

Evaluation Criteria for Evaluators

I. Quality of the submitted student grant and declared outputs

10 points

The proposed student grant solves up-to-date topics in the given area of science according to the research and development classification (Frascati Manual, 2015) and develops knowledge on an international level. It uses new scientific methods to solve little explored issues in the given area of science. Outputs in prestigious journals in the given area of science are planned (usually Q1 according to AIS JCR - Journal Citation Reports or D1 SCOPUS SJR – Scientific Journal Rankings (for outputs in FORD 5 and 6 only)). The number of outputs and their quality is appropriate.

8 points

The proposed student grant solves largely up-to-date topics in the given area of science according to the research and development classification (Frascati Manual, 2015) and develops knowledge on an international level. It uses up-to-date but already established scientific methods to solve not yet completely solved issues in the given area of science. Outputs in well-known and highly appreciated journals in the given area of science are planned (usually Q1 according to IF JCR or SCOPUS SJR (for outputs in FORD 5 and 6 only)). The number of outputs and their quality is appropriate.

6 points

The proposed student grant solves, to a lesser extent, up-to-date topics in the given area of science according to the research and development classification (Frascati Manual, 2015) and develops knowledge on a national level. It uses established scientific methods to solve issues in the given area of science. Outputs in above-standard and standard journals in the given area of science are planned (Q2-Q3 according to IF JCR or SCOPUS SJR (for outputs in FORD 5 and 6 only)). The number of outputs and their quality is largely appropriate.

4 points

The proposed student grant solves up-to-date topics in the given area of science according to the research and development classification (Frascati Manual, 2015) very little or marginally; the benefit for the scientific community is small. The used scientific methods and procedures are not set up clearly. Outputs in slightly below-standard journals in the given area of science are planned (Q3 according to IF JCR or SCOPUS SJR (for outputs in FORD 5 and 6 only)). The number of outputs and their quality is largely inappropriate.

2 points

The proposed student grant does not solve up-to-date issues and topics in the given area of science according to the research and development classification (Frascati Manual, 2015); the benefit is not clear and the issues solved are common or irrelevant. Scientific methods used to solve the student grant are inadequate, unclear, or bad. Outputs in below-standard journals in the given area of science are planned. The number of outputs and their quality is largely inadequate at all and it is not realistic to achieve them.

II. Quality of the research team, especially the proposer and the mentor

5 points

The professional orientation of the whole research team corresponds fully to the issues solved. The publication history of all members of the research team corresponds to the expected publication outputs of the student grant. The mentor or the principal investigator have published at least one publication related to the given topic in Q1 journal according to IF JCR or SCOPUS SJR (for outputs in FORD 5 and 6 only). The expected work capacity of the individual team members corresponds well to the objectives set. The educational aims of all investigators are valuable and real.

4 points

The professional orientation of the whole research team corresponds fully to the issues solved. The publication history of the research team members corresponds largely to the expected publication outputs of the student grant. The mentor or the principal investigator have published at least one publication related to the given topic in a WoS-indexed journal (at least Q2 according to IF JCR or Q2 according to SCOPUS SJR (for outputs in FORD 5 and 6 only)). The expected work capacity of the individual team members is appropriate to the objectives set. The educational aims of all investigators are valuable and real.

3 points

The professional orientation of the whole research team corresponds largely to the issues solved. The publication history of the research team members corresponds largely to the expected publication outputs of the student grant. The mentor or the principal investigator have published at least one publication related to the topic in a WoS-indexed journal (at least Q3 according to IF JCR or Q3 according to SCOPUS SJR (for outputs in FORD 5 and 6 only)). The expected work capacity of the individual team members is probably appropriate to the objectives set. The educational aims of all investigators are largely valuable and real.

2 points

The professional orientation of the whole research team corresponds to a lesser extent to the issues solved. The publication history of the research team members hardly corresponds to the expected publication outputs of the student grant. The expected work capacity of the individual team members is not appropriate to the objectives set. The educational aims of all investigators are largely invaluable and unreal.

1 point

The professional orientation of the whole research team does not correspond at all to the issues solved. The publication history of the research team members does not correspond to the expected publication outputs of the student grant. The expected work capacity of the individual team members is undervalued in terms of the objectives set. The educational aims of all investigators are invaluable and unreal.

III. Scientific importance and topicality of the given topic

10 points

The student grant solves up-to-date, serious and new topics in the given area of science on an international level. The topic of the student grant has a potential to be highly beneficial for scientific knowledge.

8 points

The student grant solves up-to-date and serious topics in the given area of science on an international level and has a potential to bring new findings in the given area of science.

6 points

The student grant solves largely up-to-date and serious topics in the given area of science and has a potential to extend notably the existing knowledge in the given area of science.

4 points

The student grant does not solve quite up-to-date and serious topics; it touches them only. There is a lesser potential for extension of the existing knowledge in the given area of science.

2 points

The student grant solves topics that have already been explored and is not of any large benefit for the given area of science.

IV. Feasibility of the student grant aims

10 points

Achievement of the set student grant aims is very real. The research team activities are linked to the budget and allow achievement of the aims set. The aims are defined clearly, understandably and accurately.

8 points

Achievement of the set student grant aims is probable. The research team activities are linked to the budget and allow achievement of the aims set. The aims are defined clearly and understandably.

6 points

Achievement of the set student grant aims is questionable. The research team activities are linked unclearly to the budget and allow achievement of the aims set with difficulty. The aims are defined rather generally.

4 points

Achievement of the set student grant aims is unlikely. The research team activities are unclear, the linkage to the budget is minimum and achievement of the aims set is unlikely. The aims are defined very generally.

2 points

Achievement of the set student grant aims is not real both by definition and allocation of financial and/or human resources. The aims are defined unclearly and insufficiently.

V. The concept and methods of solution

10 points

The selected procedures/methods are described in detail and are adequate to the student grant aims and allow their achievement. The methods selected for the student grant solution are advanced or innovative. Up to now, they can be found in prestigious world journals only. The selected nature and duration of the individual members' educational/research activity predicts high-quality outputs of the student grant.

8 points

The selected procedures/methods are largely described in detail. They conform very well to the student grant aims and allow their achievement. The methods selected for the student grant solution are new; they can be found in high-quality world journals in the given area of science.

6 points

The selected procedures/methods are described sufficiently and as such, they allow publication in average journals in the given area of science.

4 points

The selected procedures/methods are, here and there, described insufficiently. They correspond to the aims set but due to their not completely detailed description, their help in the aims achievement is not clear. The methods allow publication in rather below-standard journals in the given area of science.

2 points

The selected procedures/methods are described insufficiently or not at all. By their nature, such methods are basic and obsolete. They do not allow achievement of the set student grant aims.

VI. Appropriateness of financial expenses

5 points

The expenses correspond to the key outputs. They are neither under- nor overestimated and in general, the budget is reasoned sufficiently in full extent.

4 points

The expenses correspond to the key outputs. However, some items are under- or overestimated. The budget is reasoned sufficiently in full extent.

3 points

The expenses correspond to the key outputs. However, some items are under- or overestimated. The budget is reasoned, except for some partial items.

2 points

The expenses largely correspond to the key outputs; however, the number of under- or overestimated items is high. The budget is largely unreasoned.

1 point

The expenses largely do not correspond to the key outputs; they are grossly under- or overestimated. The budget justification is very weak.



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

