOCH to bring together the review college.

3 Process of forming the college

Invitations to nominate members of the review college were issued to all the partners on 8th April 2004 with a reminder sent on the 15th May 2004. By the time nominations closed in August 2004, a total of 66 partners had made nominations (17 were missing). As a result of the nominations a total of 230 individuals had been nominated with well over 400 nominations in total.

64 nominees had been received at or above the required 3 nominations and these people were invited to join the Review College on 31st August. At the time of completing this report 36 of the invitees had agreed to the nominations and none had refused. The remaining 28 are being chased for confirmation of their acceptances.

As part of the process of acceptance of their nominations nominees were asked to indicate which constituencies they would most like to represent including the original four and a fifth constituency of policy-makers.

4 Results

The following people have been nominated invited to join and accepted.

Name		Organisation	Country
Lon	Addison	University of California at Berkeley	USA
David	Arnold	University of Brighton	UK
Juan	Barcelo	Universitat Autonoma Barcelona Division Prehistoria	Spain
Duncan	Brown	Museum of Archaeology	UK
Lorenzo	Cantoni	Università della Svizzera Italiana (USI)	Switzerland
Alan	Chalmers	University of Bristol	UK
Agustin	Diez	Universidad de Valencia	Spain
Martin	Doerr	FORTH- Crete	Greece
Pierre	Drap	MAP-CNRS	France
Mercedes	Farjas-Abadia	EUIT Topografica-UPM	Spain
Franca	Garzotto	Politecnico di Milano	Italy
Itzik	Gilead	University of Beersheva	Israel
Maria Pia	Guermandi	Istituto Beni Culturali Regione Emilia Romagna	Italy
Ian	Johnson	University of Sydney	Australia
Gary	Lock	Oxford University	UK
Mike	Loveday	Norwich City Council	UK
Paola	Moscati	Istituto per l'archeologia etrusco-italica	Italy
Jurgen	Mrosek	Berlin State Museums (consultant)	Germany
Franco	Niccolucci	University of Florence	Italy
Irina	Oberlander-Tarnoveanu	CIMEC	Romania
Christian-Emile	Ore	University of Oslo	Norway
Paolo	Paolini	Politecnico di Milano	Italy
Daniel	Pletinckx	Ename Center for Public Archaeology and Heritage Presentation	Belgium
Julian	Richards	University of York	UK
Seamus	Ross	University of Glasgow	UK
Arturo-Carlos	Ruiz-Rodriguez	Universidad de Jaén	Spain
Nick	Ryan	University of Kent	UK
Robert	Sablatnig	Vienna University of Technology	Austria
Alfonso	Santoriello	University of Salerno	Italy
Roberto	Scopigno	ISTI-CNR	Italy
Brian	Smith	EAHTR	UK
Zoran	Stančič	Ministry of Culture	Slovenia
Steve	Stead	Paveprime	UK
Luis	Valdes	Gastiburu	Spain
Luc	Van Gool	ETH & KU Leuven, Sagalassos Division	Belgium
Paul	Van Lindt	Ministerie van de Vlaamse Gemeenschap	Belgium

5 Conclusions

As with much of the initial work of EPOCH there were some initial delays whilst processes were put in place. However, the initial membership of the review college has been established and operations are beginning. There is some unevenness in the representation of the constituencies with SME's predictably under-represented. It is probable that additional nominations will be taken to boost numbers in this area and possibly in the museum professionals and policy-makers areas too.

The next stages will be to instigate the assignment of reviewers to deliverables in time for the first batch of annual reports, and to ensure that the web-site includes a work area for the work of the review college.