**Minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of 18/05/2015**

**Proposing structure: RESEARCH SERVICE**

**Int. Exec. Struct.:** **SRIC** **SWEG**

**Int. non-Exec. Struct. AAF** **ACRE**

**4 - MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS**

**4.9 University Interdepartmental Laboratories**

* **Committee Evaluations 1st 2015 CALL**

The Chairman gave the floor to Prof. Resta who illustrated topic in question.

The Spokesman announced that the Committee for evaluation of the proposals relating to the 2nd Call 2014 University Interdepartmental Laboratories had met on 06.05.2015 to evaluate the proposals submitted by Departments relating to the 1st Call 2015 University Interdepartmental Laboratories.

The proposals submitted by Departments were:

* 4 proposals for Laboratory funding
* 3 proposals for Laboratory accreditation

All the proposals had met the requirements for access the contribution.

The evaluation criteria defined in the Call were recalled:

* significance vis-a-vis University policies
* creation or consolidation of synergies
* number of departments involved
* amount of co-funding
* coherency of funding compared to laboratory equipment/coherency with the educational offer.

The funding available for for the first Call of 2015 amounted to € 513,888.60 including the amount not assigned in the second Call of 2014.

The funding proposals were as follows:

* BrainLab@PoliMi
* PSVL - PoliMi Sound and Vibration Laboratory
* Lightweight and Durability Performance
* Internet of Things Lab (IoT Lab)
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The Committee, following evaluation by the individual committee members of the proposals according the five assessment criteria envisaged in the Call, had agreed on the following evaluations:

# BrainLab@PoliMi

* significance vis-a-vis University policies: *high*
* creation or consolidation of synergies: *high*
* number of departments involved: *high*
* amount of co-funding: *high*
* coherency of funding compared to laboratory equipment/coherency with the educational offer: *average*

The Committee considered the project eligible for funding.

**PSVL - PoliMi Sound and Vibration Laboratory**

* significance vis-a-vis University policies: *high*
* creation or consolidation of synergies: *high*
* number of departments involved: *high*
* amount of co-funding: *high*
* coherency of funding compared to laboratory equipment/coherency with the educational offer: *high*

The Committee considered the project eligible for funding.

**Lightweight and Durability Performance**

* significance vis-a-vis University policies: *high*
* creation or consolidation of synergies: *high*
* number of departments involved: *average*
* amount of co-funding: *high*
* coherency of funding compared to laboratory equipment/coherency with the educational offer: *average*

The Committee considered the project eligible for funding.
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It was pointed out that the Committee, in expressing its evaluation, had considered that the amount of funding made available by the Departments should be equal to 3,000 euro per year for three years.

# Internet of Things Lab (IoT Lab)

* significance vis-a-vis University policies: *high*
* creation or consolidation of synergies: *high*
* number of departments involved: *high*
* amount of co-funding: *low*
* coherency of funding compared to laboratory equipment/coherency with the educational offer: *high*

The Committee considered the project eligible for funding.

The Committee had evaluated the amount of co-funding equal to zero since research grants are not considered valid for co-funding purposes. While overall it had positively evaluated the adequacy of funding, considering the rental and operating costs and the works for access to the laboratory as funds for the normal operation of the laboratory.

In summary, the results were as follows:

# BrainLab@PoliMi 45 points

# PSVL - PoliMi Sound and Vibration Laboratory 50 points

# Lightweight and Durability Performance 40 points

# Internet of Things Lab (IoT Lab) 40 points

The Committee therefore proposed funding for all the proposed laboratories:

* **BrainLab@PoliMi** Funding requested € 150,000.00 - Funding proposed by the Committee € 137,400.00
* **PSVL - PoliMi Sound and Vibration Laboratory** Funding requested € 150,000.00 - Funding proposed by the Committee € 137,400.00
* **Lightweight and Durability Performance** Funding requested € 150,000.00 - Funding proposed by the Committee € 137,400.00
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* **Internet of Things Lab (IoT Lab)** Funding requested € 111,000.00 - Funding proposed by the Committee € 101,676.00

# Total Funding requested € 561,000.00.

# Total Funding proposed by the Committee € 513,876.00.

The Committee proposed a reduction of funding requested of approximately 8.4% for all four projects selected so as to fall within the budget available.

The Committee then evaluated the 3 accreditation requests:

# ATGLab (ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY GROUP Lab)

The proposal, from the formal point of view, was not acceptable since a Department involved had not approved the proposal. The Committee evaluated the proposal not to be accreditable.

# ArchiDigiLab - Laboratory for process Digitisation in Architecture, in Construction and in Land Management

The proposal, from the formal point of view, was not acceptable since a Department involved had not approved the proposal. The Committee evaluated the proposal not to be accreditable.

For the above laboratories, the Committee specified that the topics addressed were definitely of interest to the University; it pointed out that it was possible to submit the accreditation proposal to the desk and therefore asked all the proposers to verify their interest, updating the proposal where necessary.

# MANTOVA LAB

The proposed laboratory had the required characteristics of significance vis-a-vis the policies of the University as well the related creation of synergies; it was pointed out, however, that, according to the Call, the Management Committee should be composed of a maximum of 5 Members.

The Committee evaluated the proposal to be accreditable.
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Prof. Resta then illustrated the characteristics of the laboratories proposed for funding in detail (Att. no. .

Finally, Prof. Resta informed those presents that, in synergy with Communications and External Relations and the Research Service, the status of publication of the data concerning laboratories accredited and/or funded to date had been verified; with the collaboration of Prof. Magnani, therefore, it had been that the information was complete or nearing completion. Only following this verification had the Committee decided to submit to the Academic Senate publication of the second 2015 call, with deadline on 30.09.2015 (Att. no. .

Dr. Dama underlined that the call envisaged that the "funding requested from the University can be used exclusively for the purchase of new equipment to supplement existing equipment that the proposing Departments make available to the Interdepartmental Laboratory”. Finally, he recalled to proceed with publication of the Committee minutes on the INTRANET.

The Chairman, at the end of the discussion, proposed to the Academic Senate to vote on the following points:

1. Approval of the proposed ranking for co-funding of the 4 laboratories indicated in the introduction.

The Academic Senate unanimously approved.

1. Approval of the proposed accreditation of the MANTOVA LAB.

The Academic Senate unanimously approved.

1. Approval of the proposed publication, in June, the second 2015 Call with deadline on 30 September 2015.
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The Academic Senate unanimously approved.