
Selection process

About the Kellner Research Programme (KRC)

The Kellner Research Chairs (KRC) programme supports excellent researchers in establishing or strengthening internationally recognized research groups at Charles University (CU).

The initiative is co-funded by The Kellner Family Foundation (TKFF) and Charles University, aiming to attract and sustain top-level researchers who will contribute to CU's long-term excellence, global visibility, and societal impact.

Each selected Chair will receive institutional and financial support for a three-year period, with faculty commitment for continued support for two additional years.

Principles of Scientific Evaluation

The evaluation process is guided by the core principles of:

- **Excellence, transparency, and fairness** – following open, merit-based, and impartial evaluation standards.
- **Independence** – reviewers act in a personal capacity, not on behalf of institutions or countries.
- **Equality and inclusion** – reviewers ensure equal opportunities, respecting career diversity and legitimate career breaks.
- **Confidentiality** – all materials and communications are to remain strictly confidential.
- **Feedback and transparency** – applicants receive constructive feedback to enhance their future performance.

Evaluators are expected to comply with the **European Charter for Researchers** and the **Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers**.

Evaluation Structure

Independent Experts

Each proposal will be evaluated by **two independent international experts** (three in justified cases).

Experts are selected for:

- disciplinary and methodological fit,
- diversity (gender, geography, sector),
- and absence of conflicts of interest.

Evaluators assess applications based on three main criteria:

Excellence (50%), Impact (30%), and Implementation and Sustainability (20%).

Steering Committee (SC)

Composition:

1. Vice-Rector for Research (Chair)
2. 2 representatives of TKFF
3. 1 representative of CUEF
4. 3 external disciplinary representatives (SSH, SCI, MED)

Role of SC:

1. Confirm external evaluations
2. Approve final list of selected Chairs
3. Oversee programme integrity, equality, and transparency

Evaluation Timeline

- **Eligibility check** – by the programme administrator.
- **Independent remote evaluation** – by two (or three) independent, international experts.
- **Consensus meeting** – evaluators align comments and scores into a single report.
- **Interview** – top-ranked candidates (max 10) are invited for interviews.
- **Steering Committee approval** – final ranked list and appointment.
- **Mid-term and final evaluations** – progress and sustainability review.

Criteria for individual evaluation

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Weight
1. Excellence	1.1. Quality and credibility of the research and innovation objectives – novelty, methodology, interdisciplinarity, gender and ethical aspects.	50%
	1.2. International standing and leadership of the applicant – major achievements, supervision experience, capacity to establish a high-level team.	
	1.3. Potential to advance the state of the art and CU's visibility – contribution to global research, positioning CU as a hub of excellence.	
2. Impact	2.1. Contribution to CU's excellence and competitiveness – potential to attract further international funding (ERC, Horizon Europe).	30%
	2.2. Mentoring, capacity-building, and knowledge transfer – support for early-career researchers and dissemination of best practices.	
	2.3. Societal and institutional impact – addressing societal challenges, Open Science, responsible research, and communication.	
3. Implementation	3.1. Feasibility and coherence of the work plan – realistic milestones, deliverables, and resource allocation.	20%
	3.2. Institutional commitment and infrastructure support – integration strategy and sustainability beyond Foundation funding.	
	3.3. Risk management – identification and mitigation of scientific and operational risks.	

Each evaluator assesses the assigned proposal independently using the official criteria and sub-criteria.

Evaluators submit their **Individual Evaluation Report**

Each criterion is scored from **0–5**, where:

- 0 = missing information
- 1 = not adequately addressed
- 2 = significant weaknesses
- 3 = addressed with shortcomings

- 4 = very well addressed with minor shortcomings
- 5 = excellently addressed

The **maximum total is 15 points (100%)**, with a **threshold of 80%** required for interview consideration.

c) Interviews

Top-ranked applicants (above 80%) are invited for an online interview (30 minutes: 15 min presentation + 15 min Q&A).

During the interviews, the following criteria will be evaluated:

Criterion	Weight
Scientific skills, including strategic intent and evidence of creative/innovative thinking	40%
Match between candidate's profile and the hosting institution/group	30%
Communication and people skills, including clarity, leadership, and capacity to execute the project	20%

Each interview criterion is scored 0–5.

The final score combines:

- 50% remote evaluation (max 15 points)
- 50% interview evaluation (max 15 points).

In case of a tie, the proposal with a higher score in Criterion 1 – Excellence prevails; if still equal, Criterion 2 – Impact decides.

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. Evaluators are expected to flag potential ethical issues in the proposal but not penalize applicants for them. Ethics screening is advisory and will be reviewed separately if the proposal is selected. Evaluators should also consider the AI-related ethical safeguards described in Part B of the application.

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.

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.