

Methodology for IGA Committee within the Student Grant Competition for Doctoral Students „Igráček UHK“

This document determines the methodology for IGA Committee 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 IGA Committee members 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.

- 6) In the second stage, applications accepted for **factual assessment** are assessed by two **evaluators** at first and then submitted to the **IGA Committee**.
- 7) 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.
- 8) 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.
- 9) The project gets **0-50 points** by each evaluator.
- 10) 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.
- 11) 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.
- 12) The IGA Committee consists of representatives of the following areas: Natural Sciences, Medical and Health Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities and Art. In case of need, the number of representatives in the Committee can be increased subsequently the Rector.
- 13) The IGA Committee term of office is till 30.6.2023.
- 14) The IGA Committee meeting is convened and chaired by its Chair; the Chair can authorize another Committee member to chair the meeting.
- 15) Minutes of the IGA Committee are taken by the IGA Manager.
- 16) The IGA Committee has a quorum if the absolute majority of its members are present. A resolution is adopted if the absolute majority of present members approve it. In a situation of equality of votes, the vote of the Chair of the IGA Committee is decisive.

- 17) The IGA Committee can also vote by correspondence. In case of such voting, the Chair sends the draft resolution in the given matter and all relevant documents to all members and determines the deadline for answering. The individual members send their answer “I agree”, “I do not agree”, “I abstain from voting” to the Chair by the given deadline. Answers delivered after the specified deadline are taken out. In order to adopt a resolution, the absolute majority of all members of the IGA Committee must say “I agree”. The Chair announces the result of the voting to the members in the same way in which the voting was performed. Minutes are taken about the course and result of the voting by correspondence.
- 18) Committee members acquaint themselves with the project proposals corresponding to their professional specialization and with both expert opinions.
- 19) At first, the relevant IGA Committee member **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 he/she finds an opinion to be professionally insufficient (and describes and justifies the decision in the minutes of the Committee meeting), the Committee 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 (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.
- 20) The relevant IGA Committee member 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.
- 21) The relevant member shall submit his / her proposal for the scoring of the grant application at the meeting of the IGA Committee, which will vote after discussion of his / her proposal.

- 22) 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.
- 23) The Rector decides the award of finances to the project proposal on the basis of the IGA Committee opinion.
- 24) 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.
- 25) There is no legal entitlement to an award of the project financial support.
- 26) During the evaluation, conflict of interests/bias is controlled strictly.
- 27) Conflict of interest of individuals who participate in the evaluation, approval and decision-making with respect to the individual applications/grants (especially the IGA Committee members, internal and external evaluators) include mainly situations where such individual:
 - a) Is a supervisor of any of the investigators;
 - b) Is a mentor of the given project;
 - c) Has such personal or professional relation to any of the investigators that could influence his/her independence at this project consideration.
- 28) When each individual specified in Article 1 receives applications for evaluation, or at any time later, he/she considers seriously whether or not he/she is in a conflict of interest and whether or not he/she is able to act independently and without bias.
- 29) If he/she comes to the conclusion he/she faces a conflict of interest, he/she must notify the IGA Manager of it immediately. The individual who has declared a conflict of interest in relation with the discussed application, may only provide additional information but may not vote/decide on this matter.

Evaluation of Final Reports

- 1) The IGA Manager makes the Final Reports available to the IGA Committee members in the IGA Application.
- 2) The members acquaint themselves with the Final Reports of projects related to their professional specialization.

3) The members then assess achievement of the project research aims and outputs (scientific publications, participation in conferences etc.) and achievement of educational aims of the individual investigators.

4) Criteria for the Final Reports evaluation (YES/NO):

- a) The research aim was achieved
- b) The expected outputs were achieved
- c) The educational aims of the principal investigator were met
- d) The educational aims of other investigators were met
- e) The internships were valuable for the students
- f) The Principal Investigator coped with the team leading and the project solution organizing

Competition schedule

Date	Procedure	Persons involved
13. 12. 2021 v 9:00 am – 21. 1. 2022 4:00 pm	Project proposals filing	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
1. 4. 2022 – 31. 3. 2023	Project solving	
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

