



-

**CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF PROJECTS WITHIN
THE DOCTORAL GRANT COMPETITION**

Each Doctoral Grant Competition (DGS) project application will be evaluated by two external evaluators. At least one of the evaluators must be a foreign expert. The overall point evaluation of the project application, which is not excluded from the evaluation process, is based on the average of the achieved points from both evaluation reports. If one of the evaluation reports is not delivered by the set deadline, or it is incomplete, or the evaluation reports of both independent evaluators significantly differ (e.g. one evaluator recommends the project for funding, while the other does not, or there is a total difference of greater than 15 points between the two evaluations), the Expert Guarantor will provide an additional evaluation report. The final evaluation, in the case of the additional evaluation report, is the average of all received complete evaluations.

The DGS project application is evaluated according to the evaluation criteria approved by the DGS Expert Panel.

Each criterion can take values in the range of 0-5 points, and the award of 0 points to any of the criteria is a sign of non-compliance with the criterion and leads to the exclusion of the project application from the competition. Failure to meet the criterion must be duly justified by the evaluator by means of a narrative commentary.

The award of points in the range 1-5 for each of the criteria, according to the evaluator's assessment, proves the fulfilment of the criterion and the number of points awarded must be justified in writing as a narrative commentary for each criterion written by the evaluator.

The project can achieve a maximum of 50 points in the evaluation report; the limit for granting support is 30 points. Based on the points awarded in the evaluation reports, a list of projects recommended for funding will be compiled. The final decision on the allocation of funds will be made by the Expert Panel. Projects which achieve the required number of points will be supported based on their acquired points (highest to lowest) until the exhaustion of funds allocated to this first DGS call, i.e. CZK 40 249 440.

The decision of the Expert Panel on selected student grants supported under the DGS will be implemented by 15th February of the year of the grant provision. The Expert Panel is obliged to prepare a report of the evaluation of DGS project proposals and determine their order. This will include a clear and transparent evaluation of DGS project proposals and the signatures of at least an absolute majority of all members of the Expert Panel. Evaluation reports will be made available in an anonymised form to student grant applicants via the VSB-TUO Grant Competition information system (<https://grantovesouteze.vsb.cz/>). The Vice-Rector for Science and Research is responsible for publishing the results of the supported projects.

Quality of the student project:	Points
<p>1. Compliance with the goals of the VSB-TUO Doctoral Grant Competition</p> <p>Comments: The evaluator will assess the compliance of the content of the project application with the objectives of the Doctoral Grant Competition. The DGS objectives are defined in Article 4 of the DGS Regulations.</p> <p><i>0 points – The project proposal did not meet the criteria, which is the reason for excluding the project proposal from the DGS competition.</i></p> <p><i>1 point – The project proposal has very serious shortcomings, the objectives of the project proposal are partially in line with the DGS objectives</i></p> <p><i>2 points – The project proposal is partially in line with the DGS objectives.</i></p> <p><i>3 points – The project proposal is in line with the DGS objectives, but the fulfilment of the DGS objectives is not sufficiently clear from the proposal.</i></p>	0-5

	<p>4 points - The project proposal is in line with the DGS objectives.</p> <p>5 points – The project proposal is fully in line with the DGS objectives and fulfils all the defined DGS objectives.</p>	
2.	<p>Originality, scientific significance, , project potential - knowledge of the subject matter (state-of-the-art)</p> <p>Comments: The evaluator will assess the extent to which the applicant has demonstrated state-of-the-art knowledge in the field of the issues addressed, the extent to which the issues addressed by the project proposal are original, current and prospective.</p> <p><i>0 point – This part of the project proposal shows very serious shortcomings; the applicant has not demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter; the applicant has not demonstrated the originality, or the current and prospective nature of the topic. This part of the project proposal did not meet the criterion, which is the reason for excluding the project proposal from the DGS competition.</i></p> <p><i>1 point – This part of the project proposal has serious shortcomings; the applicant has demonstrated a low level of knowledge of the subject matter, low originality, relevance and prospective nature of the topic.</i></p> <p><i>2 points – The project proposal has shortcomings; the applicant has demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter, originality, and the current and prospective nature of the topic only briefly.</i></p> <p><i>3 points – This part of the project proposal contains several minor shortcomings; the applicant has demonstrated the knowledge of the subject matter, originality, relevance and prospective nature of the topic sufficiently.</i></p> <p><i>4 points - The project proposal contains all the necessary information; the applicant has demonstrated good knowledge of the subject matter, originality, and the current and prospective nature of the topic.</i></p> <p><i>5 points – This part of the project proposal is elaborated very well; the applicant has demonstrated excellent knowledge of the subject matter, originality, and the current and prospective nature of the topic.</i></p>	0-5
3.	<p>Project proposal elaboration (technical aspect, language level)</p> <p>Comments: The evaluator will assess the quality of the design process from a technical point of view, the language level of the project proposal, whether all the necessary information for the project assessment is included.</p> <p><i>0 points – The project proposal is below average, shows very serious shortcomings, the language level of the project proposal is very weak, the individual parts of the project proposal are not sufficiently described, or are completely missing. The project proposal did not meet the criterion, which is the reason for excluding the project proposal from the DGS competition.</i></p> <p><i>1 point – The project proposal has serious shortcomings, the language level of the project proposal is weak, the individual parts of the proposal are not sufficiently described, or they lack proper justification.</i></p> <p><i>2 points - The project proposal has shortcomings, the language level of the project proposal is average, the individual parts of the proposal are briefly presented without proper justification.</i></p>	0-5

	<p>3 points – Average project proposal containing shortcomings, the language level of the project proposal is average, individual parts of the proposal are sufficiently described and justified.</p> <p>4 points - The project proposal is well prepared, it contains all the necessary information, the language level of the project proposal is very good, the individual parts of the proposal are well described and justified.</p> <p>5 points – The project proposal is written very well; it contains all the necessary information, the language level of the project proposal is very good, the individual parts of the proposal are fully described and justified.</p>	
4.	<p>Concept, methodology and work schedule</p> <p>Comments: The evaluator will assess the overall concept of the project, the suitability of the chosen methodology and procedures for solving the project, the adequacy of the work schedule, the logical sequence of individual stages of the project and their connection with project outputs, the ability to meet planned outputs and goals in the selected work schedule.</p> <p>0 points – The project proposal is below average; it shows very serious shortcomings, the project concept is not set properly, the description of the methodology and time schedule is missing. The logical sequence of procedures and the interconnection of the individual stages of the project with the outputs are missing. The project proposal did not meet the criterion, which is the reason for excluding the project proposal from the DGS competition.</p> <p>1 point – The project proposal has serious shortcomings; the design concept is not well developed; the methodology and time schedule are insufficiently planned. The sequence of the procedure is not logical; the results are not linked to the individual stages of the project proposal.</p> <p>2 points - The project proposal has shortcomings; the design concept is developed; the methodology and time schedule are planned. However, the individual activities do not follow each other logically and the results are not linked to the individual stages of the project proposal.</p> <p>3 points - Average project proposal containing shortcomings, the design concept is elaborated, the methodology and time schedule are elaborated, the individual activities follow each other logically, the results are linked to the individual stages of the project proposal.</p> <p>4 points - The project proposal is well written, it contains all the necessary information, the design concept is developed very well, the methodology and time schedule are planned in detail, the individual activities follow each other logically, the results are linked to the various stages of the project proposal.</p> <p>5 points – The project proposal is written very well, it contains all the necessary information, the design concept is developed very well, the methodology and time schedule are elaborated in detail, the individual activities follow each other logically, the results are clearly linked to the various stages of the project proposal.</p>	0-5
5.	<p>Project goals and proposed outputs</p> <p>Comments: The evaluator will assess the selected objectives of the project, their connection with the planned outputs, the adequacy of the outputs, the potential to achieve the planned outputs.</p>	0-5

	<p><i>0 points – The objectives of the project proposal are very vaguely defined, the planned outputs are not in accordance with the defined objectives of the project proposal, the planned outputs are not in accordance with the DGS Regulations, the project does not have sufficient potential to obtain quality outputs. The project proposal did not meet the criterion, which is the reason for excluding the project proposal from the DGS competition.</i></p> <p><i>1 point – The objectives of the project are vaguely defined, the planned outputs are partially in line with the defined objectives of the project proposal, the planned outputs are not fully in line with the DGS Regulations, the project has low potential for quality outputs.</i></p> <p><i>2 points - The objectives of the project are defined, the planned outputs are not in accordance with the defined objectives of the project proposal, the planned outputs are not in accordance with the DGS Regulations, the project has some potential for obtaining quality outputs.</i></p> <p><i>3 points – The objectives of the project are defined, the planned outputs are in accordance with the defined objectives of the project proposal, the planned outputs are in accordance with the DGS Regulations, the project has an average potential for obtaining quality outputs.</i></p> <p><i>4 points - – The objectives of the project are defined, the planned outputs are in accordance with the defined objectives of the project proposal, the planned outputs are in accordance with the DGS Regulations, the project has an above average potential for obtaining quality outputs.</i></p> <p><i>5 points – The objectives of the project are clearly defined, the planned outputs are in accordance with the defined objectives of the project proposal, the planned outputs are in accordance with the DGS Regulations, the project has a high potential for obtaining quality outputs.</i></p>	
6.	<p>The intensity of international cooperation and the level of multidisciplinary collaboration Comments: The evaluator will assess the planned intensity of international cooperation, the contribution of this cooperation to the project investigation and to the project researchers. The multidisciplinary character of the project, the intersection of the topic within more disciplines is also evaluated.</p> <p><i>0 points – The applicant does not plan international cooperation or participation in an international event, such as a conference. The project proposal does not show a multidisciplinary character. The project proposal did not meet the criterion, which is the reason for excluding the project proposal from the DGS competition.</i></p> <p><i>1 point – The applicant does not plan international cooperation and is only planning participation in an international event, e.g. conference. The project proposal does not show a multidisciplinary character.</i></p> <p><i>2 points – The applicant plans international cooperation which is not very important for the solution of the project, and is planning to participate in an international event, e.g. conference. The project proposal does not show a multidisciplinary character.</i></p> <p><i>3 points – The applicant plans international cooperation, and is planning active participation in international events, e.g. conferences. The project proposal shows a multidisciplinary character.</i></p>	0-5

	<p>4 points - The applicant plans active international cooperation relevant to the project, and is planning active participation in international events, e.g. conferences. The project proposal shows a multidisciplinary character.</p> <p>5 points – The applicant plans active international cooperation, which is crucial for the project investigation, and is planning active participation in international events, e.g. conferences. The project proposal shows a significant degree of multidisciplinary character.</p>	
7.	<p>The expected contribution of the project for R&D&I</p> <p>Comments: The evaluator will assess the contribution of the project proposal to R&D&I.</p> <p>0 points – The applicant has not demonstrated the contribution of the project proposal. The project proposal did not meet the criterion, which is the reason for excluding the project proposal from the DGS competition.</p> <p>1 point – Contribution of low significance.</p> <p>2 points - Less than average contribution.</p> <p>3 points – Average contribution (generally of national importance).</p> <p>4 points - More than average contribution.</p> <p>5 points – Significant contribution (of international importance).</p>	0-5
Quality of the individual/principal investigator and the research team		
8.	<p>The individual researcher/principal investigator, the research team</p> <p>Comments: The evaluator will assess the assumptions of the principal investigator and the research team to meet the project objectives and planned outputs. The evaluation will also take into account the mentor(s). The bonus for a team with more than one member (up to a maximum of 5 points) is evaluated as follows: +1 point for a team with three members, +2 points for a team with four or five members.</p> <p>0 points – The individual researcher/principal investigator, the research team does not have the prerequisites to meet the goals and planned outputs. The mentor is not a guarantee of achieving goals and planned outcomes. The project proposal did not meet the criterion, which is the reason for excluding the project proposal from the DGS competition.</p> <p>1 point – The individual researcher/principal investigator, the research team have weak preconditions for meeting the goals and planned outputs. The mentor is a weaker guarantee of achieving the goals and planned outputs.</p> <p>2 points - The individual researcher/principal investigator, the research team have average prerequisites for meeting the goals and planned outputs. The mentor is a guarantee of achieving the goals and planned outputs.</p> <p>3 points - The individual researcher/principal investigator, the research team have above-average prerequisites for meeting the goals and planned outputs. The mentor is a reliable guarantee of achieving the goals and planned outputs.</p>	0-5
9.	<p>The readiness of the applicant(s) to solve the project (assurance of infrastructure for the project)</p>	0-5

	<p>Comments: The evaluator will assess the readiness of the applicant and the workplace where the project will be solved in terms of equipment and provision of infrastructure for the project.</p> <p><i>0 points – The applicant’s workplace, including cooperating departments or institutions, does not have an assurance of infrastructure; the applicant is not ready to solve the project. The project proposal did not meet the criteria, which is a reason to exclude the project from the DGS competition.</i></p> <p><i>1 point – The applicant’s workplaces, including cooperating departments or institutions, have insufficient infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>2 points - The applicant’s workplace has the necessary infrastructure, through their own workplace or cooperating departments or institutions.</i></p> <p><i>3 points – The applicant's workplace, including cooperating departments or institutions, have sufficient infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>4 points - The applicant’s workplace has a fully functioning infrastructure, through its own workplace or cooperating departments or institutions.</i></p> <p><i>5 points – The applicant’s workplace, including cooperating departments or institutions, have a fully functioning state-of-the-art infrastructure.</i></p>	
--	--	--

Justification of financial costs

10.	<p>Justification of financial costs, their adequacy, and the economics</p> <p>Comments: The evaluator will assess the breakdown of financial costs, justification of individual items, their cost-effective and efficient use.</p> <p><i>0 points – Financial costs are not well distributed; they are not sufficiently justified; their economics and efficient use are not clear. The project proposal did not meet the criterion and is the reason for excluding the project proposal from the DGS competition.</i></p> <p><i>1 point – Financial costs are allocated; they are not sufficiently justified, their cost-effectiveness and efficient use are not evident.</i></p> <p><i>2 points - Financial costs are allocated; they are briefly justified; their cost-effectiveness and efficient use are not evident.</i></p> <p><i>3 points - Financial costs are allocated; they are justified; their cost-effectiveness and efficient use are evident.</i></p> <p><i>4 points - Financial costs are allocated, appropriately justified and their cost-effectiveness and efficient use are evident.5 points - Financial costs are clearly allocated ; they are justified in detail; theircost-effectiveness and efficient use are completely obvious.</i></p>	0-5
-----	---	-----

The final opinion of the opponent

Strengths of the project:

The evaluator will briefly evaluate the strengths of the project.

Weaknesses of the project:

The evaluator will briefly evaluate the weaknesses of the project.

Opinion on the allocation of support:

The evaluator will express his/her opinion on the allocation of support: I recommend/do not recommend the project for funding.