

# Minutes from the online consultation on 20. 1. 2021

## (MED)

### Present:

Prof. Anděl, Prof. Hampl, Associate Prof. Cendelín, Prof. Pávek

**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, suggested justifications and comments.

#### 3) Evaluation reports and their replacement

- a. Dr. Nohel thanked the members for all the evaluations received so far and asked that the remaining ones be delivered by 22. 1. 2021.
- b. By the same date, the evaluation should be clarified in cases where the RC is hesitating between awarding 2 or 3 points.
- c. Dr. Nohel promised to send all members of the RC a form for new evaluations. The reviewer fills in the form and e-mails it to Dr. Miková, who records the ratings in the system.
- d. Associate Prof. Cendelín pointed out that, while some reviews are not specific enough, their final rating did not damage the relevant project. In many cases, he would have given them the same number of points himself, but he would have attached more detailed comments to the evaluation.

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

Dr. Nohel explained the process for evaluating the criteria for feasibility and innovation in terms of the Principles.

#### 5) Next steps

- a. Dr. Nohel reminded those present that there are no quotas for individual areas.
- b. Prof. Anděl asked the individual members of the RC for their previous experience and comments, agreeing that it was a necessity to apply the same criteria in all areas. He emphasised that clearly innovative projects should be given extra points. He conveyed the recommendations from the online consultation with HUM and SOC members on a uniform procedure for awarding 0-60 points. He himself identified several outstanding projects that were not, however, very innovative, and then highlighted some standard projects that were, on the other hand, very innovative. Therefore, he believed that it would be wrong if support was ultimately given to less innovative projects.
- c. Prof. Anděl raised the question of the admissibility of brief comments in the evaluation reports. Dr. Nohel replied that, technically speaking, brevity is not a problem, and on the contrary, a long comment may not automatically be a good one. It depended on how the opinions in the report were professionally substantiated. In



any case, the Commission must evaluate the report according to the criteria in the Methodology and then order the preparation of a new report (rating 1 or 2 points).

- d. In the case of projects rated "D/D", it is no longer possible to add a new report; the project proposal does not proceed to the next stages of evaluation or implementation. However, it is possible to recommend that the authors enter another competition at the Charles University if the RC finds the project to be of good quality.
- e. Dr. Miková reminded those present that it is necessary to prepare a justification for points given for feasibility and innovation.

6) Subsequent date for meeting and work of the RC

- a. Dr. Nohel said that the reviewers from HUM, SOC and SCI agreed that they saw the schedule as realistic. They expected that by Wednesday 27. 1. 2021 they will have prepared proposals for evaluation for feasibility and innovation.

7) Summary and conclusion

- 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;
  - ii. consider adding points for the feasibility and innovation of a project.
- b. Dr. Nohel asked if he thought that 27. 1. 2021 was a realistic date for assigning points for innovation. Other colleagues agreed that it was, but they had been working on a solution a little longer. He confirmed that he would inform others to do the same and also asked if he agreed to hold the final meeting in the first week of February. The members of the commission agreed with the proposed scheduling options.
- c. The consultation focused primarily on the quality of evaluation reports for MED/005-063.
- d. The position of the members for MED was the same as that of their colleagues from HUM and SOC.
- e. Prof. Anděl thanked all participants from the Rector's Office and the RC and ended the online consultation.

minutes kept by: RNDr. Dana Miková



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

