



# Methodology for Evaluators within the Student Grant Competition for Doctoral Students „Igráček UHK“

This document determines the methodology for evaluators of the student grant competition of the University of Hradec Králové which provides support from the project Development of the Internal Grant Agency of the University of Hradec Králové, reg. No. CZ.02.2.69/0.0/0.0/19\_073/0016949, submitted within the Operational Programme Research, Development and Education – Call No. 02\_19\_073 to increase the quality of internal grant schemes at higher education institutions, priority axis 2 of the Operational Programme. This methodology is binding for all evaluators of the UHK Student Grant Competition.

## Evaluation of Submitted Applications and Way of Project Selection

- 1) The evaluation procedure is performed in two stages: formal evaluation and factual evaluation.
- 2) **The formal evaluation** of an application consists of:
  - a) Assessment whether or not the application contains all prescribed essentials according to Article 8 of this Rules, including the obligatory attachments;
  - b) Assessment of the data trueness and correctness;
  - c) Comparison of the project topic with the topic of doctoral theses of all members of the research team.
- 3) If the project topic equals to the topic of doctoral thesis of any of the investigators, the application will be taken out from the competition.
- 4) In case any other formal deficiencies are found, the proposer will be asked to remedy them within a specified period of time. If the deficiencies are not remedied by the deadline, the application will be taken out from the competition.
- 5) The formal evaluation is performed by the IGA Manager in cooperation with the respective faculty IGA Consultant.

Incorrect and untrue data include, but are not limited to:

- a) The applicant is not a Ph.D. student of the UHK on the day of the application submission (a 2<sup>nd</sup>- and 3<sup>rd</sup>-year student only may apply);
  - b) The figures are not specified in the prescribed currency and form (i.e. the unit cost);
  - c) Sums of the individual items of recognized costs and items in the individual years do not correspond to the overall sum;
  - d) The proposed financing breaches the valid legal regulations;
  - e) The proposed overhead costs financing does not correspond to the respective work capacities (loads), or does not respect the dossier provisions;
  - f) The form of documents forwarded does not comply with the requirements;
  - g) Complete information about other projects solved by the Applicant is missing;
  - h) Bibliographic citations are missing in the cited texts;
  - i) Untrue data are provided.
- 6) All above specified deficiencies found during the formal check can be remedied after a call to supplement the application within max. 5 working days from the call receipt.
- 7) In the second stage, applications accepted for **factual assessment** are assessed by two **evaluators** at first and then submitted to the **IGA Committee**.
- 8) The evaluators are selected from the database of external evaluators. If there are not enough external evaluators, one of them can be replaced by an internal evaluator.
- 9) The evaluators perform their evaluation via the IGA Application within 14 days at the latest from the selected projects confirmation and the IGA Application access details sending by the IGA Manager.
- 10) The project gets **0-50 points** by each evaluator.
- 11) The factual assessment by the evaluators consists of the following criteria assessment:
- a) Quality of the submitted student grant and declared outputs;
  - b) Quality of the research team, especially the proposer and the mentor;
  - c) Scientific importance and topicality of the given topic;
  - d) Feasibility of the student grant aims;

- e) The concept and methods of solution;
  - f) Appropriateness of financial expenses.
- 12) Points given by all evaluators are summed up in all project proposals and the proposals proceed to the next stage of evaluation by the IGA Committee appointed by the Rector.
  - 13) Committee members acquaint themselves with the project proposals corresponding to their professional specialization and with both expert opinions.
  - 14) At first, the IGA Committee assesses the quality of expert opinions, especially in project proposals with opposing evaluations of the two evaluators (one evaluator recommends the project for financing while the other does not)
    - a) If the Committee finds an opinion to be professionally insufficient (and describes and justifies the decision in the minutes of the Committee meeting), it replaces the opinion by a new one elaborated by one of the IGA Committee members.
    - b) If both opinions are found to be professionally insufficient by the Committee (and the Committee describes and justifies the decision in the minutes of the Committee meeting), the opinion will be replaced by new opinions out of which one is elaborated by one of the IGA Committee members and the other one by another external evaluator.
  - 15) The IGA Committee assesses further the project proposals from the point of view of their realizability and innovative approach and gives **0-30 points** to the project (0-10 points: the project is realizable but uninnovative; 11-20 points: the project is realizable and innovative; 21–30 points: the project is well realizable and very innovative). The Committee justifies the evaluation.
  - 16) The IGA Committee approves the final list of all project proposals according to their final number of points given to the project within the evaluation. The list shows the threshold for the financial support awarding or not awarding.
  - 17) The Rector decides the award of finances to the project proposal on the basis of the IGA Committee opinion.
  - 18) If the principal investigator refuses the award of the financial means, the IGA Committee can decide that the financial means are given to the next project in line.
  - 19) There is no legal entitlement to an award of the project financial support.
  - 20) During the evaluation, conflict of interests/bias is controlled strictly:

- a) On the grant competition level: If the evaluator is a member of a research team or a mentor of a project, he/she must, when asked to be an evaluator of this grant competition project proposals, notify the IGA Manager of this fact without any undue delay. He/she is then excluded from the evaluation of student grant competition projects.
- b) On a specific project level: Every evaluator with potential conflict of interests due to connection to a proposer/research team must notify the IGA Manager of this fact and must withdraw immediately from the procedure of a specific project proposal evaluation (must refuse to take over a project proposal for evaluation). It is each evaluator's responsibility to consider whether or not his/her potential present or past cooperation with the proposer/research team of the project proposal constitutes a conflict of interests within the meaning of the signed declaration; i.e. whether or not his/her impartiality can be doubted.

21) When downloading their opinion in the IGA Application, all evaluators confirm their impartiality and confidentiality. All information related to both the evaluation/project selection procedure and the content of the project as such is confidential. The evaluator is obliged to maintain confidentiality with respect to all entities/individuals except for entities/individuals responsible for the control of the evaluation and project selection procedure; he/she is further obliged to ensure the unquestionable nature of the evaluation procedure. Any doubts regarding a breach of this rule must be investigated and can lead to termination of cooperation with the evaluator and, as a last resort, to discontinuation of the whole evaluation procedure with all consequences. It is, therefore, necessary to prevent any leak of information even if only through negligence. The evaluator must evaluate the project objectively and impartially, using all his/her knowledge and expertise and, eventually, using publicly available information. In no case the evaluator may contact the proposer during the evaluation, even for supplementing or explaining data from the project proposal.

22) After downloading their opinion in the IFA Application, all evaluators certify the following text:

*I certify I have evaluated the project objectively and impartially, using all my knowledge. My evaluation is not biased by any form of advantages resulting for me from the results of evaluation. I declare I am not dependent on the proposer. I haven't participated in this project drawing and, in case the project will be*

*supported, I will not participate in its implementation. I undertake to keep confidential all data and facts I learned during the evaluation.*

## Competition schedule

Date	Procedure	Persons involved
<b>13. 12. 2021 v 9:00 am – 21. 1. 2022 4:00 pm</b>	<b>Project proposals filing</b>	Principal investigators
24. 1. 2022 – 28. 1. 2022	Formal evaluation	IGA Manager and faculty IGA Consultants
29. 1. 2022 - 13. 2. 2022	Correction of formal deficiencies	Principal investigators
14. 2. 2022 – 27. 2. 2022	Factual evaluation by evaluators	External evaluators
28. 2. 2022 - 20. 3. 2022	Factual evaluation by IGA Committee	IGA Committee
21. 3. 2022 – 25. 3. 2022	Results announcement	IGA manager
28. 3. 2022 – 31. 3. 2022	Decisions issue	Principal investigators, Rector
<b>1. 4. 2022 – 31. 3. 2023</b>	<b>Project solving</b>	
1. 4. 2023 – 30. 4. 2023	Final Reports submission	Principal investigators
1. 5. 2023 – 31. 5. 2023	Final Reports evaluation	IGA Committee



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

