

---

# Rector's Directive No. 16/2017

---

Date of effect: 1 April 2017

## **Code of Procedure for the Commission for Programmes for the Support of Research at Charles University**

The Commission for programmes for the support of research at Charles University (“the commission” and “CU”) is a body contributing to the quality and transparency of the evaluation and assessment of research projects and programmes at CU. Its key role is an expert assessment of proposals, in individual programmes, for the support of research designed for implementation and funding, as well as the follow-up evaluation of their progress, status, and final reports.

### **Article I Activities of the Commission**

1. The commission's activities are governed by this code of procedure, Rector's directives related to individual programmes for the support of research at CU, and other related regulations and guidance documents.
2. The commission assesses the research quality of proposals submitted for individual projects and programmes for the support of research at CU where such assessment is required as per the documents listed in paragraph 1, the proposals are then either recommended or not recommended for implementation.
3. In the case of proposals recommended for implementation, the commission also expresses its opinion on the adequacy of the proposed budget if it is required in the relevant Rector's directives.
4. The commission assesses the quality of the progress, status, and final reports of implemented projects and programmes.
5. The commission expresses its opinion on the overall success of the programmes for the support of research at CU and proposes changes and modifications, if any.

### **Article II Membership in the Commission**

1. The commission is composed of eminent members of the academic staff of CU and representatives of other leading research institutions.
2. A nomination for membership in the commission is submitted to the Rector of CU by the members of the CU Rector's Board, deans of faculties, and directors of other units of CU, members of the Research Board of CU and research boards of faculties, and members of the International Board of CU. The nominations are submitted via the Vice-Rector for Research.
3. Membership in the commission is incompatible with the position of Rector, dean, vice-dean, and directors of Institute of the History of CU and Archives of CU, Centre for Theoretical Study, Centre for Economic Research and Graduate Education, and Environment Centre.
4. Members of the commission are appointed by the CU Rector for an indefinite period of time upon proposal of the Rector and approval by the Research Board of CU.
5. Membership in the commission is terminated:
  - a. By removal of a member of the commission from his position by the Rector of CU or the Research Board of CU;
  - b. By notice of termination of membership by a member of the commission.

### **Article III Chair and Deputy Chair of the Commission**

1. The chair of the commission is appointed by the CU Rector from among the members of the commission.
  2. The deputy chair of the commission is appointed by the CU Vice-Rector for Research.
  3. The chair of the commission, upon agreement with the deputy chair and chairs of sectional commissions (Art. IV), manages and ensures the activities of the commission in relation to the CU Rector as well as to the persons submitting the proposals and researchers of projects and programmes at CU.
  4. The position of the chair of the Commission terminates:
    - a. By removal from the position by the Rector of CU;
    - b. By notice of resignation filed by the chair of the commission.
1. The activities of the commission are implemented through the activities of sectional commissions.
  2. The projects and programmes for the support of research at CU are usually divided into the following basic research areas:
    - a. Humanities and social sciences;

- b. Natural sciences, mathematics, and informatics;
  - c. Medical sciences and biomedicine.
3. Upon the proposal of the chair and deputy chair of the commission, the CU Rector appoints from among the members of the commission the members of a sectional commission depending on their expertise and available time.
  4. Representation in the sectional commissions is not possible.
  5. A sectional commission is composed of at least three members.
  6. Every sectional commission elects from among its members a chair.
  7. The chair of a sectional commission manages its activities. When he is not present, he is represented by a deputy chair who is authorised to act within the scope defined by the chair of the sectional commission.
  8. Members of sectional commissions receive remuneration for their work.
  9. Administrative support for the activities of sectional commissions is provided by the Research Support Office of the Rectorate of CU. The Vice-Rector for Research or Vice-Rector for Projects and Publishing may assign the secretaries of sectional commissions from among the employees of the Research Support Office. A secretary provides administrative support to the sectional commission, however he is not a member of the commission.
  10. A sectional commission adopts resolutions by a simple majority of votes of the members present. Members of sectional commissions may also adopt written resolutions (per rollam), however, they can do so only upon the decision of chair or deputy chair of the sectional commission and only between individual meetings or if it is not possible to call a meeting.
  11. Secret ballot is used always when one of the members requests it and the sectional commission decides to grant it. In other cases, the voting of a sectional commission is public.
  12. Minutes are taken of every meeting of sectional a commission, the minutes are approved by the chair of the commission.

## **Article V Assessment Process**

1. Members of a sectional commission work out independent reviews of the submitted proposals, projects, or programmes.
2. Unless stipulated otherwise in the relevant Rector's directive, one of the members of the sectional commission is appointed as reviewer and at least one other member is appointed as evaluator.
3. If the relevant expertise for preparing the review is not available among the members of the sectional commission, an external evaluator may be requested to prepare the review with the consent of the chair of the sectional commission.
4. The reviewer drafts his review after receiving the reviews prepared by an evaluator or evaluators.
5. The full wording of all assessed or evaluated proposals, projects, or programmes is available to the commission members.
6. Every sectional commission assesses proposals which fall into its research area.
7. The chair of a sectional commission may propose the transfer of an assessed proposal, project, or programme to another sectional commission. In the case of proposals overlapping several research areas, the chairs of several sectional commissions may agree on a joint assessment.
8. The relevant reviewer introduces his review to the members of the sectional commission, and all reviews of the proposal under discussion are available to all members of the sectional commission. The sectional commission may agree with one of the reviews or may take a different position.
9. If required by the relevant Rector's directive, the sectional commission creates, on the basis of the reviews received, a ranking of the proposals as a basis for further discussion and an opinion on the granting or not granting of financial support to the proposals, including the proposed amount of such support.

## **Article VI Evaluation Criteria**

1. Unless stipulated otherwise in the relevant Rector's directive, the members of the sectional commission evaluate the assigned proposals on an individual basis and for each proposal they assess and evaluate using the prescribed scale the degree to which the proposal meets the expectations usually concerning the following evaluation indicators:
  - a. The quality of the project (objectives, novelty of solution, procedures, benefit for CU);
  - b. The profile of the applicant (outputs, international experience, research achievements);
  - c. The consistency of the proposal with the focus of the workplace (including mutual benefits);
  - d. The adequacy of budget;
  - e. The research team (team members, adequacy of positions).
2. After assessment of these indicators, the proposal for a project or programme may obtain one of the below evaluation grades:
3. "Excellent" – the applicant produced outputs of top quality in global comparison in terms of originality, importance, and quality; the project is original and promises a major benefit to the relevant faculty/higher education institute; its budget is adequate to the requirements of the project.
4. "Very good" – the applicant produced outputs of very good quality in global comparison in terms of originality, importance, and quality; the project is original and promises methodological and subject-matter progress for the relevant faculty/higher education institute; its budget is adequate.

5. "Good" – the applicant produced outputs visible in global comparison or very good in the national comparison; the project is in compliance with the subject area quality criteria and it is an appropriate complement to the current research profile of the host faculty/higher education institute; its budget is adequate.
6. "Rejected" – the applicant did not produce internationally visible outputs nor outputs important in the national comparison, or the project does not fulfil subject area quality criteria or does not fit in the research profile of the relevant faculty/higher education institute, or the budget costs are totally inadequate to the submitted project.

## **Article VII Evaluation and Assessment of Progress, Status, and Final Reports**

1. The evaluation and assessment of the progress, status, and final reports of projects and programmes is governed by the Rector's directives regulating the relevant programmes for the support of research at CU.
2. Unless stipulated otherwise in the relevant Rector's directives regulating programmes for the support of research at CU, the provisions of Articles V and VI of this code of procedure also apply, with the necessary modifications, to the evaluation and assessment of progress, status, and final reports.

## **Article VIII Final Provisions**

1. Persons who are in any way involved in actions related to the submitted proposals and reports of the research projects and programmes or who are involved in their assessment treat the projects with impartiality and do not share information disclosed in the projects with other persons.
2. Members of the commission as well as other persons involved in the process of the assessment of project and programme proposals must sign a statement of confidentiality, conflict of interest, and the obligation to treat the proposals with impartiality.
3. The results of meetings of the commission are published in the usual manner.
4. This code of procedure was approved by the Rector's Board of CU on 27 February 2017 and becomes effective on 1 April 2017.

In Prague on 8 March 2017

Prof. MUDr. Tomáš Zima, DrSc., MBA