

Start Programme

Minutes of the meeting of the Review Commission on 12. 1. 2021

present:

Associate Prof. Mgr. L. Hezcková, Ph.D., Associate Prof. PhDr. O. Konrád, Ph.D., Mgr. D. Kolenovská, Ph.D., Prof. JUDr. A. Macková, Ph.D., PhDr. L. Vochocová, Ph.D., Prof. Ing. E. Kočenda, M. A., Ph.D., DSc., Associate Prof. PhDr. S. Horák, Ph.D., Mgr. T. Kučera, Ph.D., Prof. RNDr. J. Černý, Ph.D., Associate Prof. Mgr. P. Mráz, Ph.D., Associate Prof. RNDr. J. Mosinger, Ph.D., Associate Prof. RNDr. V. Martínek, Ph.D., Prof. RNDr. S. Hencel, Ph.D., Associate Prof. Mgr. Z. Dvořák, Ph.D., Associate Prof. RNDr. P. Hnětynka, Ph.D., Prof. RNDr. M. Janeček, CSc., Associate Prof. RNDr. F. Trojánek, Ph.D., Associate Prof. MUDr. J. Živný, Ph.D., Associate Prof. MUDr. P. Klener, Ph.D., Prof. RNDr. V. Hampl, DrSc., Prof. MUDr. M. Anděl, CSc., Associate Prof. MUDr. J. Cendelín, Ph.D., Prof. PharmDr. P. Pávek, Ph.D., Prof. RNDr. P. Solich, CSc.

absent: Prof. RNDr. J. Jehlička, Dr.

for the Research Support Office: Associate Prof. RNDr. J. Konvalinka, CSc., RNDr. H. Kvačková, Mgr. P. Nohel, Ph.D., RNDr. D. Miková, A. Cihlářová, Mgr. K. Michlová, Mgr. T. Renner, Ph.D., Mgr. B. Jehličková
for the Project Support Department: Ing. M. Pätoprstý, Ph.D.

Agenda:

1) Opening of the meeting

Vice-Rector Konvalinka welcomed all participants to the meeting and recalled the history of the Start programme and its specific aspects. Subsequently, Dr. Nohel thanked the members of the Review Commission for their proactive approach so far and presented the following facts about the Start programme:

- a. Composition of the Review Commission (the "RC") - 4 areas - HUM, SOC, SCI and MED. The number of reviewers in the areas corresponds to the ratio of the number of projects submitted.
- b. Members of the RC have contacts for each other, contacts for members of the Rector's team, as well as for the main documents of the Start programme.

2) Objectives of the RC

- a. Evaluation of the assessments of evaluators from the second round of evaluation by allocating 1 - 5 points according to the Methodology for Reviewers.
- b. If an assessment receives 1 or 2 points, a new assessment must be prepared (if both assessments of the project are rated 1 or 2, one report is prepared by one of the reviewers, and the other is assigned to a new external evaluator by the RC).
- c. Evaluate the quality and innovativeness of projects by awarding 0 - 60 points, with textual justification according to the Methodology for Reviewers.

3) Election of chair of the RC

- a. The proposed candidates for chair were Prof. Anděl and Prof. Černý.
- b. Prof. Černý renounced his nomination in favour of Prof. Anděl.
- c. Prof. Černý was subsequently nominated as vice-chair of the Commission.
- d. The other members had no further proposals or comments. All members agreed to a public vote.
- e. Result of the vote:



EUROPEAN UNION
European Structural and Investment Funds
Operational Programme Research,
Development and Education


MINISTRY OF EDUCATION,
YOUTH AND SPORTS

in favour of the motion – 22
against the motion - 0
abstained - 2

The RC elected Prof. MUDr. M. Anděl, CSc. as its chair and Prof. RNDr. J. Černý, Ph.D. as its vice-chair.
Prof. Anděl and Prof. Černý accepted the above positions.

4) Submitted project proposals

A total of 276 project proposals were submitted.

- a. In the first round (evaluation of the formal aspect) two proposals were eliminated (SCI/114 and SCI/122).
 - b. In the second round of evaluation, three proposals (START/HUM/027, START/SOC/069 and START/MED/098) received two "D" ratings and did not advance to the third round of evaluation.
 - c. A total of 271 project proposals advanced to the third round of evaluation.
- Dr. Nohel reminded those present that a unified online system with a maximum number of characters and without attachments guaranteed the same conditions for all applicants. At the same time, when, for example, drawing up a budget, the system automatically enters some items according to the planned hours, and as a result the applicant has little opportunity to divide the remaining part at their discretion. For this reason, few points from the overall score are awarded for the budget.

5) Conflicts of interest

- Dr. Nohel stated that reviewers who were also mentors were in a conflict of interest and could be a member of the RC. If a reviewer has a personally connection to a researcher (e.g. they are their supervisor), they cannot assess that project or its evaluation and cannot be personally present while it is discussed according to the Methodology for Reviewers.
- At the same time, he invited all reviewers to indicate any potential conflict of interest in the relevant projects.

6) Evaluation of the quality of evaluation reports

- a. The members of the RC were presented with an overview of evaluation reports and the following method of their evaluation by the reviewers.
- b. The project is conditional on evaluation of the quality of prepared evaluations.
- c. The reviewers assign 1 - 5 points to each assessment (according to the Methodology for Reviewers).
 - i. If an assessment is awarded 1 or 2 points, one of the reviewers must prepare an alternative assessment.
 - ii. If a reviewers evaluates both assessments for a single project with 1 or 2 points, then one new assessment must be prepared by one of the reviewers and the second assessment is assigned by the university clerk to a new individual evaluator, preferably one from the evaluator database (external evaluator).
 - iii. The assessments are then discussed, with a replacement assessment being required for some. The preliminary estimate of the RC is that there could be about 10-20 such assessments. The list of replaced assessments, including their original and new scores, as well as the justification for revision, shall form an attachment to the minutes of the final meeting of the RC.
 - iv. The members of the RC also agreed that, due to the work on evaluating the quality of assessments and project proposals, but also for the needs of mutual continuous feedback, they will meet for online consultations in groups focusing on the relevant areas. Dr. Nohel promised technical support.



EUROPEAN UNION
European Structural and Investment Funds
Operational Programme Research,
Development and Education


MINISTRY OF EDUCATION,
YOUTH AND SPORTS

- d. New assessments are entered in the evaluation form, which is filed in the information system by the university clerk.

7) Subsequent discussion

- a. Associate Prof. Horák recommended considering new assessments, especially for projects rated "A" and "D".
- b. Dr. Nohel reminded those present that new assessments should replace only low-quality assessments.
- c. Prof. Anděl recommended looking at the projects rated as the best and worst and assessing whether there is any imbalance, especially with emphasis on projects that have received two "D" ratings.
- d. Dr. Nohel reminded those present of the binding rule that a project proposal that has two "D" ratings cannot advance to the next round of evaluation.
- e. Prof. Hampl agreed with Prof. Anděl that it would be good to focus on these projects and, if they are found to be of high quality, possibly recommend their submission to another CU research support programme.
- f. Associate Prof. Dvořák raised the question of what impact the evaluation of assessments on a scale of 3-5 points will have on the evaluation of a project. Dr. Nohel clarified that this has no impact on the actual evaluation of the project content.
- g. Associate Prof. Konrád recommended focusing on projects with very different assessments (e.g. "A" and "D") and on how the evaluators worked with the assessments. If it appears that an assessment was only formal, it should be rated with a low number of points.
- h. Associate Prof. Mráz emphasized that it was in the interest of a fair process for high-quality projects to be implemented. He reminded those present that in other competitions, the minimum number of its characters is also entered for the quality of the assessment. Prof. Anděl said that it is necessary to ensure that the projects that are recommended for implementation really are of high quality.
- i. Prof. Anděl also reminded those present that it is necessary to really evaluate assessments in time so that it's clear which will need to be replaced by new assessments.
- j. Prof. Anděl requested that procedural comments be addressed to Dr. Nohel.

8) The following dates apply for online consultations and the final meeting of the RC:

- a. In the week of 18. - 22. 1. 2021 online consultations will take place. The dates will be set on the basis of the scheduling options of the relevant members of the RC.
- b. By 22. 1. 2021, new reviewers will be nominated for projects with poorly processed assessments.
- c. In the week of 1. - 2. 2021, a joint meeting of the RC will take place.
- d. According to the schedule, the end of the third round of evaluation is set for 12. 2. 2021.

After the end of the third round, the final list of projects and the points assigned to them will be submitted to the Rector's Board. Furthermore, time must be allocated for any appeals and for the signing of researchers' Agreements on the Allocation of Funds.

- e. Projects receiving funding shall commence on 1. 4. 2021.

9) Conclusion of the meeting

Prof. Anděl thanked everyone for their active approach and ended the meeting.

minutes kept by: RNDr. Dana Miková

approved by: Prof. MUDr. Michal Anděl, CSc.



EUROPEAN UNION
European Structural and Investment Funds
Operational Programme Research,
Development and Education


MINISTRY OF EDUCATION,
YOUTH AND SPORTS