
Selection process

The selection process consists of the following stages:

a) Eligibility check

Each proposal will be checked against a set of eligibility criteria described in section 10 of the [Guide for Applicants](#) . It will be done by the programme administrator (CU).

b) Individual scientific evaluation

Each proposal passing the eligibility check will proceed to an independent evaluation conducted remotely by two independent experts who specialize in the scientific domain of the proposal, based on a set of given evaluation criteria (detailed below). In some cases, such as highly interdisciplinary projects, a third evaluator may be required. Furthermore, a third evaluator will be assigned to each proposal as a backup, ready to step in if any of the original two evaluators reports a conflict of interest or fails to complete the evaluation for any reason.

For evaluation purposes, the proposals will be divided into four scientific panels: Natural Sciences, Medical and Health Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities, and the Arts. The panel chairs will be appointed by the scientific director of the programme, covering all disciplines of research performed at CU.

An online consensus meeting of the two independent experts will follow to determine the final score of each application, with these meetings scheduled by the programme administrator. A maximum of eighteen applicants with the highest scores from the independent evaluation will be invited to an online interview. All proposals advancing to the interview stage must meet a minimum threshold of 70%, hence eighteen is the maximum number of applicants to proceed to the interviews.

Criteria for individual evaluation

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Weight
1. Excellence	1.1. Quality and credibility of the research/innovation project; level of novelty, methodology, appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary and gender aspects	50%
	1.2. Potential of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a professional maturity /independence during the fellowship	
	1.3. Potential of the proposed intersectoral collaboration with non-academic partners	
2. Impact	2.1. Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the researcher	30%
	2.2. Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences	
	2.3. Contribution to the achievement of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals	
3. Implementation	3.1. Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan including the	20%

	appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources	
	3.2. Appropriateness of the management procedures, including risk management	

Each criterion will be valued on a scale 0-5 (0=missing information, 1=the criterion is not adequately addressed, 2=the criterion contains significant weaknesses, 3=the criterion is addressed with a number of shortcomings, 4=the criterion is very well addressed with only minor shortcomings 5=the criterion is excellently addressed). The maximum value is 15 points (100%). The value can be stated to one decimal place. In order to avoid a recruitment of underqualified applicants, an overall threshold, applying to the sum of the 3 individual scores, is 10,5 (70%) points.

In case of equal results, the preference will be given to the proposal scored higher in the criterion 1. Excellence. In case both proposals scored equal points in the criterion 1. Excellence, the preference will be given to the proposal scored higher in criterion 2. Impact.

c) Interviews

Eighteen applications that received the highest score during the Individual evaluation stage will be invited to present their proposed project at an interview panel.

The Interview committee will consist of four independent experts and two members of the SC. CU employee of the HR department will be present to discuss the employment conditions to the applicant. The programme administrator will be also present to keep notes of the interview. The interviews will be executed online, in English, with an oral presentation of the applicant followed by the Q&A session.

The interview will last 30 minutes, with 15 minutes dedicated to the applicant's presentation and 15 minutes to a Q&A section.

During the interviews, the following criteria will be evaluated:

Criterion	Weight
1. Scientific skills, including the strategic intent of the research and evidence of creative and innovative thinking	40%
2. Match between the candidate's profile and the hosting institution/group	30%
3. Communication and people skills, encompassing the ability to engage in scientific discussions, clarity and consistency of presentation, leadership skills, and the capacity to successfully execute the project	20%

Each criterion will be evaluated on a scale of 1-5, where 0 indicates missing information and 5 represents excellent performance.

d) Final evaluation score

Subsequently, the final evaluation score will be calculated as follows: the score of the individual evaluation (maximum 15 points) will have a weight of 50%, and the interview result score (maximum 15 points) will also have a weight of 50%. In case of equal total score, preference will be given to the proposal score higher in the interviews part of the evaluation.

e) Ethics review

Ethics review - will be done by the research integrity officer of CU based on the ethics self-assessment questionnaire, which will be a part of the application. The Charles University Research Ethics Commission and Research Ethics Commissions at individual faculties will be called in to participate in the process of ethics review as it is outlined in their statutes. The proposals recommended for funding and those on a reserve list will be scrutinized against a set of ethical principles. Horizon Europe principles on ethics in research will be strictly followed. The Review will start with an Ethics Screening and if appropriate a further analysis called the Ethics Assessment will be conducted. The Ethics Review can lead to ethics requirements that can be turned into contractual obligations. See chapter 13 of the Guide to view the list of prohibited and restricted research activities.

f) Final decision

The results of the individual evaluation & interviews will be approved by the Steering Committee and a final list of proposals recommended for funding and those on reserve list will be published on the programme website. At least four individual members of the Steering Committee must approve the results.

g) Redress procedure

Appeal procedure - for procedural reasons, the unsuccessful candidates will have an opportunity of appeal against the decision within 10 days of the decision delivery. If the Steering Committee finds the provided reasoning sufficient, it may decide about a re-evaluation. The re-evaluation will be done by different evaluators than those who evaluated the proposal during the first evaluation.

h) Equal opportunities

Female researchers are welcome to apply. The programme administrator will make sure that at least 50% of the experts appointed as the independent evaluators are women. The independent evaluators will be trained on the Unconscious Bias in order to prevent any gender biases and stereotypes during the selection.

```
<!DOCTYPE html> <html lang="cs"> <head> <meta charset="UTF-8"> <meta name="viewport" content="width=device-width, initial-scale=1.0"> <title>Obrázek s textem</title> </head> <body>  <p style="font-family: 'Trebuchet MS', sans-serif; font-size: 10px; color: gray; margin-top: 10px;font-style: italic;"> <strong>N.B.</strong> Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. </p> </body> </html>
```