

# Minutes from the online consultation on 19. 1. 2021

## (SCI)

### Present:

Prof. Černý, Associate Prof. Mráz, Associate Prof. Mosinger, Prof. Jehlička, Associate Prof. Martinek, Prof. Hencel, Associate Prof. Dvorak, Associate Prof. Hnětynka, Prof. Janeček, Associate Prof. Trojánek

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

### agenda:

#### 1) Conflicts of interest

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.

#### 2) Information for RC members

- a. Members of the RC can share their comments and suggestions.
- b. Prof. Černý thanked everyone for their excellent work and asked the members of the RC for their comments and remarks.
- c. Associate Prof. Mráz asked about the size of the work capacity of a research team in relation to work at Charles University. Dr. Nohel and Dr. Miková explained that the maximum work capacity must not exceed 1.2.

#### 3) Evaluation reports and their replacement

- a. Associate Prof. Trojánek asked if replacement assessments must also be made by 27. 1. 2021, substitute assessments must also be made. Dr. Nohel said that they didn't have to be. They can be prepared in parallel with the awarding of points for feasibility and innovation.
- b. It was clarified that a replacement assessment for a rejected evaluation can be prepared by any member of the RC.
- c. Associate Prof. Dvořák drew attention to the assessment in which points were deducted due to the fact that the workplace had already received another large grant. Dr. Nohel noted that this is not a reason to reduce the number of student grant points. The RC subsequently agreed to prepare a replacement assessment.
- d. Prof. Janeček compared his own projects with the assigned evaluations and found that they correlated with smaller deviations. He therefore assumes that the giving of a high rating of the feasibility and innovation criteria will not be very frequent.
- e. Dr. Nohel promised to send all members of the RC a form for new evaluations. If a reviewer prepares a new opinion, they must send it to Mgr. Jehličková (copy to Dr. Miková) for filing in the system.

#### 4) Points for the criterion of feasibility and innovation

- a. Prof. Černý conveyed the recommendations from the consultation with HUM and SOC members on a uniform procedure for awarding 0-60 points. He said that this proposal would be adequate for him in the area of SCI.
- b. Associate Prof. Mosinger prepared his own table of the originality of project proposals
- c. Associate Prof. Mráz read all the projects and prepared notes for evaluation, which he then compared with the assessments. Most matched his evaluations.
- d. Associate Prof. Hnětynka pointed out a certain number of non-innovative projects, which was also criticised by some evaluators.



- e. Prof. Jehlička and Associate Prof. Trojánek, too, agreed that points for feasibility and innovation should be awarded only exceptionally at the upper limit of the scale.
- f. Dr. Nohel asked the members of the RC to evaluate assessments by 22. 1. 2021 and to suggest points for feasibility and innovation by 27. 1. 2021.
- g. Dr. Miková reminded those present that it would be necessary to prepare an appropriate justification at the same time.

5) Next steps

Dr. Nohel noted the need to:

- a. evaluate the quality of assessments using points and, if necessary, prepare new assessments that would replace low-quality assessments;
- b. consider adding points for the feasibility and innovation of a project.

6) Subsequent date for meeting and work of the RC

Dr. Nohel said that the reviewers from HUM and SOC agreed that they saw the schedule as realistic. They therefore expected that by Wednesday 27. 1. 2021 they would prepare proposals for evaluation for feasibility and innovation and agreed with holding the final meeting of the commission in the first week of February.

7) Summary and conclusion

- a. The consultation focused primarily on the quality of the evaluation reports for SCI/006-050.
- b. The opinion of the SCI members agrees with that of HUM and SOC.
- c. By 27. 1. 2021, the members of the RC will supplement the proposals of points for feasibility and innovation, including the relevant justifications.
- d. Members of the RC will add their scheduling options to the schedule table.
- e. Members of the RC can direct any further questions to Dr. Nohel, Mgr. Jehličková and Dr. Miková.

minutes kept by: RNDr. Dana Miková



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

