Methodology for evaluators in the Start programme

This methodology is binding for all evaluators in the Start programme

- **First round of evaluation - formal aspect of evaluation by the university clerk**
- **Second round of evaluation - evaluation by evaluators**

The factual evaluation is always provided separately by two experts (evaluators), who are selected from the Database of External Evaluators with regard to the thematic focus of the submitted project proposal. In the event of a shortage of evaluators, they may be supplemented by internal evaluators. The university clerk is obliged to ensure that each project is evaluated by a min. one external evaluator.

Method of acceptance of evaluation

The external evaluator is contacted by e-mail with an offer to accept the evaluation. Annotations of project proposals are sent to him/her at the same time. The external evaluator studies the individual annotations and informs the university clerk by e-mail of which project proposals he/she will accept the evaluation for. Subsequently, the university clerk confirms the external evaluator's choice of project proposals for evaluation and access data is sent to the Research Information System ("IS Věda").

Dates and method of evaluation

Every project proposal accepted for evaluation must be evaluated by an external evaluator within fourteen calendar days of receiving access data in IS Věda.

The evaluation is performed in the evaluation protocol in IS Věda. Each evaluator assigns 0 - 100 points to the project proposal and the project proposal is evaluated with marks A - D according to the number of points awarded (A: 81 - 100 points, B: 61 - 80 points, C: 41 - 60 points, D: 0 - 40 points).
The following is evaluated for each project proposal:
a)   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),
b)   clearly defined research goal (scientific hypothesis) of the submitted project: 0 - 30 points (0 - 10 points unclear or insufficiently defined goal, 11 - 20 points goal defined in very general terms, 21 - 30 points goal defined clearly, intelligibly and precisely),
c)   composition of the research team: 0 - 20 points (0 - 6 points team composed of researchers with professional orientation that does not correspond to the research goal, or team with inadequate work capacity with respect to the set goal, 7 - 14 points researchers with appropriate professional orientation and and likely adequate work capacity for set goal, 15 - 20 points appropriate composition

of team from the point of view of researchers' professional orientation and work capacity corresponding to the set goal),

d)   adequacy of the budget, including justification[1]: 0 - 10 points (0 - 3 points insufficiently described or justified budget items, 4 - 6 points adequately and sufficiently justified budget, 7 - 10 points very precisely compiled and well-justified budget).

If the project proposal is rated D by both evaluators, it is excluded from further evaluation. For all other project proposals, the points from both evaluators are added up and they proceed to the third round of evaluation.

- **Second round of evaluation - Evaluation by the Review Commission**

- **Completion of evaluation - announcement of final status**

- **Conflict of interest/bias**

a) at the level of the grant competition: If the evaluator is a member of the research team or a project mentor, he/she is obliged to immediately notify the university clerk if he/she is approached for the evaluation of project proposals of that grant competition. On this basis, he/she is subsequently **excluded from the evaluation of project proposals under the START programme**.

b) at the level of a specific project: Any evaluator at risk of conflict of interest due to a connection with the applicant/research team must notify the university clerk of this fact, including the justification, and immediately withdraw from the evaluation process of the relevant project proposal (refuse to accept the project proposal for evaluation). It is the responsibility of every evaluator to consider whether any current or past cooperation with the applicant/research team does not create a conflict of interest under the signed declaration or not, i.e. whether his/her independence is unimpeachable.

- **Impartiality and confidentiality**

All information related to the project evaluation/selection process, as well as the content of the project itself, is confidential. The evaluator is obliged to maintain complete confidentiality towards all entities/persons, with the exception of entities/persons who are responsible for the monitoring of the evaluation process and project selection, and is also obliged to ensure the integrity of the entire evaluation process. Any doubts about a breach of this rule must be investigated and may lead to the termination of cooperation with the evaluator and, as a last resort, to the suspension of the entire evaluation process, with all the consequences that that entails. It is therefore necessary to prevent any leakage of information, even if due to mere negligence. **The evaluator must approach the assessed project objectively and impartially, using all of his/her knowledge and skills, or using publicly available information. Under no circumstances may the evaluator contact the applicant in the evaluation process, not even for the purpose of supplementing or explaining the data from the project proposal.**

All evaluators will confirm the following text in the system when entering the report into IS Věda:

---

[1]Personnel costs, mentor costs, faculty overhead costs, and the total amount of the budget are not the subject of the budget evaluation.
The subject of evaluation is: non-investment equipment necessary for the project, internship costs, and training costs.

I hereby confirm that I have evaluated the project objectively and impartially, using the entirety of my knowledge. My evaluation is not influenced by any form of benefit to myself from the results of the evaluation. I hereby declare that I am not dependent on the applicant. I did not participate in the elaboration of this project, and if the project receives support, I shall not participate in its implementation. I undertake to maintain the confidentiality of all data and facts that I learn during the evaluation.

Timetable

03. 08. 2020 - 11. 09. 2020: appointment of reviewers and Review Commission (Vice-Rector for Research)

15. 09. 2020 12:00 – 30. 10. 2020 12:00: submission of project proposals in IS Věda (head researchers)

02. 11. 2020 – 06. 12. 2020: addition of the number of reviewers from subject panels with a large number of project proposals (Vice-Rector for Research)

02. 11. 2020 – 06. 11. 2020: 1st round of evaluation - formal aspect (university clerk)

02. 11. 2020 – 20. 11. 2020: assignment of project proposals to external evaluators (university clerk)

From 02. 11. 2020 14 calendar days, no later than 20. 11. 2020:

- corrections of formal deficiencies (head researchers)

- evaluators receive an e-mail with the names and annotations of project proposals in their panel (university clerk)

23. 11. 2020 – 06. 12. 2020: second round of evaluation (external evaluators)

07. 12. 2020: raporteurs granted access to all project proposals in IS Věda (university clerk)

07. 12. 2020 – 11. 12. 2020: assignment of evaluated project proposals to reviewers (university clerk)

14. 12. 2020 – 12. 1. 2021: Third round of evaluation - acquaintance with project proposals and their assessments (reviewers)

13. 01. 2021 – 19. 01. 2021: Third round of evaluation - meeting of the Review Commission

- election of the president of the Review Commission

- assessment of the quality of assessments

- where appropriate, the submission of new opinions to the reviewers (including justification for the inadequacy of the original opinions)

- assessment of project proposals (feasibility, innovative approach)

- allocation of 0-60 points to each proposal (including justification)

- approval of the list of all project proposals according to the sum of points in the second and third rounds of evaluation, with indication of the limit for granting or not granting financial support (in the case of entering new opinions, preparation of an incomplete list and postponement of voting)

- filling in of minutes from the meeting of the Review Commission (university clerk)

by 29. 01. 2021:

- **elaboration of new assessments** (appointed Reviewers **or other evaluators selected by the university clerk)**

- elimination of project proposals with two "D" marks,

- vote on an updated list of project proposals with a marked limit for granting or not granting financial support - per rollam (RC)

01. 02. 2021 - 26. 02 2021: announcement of results - head researchers granted access to evaluation of project proposals in IS Věda (university clerk)

01. 03. 2021 – 31. 03. 2021: signing of Agreements on the Allocation of Funds (head researchers, deans, Rector)
01. 04. 2021 – 31. 03. 2023: project implementation
01. 04. 2023 – 30. 04. 2023: submission of final reports (head researchers)
01. 05. 2023 - 31. 05. 2023: evaluation of final reports (reviewers and Review Commission)
01. 06. 2023 – 30. 07. 2023: Submission of final evaluation report to the Rector's Board (Vice-Rector for Research)