



COMPETITION FOR THE JUNIOR GRANT OF PALACKÝ UNIVERSITY IN OLOMOUC

EVALUATION PROCESS FOR PROJECT PROPOSALS (according to internal standard R-B-22/10-ÚZ04)

1. project evaluation phase

- Formalities are checked by the Project Service of Palacký University in Olomouc.
- The formalities check criteria are remediable (i.e. completion by the applicant is possible following a call for completion).

----- Transmission of project proposals to faculties/universities -----

2. project evaluation phase

- Substantive evaluation is carried out by ***an evaluation committee at the faculty/institute of higher education.***
 - Evaluation committees and their chairpersons at individual faculties or higher education institutes are appointed by the dean or director of the higher education institute.
- a) Evaluation of project proposals by two independent external expert assessors appointed by the Evaluation Committee.
- b) Based on the evaluation, the Evaluation Committee will rank the project proposals recommended for funding.

----- Evaluation of individual scientific areas -----

3. project evaluation phase

- ***The project rapporteurs*** will rank the recommended project proposals in each scientific area based on consensus and allocated funding.

----- Funding decision -----

Approval of the recommended projects by the UP Grants Council.

Rector's decision on the grant award.

Evaluation form for Young Researcher Grants of Palacký University in Olomouc

Project title:	
Principal Investigator:	
Topic Area:	
Name of evaluator:	
Date of evaluation:	

		number of points
Criterion 1	Overall quality of the project	
5-4 points	Excellent - the project is well prepared, has no or only minor flaws.	
3-2 points	Good - the quality of the project's preparation is average or lower, the weaknesses are obvious.	
1-0 points	Inadequate - poor quality project design, serious deficiencies.	

Criterion 2	Clarity and conciseness of the project, definition of objectives	
10-9 points	Excellent - the project is described clearly and concisely, the objectives are defined in line with the project activities and their achievement is realistic.	
8-6 points	Very good- clarity and conciseness is average, objectives are defined in a meaningful way and achievement is realistic. Minor reservations.	
5-3 points	Satisfactory - the project is difficult to understand, the objectives are unclear. Serious reservations.	
2-0 body	Inadequate - the project is not clear, the set objectives are not in line with the project activities, the fulfilment of the objectives is not realistic.	

Criterion 3	Originality of the solution and contribution of the expected project results	
10-9 points	Excellent - the project addresses current, important and new problems in the field of science. The solution is original, the results have the potential for high contribution to scientific knowledge.	
8-6 points	Good - the project addresses rather current and important problems in the given scientific field. The solution is not entirely original, but the results have the potential to bring new knowledge to the field.	
5-3 points	Satisfactory - the project does not fully address current and important issues, it only touches on them. There is less potential for expanding existing knowledge in the field.	
2-0 points	Inadequate - the project deals with topics that have already been studied, without any major contribution to the field of science.	

Criterion 4	Chosen methodological procedures	
10-9 points	Excellent - the methodology is fully in line with the objectives of the project, the chosen procedures reflect the main objectives of the project and have the potential to effectively achieve these objectives.	
8-6 points	Good - the methodology is mostly in line with the project objectives, the chosen procedures lead to the achievement of the project objectives, but there are ambiguities or inconsistencies.	
5-3 points	Satisfactory - the methodology has significant shortcomings, the chosen procedures are not sufficiently adapted to the project objectives. Significant ambiguities or weaknesses in the logic and approach of the methodology.	
2-0 points	Inadequate - the methodology does not fully meet the objectives of the project, the chosen procedures are completely inappropriate or unrelated to the project objectives.	

Criterion 5	The timetabled realism of the solution	
5-4 points	Excellent - the chosen solution schedule is described in detail and is adequate to the expected results of the project.	
3-2 points	Good - the chosen timetable for the solution is sufficiently described, but there are ambiguities or deficiencies.	
1-0 points	Inadequate - The chosen timetable is described inadequately or not at all and does not allow the expected results to be met.	

Criterion 6	Quality of the research team and workplace readiness	
10-9 points	Excellent - the professional focus of the entire research team fully corresponds to the problem addressed. The equipment of the workplace includes everything necessary for the implementation of the project.	
8-6 points	Very good - the professional focus of the whole research team partly corresponds to the problem addressed. The equipment of the workplace corresponds to the needs of the project implementation.	
5-3 points	Satisfactory - the professional focus of the research team does not correspond to the problem addressed. The equipment of the workplace only partially covers the needs of the project.	
2-0 points	Inadequate - the professional focus of the research team does not correspond to the problem addressed. The equipment of the workplace does not cover the needs of the project.	

Criterion 7	Reasonableness and justification of the financial requirements requested	
5-4 points	Excellent - costs are in line with expected results. They are neither underestimated nor overestimated and overall the budget is adequately justified throughout.	
3-2 points	Good - costs are partly in line with expected results. However, some items are over- or underestimated. The budget is justified except for some sub-items.	
1-0 points	Inadequate - costs are not in line with expected results, grossly overestimated or underestimated. Budget justification is very weak.	

Total points awarded	0
----------------------	---

Comment

Declaration on honour of the evaluator of the Palacký University Young Researcher Grant

Name:	
-------	--

DECLARATION OF IMPARTIALITY:

I, as the person involved in the evaluation and selection process (hereinafter referred to as the "evaluator") of the grant applications, further **declare on my honour** that:

- ✓ I will approach the evaluation impartially,
- ✓ I will not evaluate a project under the DSGS call in the same panel under which a grant application has been submitted by an applicant who is in any way linked to me (e.g. no link between the evaluator and the applicant or its partner is allowed; the evaluator must not be linked to the applicant or its partner by a personal or other similar relationship, the evaluator is not identical to the applicant, etc.),
- ✓ I will not evaluate other projects under the DSGS call in the support areas where a project in which I have been actively involved in its preparation is submitted.

DECLARATION OF CONFIDENTIALITY

I, as the person involved in the evaluation and selection (hereinafter referred to as the "evaluator") of the grant applications, further **declare on my honour** that:

- ✓ I will keep confidential all facts relating to the evaluation of applications,
- ✓ I will not use the information obtained in connection with the evaluation of the project for my own benefit,
- ✓ I will not disclose information obtained in connection with the evaluation of the project to third parties,
- ✓ I will not allow third parties to obtain information obtained in connection with the evaluation,
- ✓ I will not contact the applicant of the project application under review during or after the evaluation of the application and will not seek additional information from the applicant or communicate the results of my review to these entities.

DECLARATION OF ACTIVITY

I, as the person involved in the evaluation and selection (hereinafter referred to as the "evaluator") of the grant applications, further **declare on my honour** that:

- ✓ I will not, by my actions, compromise the independence of the evaluation,
- ✓ I shall take such measures in connection with the evaluation as will prevent the leakage of information to third parties,
- ✓ I will assess applications only on the basis of the information contained in the project application and my own knowledge,
- ✓ I will familiarise myself in detail with all the rules that may form the basis of the evaluation.

Signature date:

.....

Signature of the
evaluator/approving authority