

Minutes from the online consultation on 18. 1. 2021

(HUM + SOC)

Present:

Associate Prof. Macková, Associate Prof. Horák, Dr. Kučera, Associate Prof. Heczková, Associate Prof. Konrád, Dr. Vochocová, Dr. Kolenovská

for the Research Support Office: Dr. Nohel, Dr. Renner, Mgr. Jehličková, Dr. Kvačková, Dr. Miková

agenda:

1) Conflicts of interest

- a. Dr. Nohel asked the members of the Review Commission (RC) to check and, if applicable, update the list of conflicts of interest for individual project proposals.
- b. Associate Prof. Heczková informed the Commission about a conflict of interest in two projects (HUM/028 and SOC/032).

2) Availability of information for members of the RC

Dr. Vochocová requested that information be shared with all members of the RC.

3) Evaluation reports and their replacement

- a. Dr. Kučera asked how to proceed in the case of the SOC/020 project, which received "A" and "D" ratings. Both assessments are prepared carefully, both rate the project as high quality, only the evaluator who gave the mark "D", gave it because he believed that the project does not belong to this competition. Dr. Nohel and Dr. Miková explained the need to proceed in accordance with the Methodology for Reviewers, which is binding, and recommended that the preparation of a new assessment be considered.
- b. Dr. Renner pointed out a column in the evaluation form where the evaluators chose from the options in the system. Dr. Miková clarified that this was confirmation that the evaluator was not in a conflict of interest.
- c. Dr. Vochocová opened a discussion on the appropriate procedure for when the individual assessments have only very brief comments for the assigned points and wondered whether the project has received too high a rating or not.
- d. Also, Associate Prof. Heczková noted that the low score for the budget item may be due to the evaluator's lack of understanding of the system.
- e. Dr. Nohel explained the system of evaluation of opinions in accordance with the Methodology for Evaluators and promised to send a form for new evaluations to all members of the RC. If a reviewer prepares a new opinion, they will send it to Dr. Miková for filing in the system.

4) points for the criterion of feasibility and innovation

- a. Dr. Kučera was of the opinion that points at the upper limit of the scale should rather be awarded exceptionally and that it would be good to reach agreement across fields.
- b. Associate Prof. Horák recommended focusing mainly on projects rated "AA" or "AB".
- c. Dr. Miková explained that it is important that every evaluator reads the projects and proposes the allocation of points for feasibility and innovation, which will then be approved by the entire RC.

5) Next steps

- a. Dr. Nohel noted the need to:
 - i. evaluate the quality of assessments using points and, if necessary, prepare new assessments that would replace low-quality assessments;



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



- ii. consider adding points for the feasibility and innovation of the project.
 - b. Dr. Kolenovská asked if there was any quota for the HUM and SOC projects. Dr. Nohel replied that there was none. Project support will be given only according to the total number of points that they receive.
 - c. Associate Prof. Macková asked what the point limit was for the acceptance of projects. Dr. Nohel explained that, due to unit funding and the differently sized teams, in cases where the total budget is clearly set, the limit is not set unambiguously, that is, it is dependent only on the available resources. However, we estimate that we will be able to support about 1/3 of the project proposals. Approximately 228 million crowns are available.
- 6) Subsequent date for meeting and work of the RC
- Dr. Nohel asked the members of the RC if he saw the first week of February as a realistic date for the final meeting and reminded them that this date was also important for the evaluation of other projects being implemented at Charles University. The reviewers agreed that the date is realistic; only Associate Prof. Konrád asked for an appointment in the second half of the week in question, and at the same time that the appointments and an information e-mail be sent.
- 7) Summary and conclusion
- a. The consultation focused primarily on the quality of the HUM/007-031 and SOC/003-029 evaluation reports.
 - b. It recommended a uniform procedure for awarding 0-60 points. This recommendation will be forwarded to SCI and MED members for comments.
 - c. The reviewers present agreed to draw up proposals for feasibility and innovation criteria by Wednesday, 27. 1. 2021.

minutes kept by: RNDr. Dana Miková



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

