



- Navigate to Assessment. Most values in filter should fill in automatically. However, if you are an evaluator in multiple panels, the “Tender/category” option has to be selected manually.

IS VĚDA  
EVIDENCE A HODNOCENÍ  
TVŮRČÍ ČINNOSTI  
Univerzita Karlova

start-01180 (NIEDERLE Matěj)

Portál IS Věda Internal tenders

Internal tenders

My project proposals

**Assessment**

HelpDesk

Ask for help

List of issues

Settings

My questions in HelpDesk

No issues created by you with state Open or Canceled found.

Internal competitions

**MOBILITY FUND 2020-2**

+ Add portlet Change layout

Programme

START

Evaluation phase

Second round (external evaluators)  show completed evaluations

Tender/category

START HUM

- List of all projects assigned to you will be shown below. The project can be opened by clicking on its number or title in the table.

All proposals Assigned to me To be evaluated

Search

Unit Workplace of researcher Researcher surname Evaluator (surname)

Evaluation of project Evaluation flow State

Not selected Not selected Not selected

Clear Filter

Number	Affiliation	Researcher	Title	Status	Assigned	Preliminary	Action
START/HUM/	FF			Passed the formal check	<input type="checkbox"/> NIEDERLE Matěj		

- The protocol can be accessed by clicking on “My evaluation” button in the upper right menu.

Project proposal: [redacted] ✓ Check Tender terms Evaluators **My evaluation** 1 of 38

Basic information Research team Budget

Make project accessible for co-researchers

Whole project

Category Project number

START HUM: Arts & Humanities START/HUM/

Applicant Faculty/institute Status

Passed the formal check

- 5) The protocol consists of multiple sections, all with “Score” and “Commentary” fields. Refer to Methodology for evaluators for details on the different evaluation criteria.

Report of the reviewer ✕

**NIEDERLE Matěj**  
(Report of the reviewer)

An overall quality of the project  
**[0 - 40 points]** 0 -10 points project insufficiently prepared, 11 -20 points average project in acceptable quality, 21 -30 points very good project, 31 -40 points excellent and innovative project

**Score**

**Commentary** Expand field

A clearly defined research objective of the envisaged project  
**[0 - 30 points];** 0 -10 points unclear or insufficiently defined goal, 11 -20 points goal defined in very general terms, 21 -30 points

- 6) At the end of the protocol, you have to confirm your objectiveness and impartiality of your evaluation, and by clicking “Save changes”, your evaluation will be saved. Note that changes can be made until the evaluation round ends.

I hereby confirm that my assessment of the project was objective and impartial and that I utilised the entirety of my knowledge. My assessment was not influenced by any form of benefit to myself as a result of the result of the assessment. I hereby declare that I am not dependent on the applicant. I did not participate in the preparation of the project, and I shall not participate in its realisation. I undertake to maintain the confidentiality of all data and facts which I learned in the course of the assessment.

**Decision**

---

<b>Total score</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
1	D	Fail

✎ changed ✕ Exit Save changes

- 7) If all the requirements of the protocol are satisfied, you will see a green ticked box next to your name on the Assessment page.

All proposals Assigned to me To be evaluated

**Search** 🔍 Filter

Unit  Workplace of researcher  Researcher surname  Evaluator (surname)

Evaluation of project  Evaluation flow  State

✕ Clear Filter

Number	Affiliation	Researcher	Title	Status	Assigned	Preliminary	Action
START/HUM	FF			Passed the formal check	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NIEDERLE Matěj		