

## Methodology for Assessment, Control and Evaluation of Grants

### Part 1: Evaluation process, control and final evaluation

#### 1. Submission of grant applications

- a. TBU accepts grant applications in accordance with the announcement of the internal grant competition entitled “TBU JUNG”, to be announced by the Rector. After the competition has been announced, the Rector will contact senior executives of the relevant component parts and ask them to submit nominations for members of the Evaluation Panels and of the Board.
- b. The project application must be processed and submitted exclusively in electronic form via the relevant web interface, and that entirely in English.

#### 2. Check of formal accuracy and completeness of the application

- a. A check of formal accuracy and completeness is carried out in order to discard all applications that are incomplete and do not meet the formal criteria laid down.
- b. The following parameters of formal accuracy and completeness of applications shall be assessed:
  - i. The project including all appendices has been completely written in English.
  - ii. All required appendices are attached, and all appendices have been submitted in the required form.
  - iii. All mandatory data have been entered.
  - iv. The project is kept within the financial limits set in the budget.
- c. The employee holding the post of the administrator of the competition shall do the required checking. The Competition Administrator shall also check as to whether there is a duplication of the project’s topic, i.e. a similarity to the topic of a doctoral thesis (by comparing the annotation of the project and detailed information on the assigned topic of the doctoral thesis). A well-arranged list of applications indicating those that do not meet the formal criteria defined above shall be submitted for consideration to the Evaluation Panel.

#### 3. Meetings of the Evaluation Panel, selection of reviewers

- a. The Evaluation Panel shall discuss the outcome of the formal inspection carried out by the Competition Administrator, decide on the elimination of applications for formal reasons, and submit a list of applications that will be subject to a factual evaluation.
- b. Assessment of the content and of factual aspects of each project application shall always be carried out separately and independently by 2 reviewers, with one of them being an external employee, i.e. a person who has no employment-law relation with TBU (except for any labour-law relation established exclusively for the purposes of project assessment).
- c. Reviewers shall be selected by the relevant Evaluation Panel to which the application has been assigned. Reviewers are selected from the reviewers' database. The selected reviewer must be included in the FORD database in a field of research and development identical to topic of the project application assigned. At the same time, a substitute reviewer shall be appointed in the event that the reviewer approached refuses to write the required review.
- d. In the event that no reviewer can be selected according to the above-mentioned criteria, the reviewer will be selected in accordance with the relevant decision taken by the Evaluation Panel.
- e. Minutes of meetings of the Evaluation Panel shall be kept, which must contain at least the following information: Date and time of the start of the meeting, list of attendees’ names, an overview of project applications that have advanced to the evaluation stage and an overview of discarded applications, incl. the reasons for their elimination. Reviewers proposed for applications that have advanced to the evaluation stage shall be listed. The Minutes shall be kept by the Competition Administrator and signed by the Chairperson of the Evaluation Panel.

#### 4. Application evaluation process (Reviews written by reviewers)

- a. Communication with reviewers shall be ensured by the Competition Administrator.



- b. The evaluation table available in the system shall be used to carry out the assessment of an application. Access to the system will be provided for reviewers by the Competition Administrator in cooperation with the Information Technology Centre of TBU.
- c. Reviewers have to write a review within the period of 7 working days.
- d. Reviewers are obliged to assess the application solely according to the criteria laid down in Part 2 of this document, namely using the criteria No. 1-7. For each criterion, a reviewer is, in addition to a point score, required to state the grounds for the assessment provided. The point score is given by the sum of the points earned during the assessment according to the individual criteria.
- e. The result of an assessment of a project application is the arithmetic mean of point scores given by both reviewers. The full assessment carried out by both reviewers shall be discussed by the relevant Evaluation Panel, which shall/shall not recommend the grant applications for funding on the basis of the assessments carried out.
- f. If assessments given by both reviewers differ significantly (one reviewer recommends the project, the other does not recommend the project for funding), the Chairperson of the Evaluation Panel shall appoint the so-called arbitrator of the project application. The arbitrator is usually one of the members of the relevant Evaluation Panel. The arbitrator shall carry out a new assessment of the project application. When assessing the project, the arbitrator has the previous two assessment carried out by both reviewers at his/her disposal. The point score given by the arbitrator according to each criterion must be within the range set by the two previous reviewers. The result is an evaluation table prepared by the arbitrator, who assesses the individual criteria on the basis of the reviews provided by both reviewers and on the basis of his/her own assessment.

**5. Criteria for expert assessment of a project application**

- a. A detailed specification of the basic criteria is provided in Part 2 of this document. A general overview is given in the table below. The minimum number of points required to receive financial support is 59 points from the reviewers or 66 points obtained after the evaluation by the Board, provided that the minimum threshold has been met for all criteria. If the threshold value has not been met in one or more criteria, the project application will not be recommended for funding.

	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Assessor</b>	<b>Maximum number of points</b>	<b>Minimum threshold value</b>
1.	Originality and scientific importance of the project	Reviewer	20	15
2.	Topical relevance and usefulness of the project	Reviewer	20	15
3.	Expected benefit of the project, applicability of results	Reviewer	10	5
4.	Preparation of the project proposal and aims of the implementation	Reviewer	10	5
5.	Competence of the research team incl. mentors	Reviewer	10	5
6.	Concept, methodology, time schedule of work	Reviewer	10	7
7.	Level of adequacy and substantiation of the funding required	Reviewer	10	7
		<b>Total of points given by the reviewer</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>59</b>
8.	Fulfilment of the concept of interfaculty	TBU JUNG Board	10	7

	cooperation			
		<b>Total number of points</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>66</b>

## 6. Evaluation Panels

- a. Two Evaluation Panels have been set up in order to ensure the organization of the competition:
  - i. A. Natural Sciences, Engineering and Technology, Agricultural and Veterinary Sciences (composed of representatives of the FAI, FT, UNI, FHS and FLCM, one person appointed per component part).
  - ii. B. Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (composed of representatives of the FHS, FMC, FaME, FLCM and FAI, one person appointed per component part).
- b. A member of the Evaluation Panels representing the relevant component part shall be nominated by a senior executive of the same component part.
- c. Meetings of the Evaluation Panel are organized by the Competition Administrator.
- d. The Chairperson of the Evaluation Panel is elected for the currently announced competition at the beginning of the first meeting of the Panel. Any of the members of the Evaluation Panel who receives votes from an absolute majority of all members of the Evaluation Panel shall be elected the Chairperson.
- e. Decisions to be made by the Evaluation Panel shall be taken by consensus or with the consent of an absolute majority of the persons present. In the event of an equality of votes, the vote of the Chairperson of the Evaluation Panel shall be decisive.

## 7. Meetings of the Evaluation Panel – assessment of reviews and of project applications

- a. In case of acceptance of the quality of reviews written by reviewers, the Evaluation Panel shall respect the results of reviews according to the individual criteria for the relevant project applications written by reviewers in the previous evaluation stage.
- b. In accordance with the assessment provided by the reviewers, the Evaluation Panel is entitled to propose an adjustment to financial requirements listed in the project applications; when doing so, the Panel is not allowed to reduce personnel expenses below the limit of CZK 4,667 for a workload corresponding to 0.1/month.
- c. The Evaluation Panel checks the quality of reviews written by reviewers and is entitled to order the elaboration of a new review if the review available is of poor quality and shows serious or very serious deficiencies. A review shall be assessed according to the following table:

	Assessment criteria applied in a review
The review is acceptable.	The assessment shows no deficiencies, it objectively assesses the grant application in accordance with the rules of the grant competition. It may occur that the assessment shows only minor deficiencies which do not affect the objectivity of the overall assessment (e.g. some comments are more concise). Or the assessment has been carried out at an average level and shows several minor deficiencies (e.g. some irrelevant comments or an insufficient statement of reasons).
The review is not acceptable, a new review must be written.	The assessment shows serious deficiencies (inadequate, insufficient statement of reasons for the number of points awarded, missing comments, copied or non-relevant comments, missing assessment of the financial aspect of the project, failure to comply with the conditions set out in the rules of the grant competition), or the assessment shows minor deficiencies relating to a high number of criteria. The assessment shows a discrepancy in the individual criteria between the number of points awarded and the comment. Or the assessment shows very serious deficiencies (e.g. the overall verdict does not correspond to the number of points awarded) or other serious deficiencies (irrelevant comments, proposed adjustments in contradiction to the rules of the grant

	competition, missing assessment of the financial aspect of the project) occur in most criteria.)
--	--

- d. In the event that the elaboration of a new review has been ordered, the upcoming meeting of the Panel shall be postponed until a new review has been elaborated.
- e. The Evaluation Panel shall, on the basis of the assessment made by the reviewers, draw up a ranking list of the projects according to the number of points awarded, and forward the list to the Board.
- f. Minutes of meetings of the Evaluation Panel shall be kept, which must contain at least the following information: Date and time of the start of the meeting, list of attendees' names, an overview of projects under assessment and the point scores assigned. The Minutes shall be kept by the Competition Administrator and signed by the Chairperson of the Evaluation Panel.

## 8. TBU JUNG Board

- a. The Board is made up of eight members: Vice-Rector for Quality Management, one representative of the University Institute (hereinafter referred to as "UNI") and one representative of each of the six Faculties. The representatives of the Faculties and of the UNI are usually Vice-Deans or employees authorized by a senior executive at the relevant component part.
- b. The Chairperson of the Board is the Vice-Rector for Quality Management or a person appointed by the Vice-Rector for Quality Management.
- c. Decisions to be made by the Board shall be taken by consensus or with the consent of an absolute majority of persons present. In the event of an equality of votes, the vote of the Chairperson of the Board shall be decisive.
- d. The Board respects the results of the assessment of projects carried out in previous evaluation stages (the Board is not allowed to interfere in an already completed check of formalities and in factual evaluation).
- e. The Board awards points for the fulfilment of the criterion "Fulfilment of the concept of interfaculty cooperation"; this assessment shall be added to the total point score which the application was awarded within reviews written by project reviewers.
- f. In compliance with a previous assessment, the Board may formulate reservations concerning the projects recommended for funding.
- g. The Board is entitled to propose a modification to the amount of funding required in project applications; personnel expenses must not be lower than CZK 4,667 for a workload corresponding to 0.1/month.
- h. The Board shall decide as to whether a project will/will not be recommended for funding.
- i. The project assessed as the best by each of the Evaluation Panels shall be recommended for funding. The remaining project applications assessed by both Evaluation Panels shall be ranked together according to their point score and recommended for funding depending on their rank until the limit set within the OP RDE project TBU JUNG is reached.
- j. In case of equality of points, the ranking is to be determined by lot.
- k. In the event that the allocation is not exhausted in the first round, and, however, the first rejected project (i.e. the first project for which the remaining funding not allocated yet is insufficient) contains funding required in such an amount that exceeds the remaining funding to be allocated, the Board is entitled to propose modifications to the financial amount required for the said project in such a manner that the project in question fits into the allocation scheme, and that even if the reviews written by project reviewers did not propose a curtailment of financial resources (and that in accordance with Clause 8g). If the research team agrees to such modification, the project will be recommended for funding. If the research team does not agree to this modification, this option shall be offered to other projects rejected, and that successively, according to their rank, depending on the amount of points achieved.

- l. A list of projects shall also be created, containing projects that have obtained the minimum number of points required to be allocated funding, however, the remaining funding not allocated yet was insufficient.
- m. In the event that the funding to be allocated is not exhausted in the first round of the competition due to an insufficient number of projects recommended for funding, the Board is entitled to propose to the Rector that another round of the competition is organized. In this additionally organized round, the requirements to be met within the competition may be modified (e.g. number of other investigators and their workloads, length of project implementation, etc.).
- n. The Board shall always give reasons for its decisions and opinions in such a manner as to make it clear what the reason was for taking the relevant decision.
- o. Minutes of meetings of the Board shall be kept, which must contain at least the following information: Date and time of the start of the meeting, list of attendees' names, an overview of project applications to be assessed, the average point score obtained, funding allocated, a list of projects recommended for funding. The Minutes shall be kept by the Competition Administrator and signed by the Chairperson of the Board.
- p. The Board draws up a list of projects recommended for funding and submits the list to the Rector.

#### **9. TBU Rector, decision on grant allocation**

- a. Following a proposal by the Board, TBU Rector shall decide on the allocation of grant funds to the projects recommended for funding, and that by means of an announcement posted on the website of TBU.
- b. In the event that a project has been classified as supported (funded) but its funding has been curtailed, the research team may, within 3 days of the issuance of the relevant decision, withdraw from the competition. In such a case, the next project included in the list of projects not eligible for funding shall be supported, according to number of points awarded, i.e. according to the ranking in the list.

#### **10. Lodging of appeals in the course of assessment of project applications**

- a. Lodging of appeals is not allowed in the course of assessment of project applications.

#### **11. Progress inspection of the implementation of projects**

- a. Each investigator is obliged to prepare a Monthly Activity Report in electronic form each month, according to the template available in the system.
- b. The professional aspect of this Monthly Activity Report shall be approved by the relevant mentor, the formal aspect shall be checked by the Competition Administrator.
- c. Twice a year, a presentation of the current state of the implementation of the project and of its outputs and aims shall be held in front of the Evaluation Panel, including a control of the use of financial resources allocated.
- d. Meetings of Evaluation Panel shall be organized by the Competition Administrator.
- e. During this progress inspection, projects are assessed by the Evaluation Panel as follows: Approved, Approved with Reservations, Unsatisfactory. The Evaluation Panel shall submit its opinion to the Board.
- f. Projects assessed as "Approved with Reservations" or "Unsatisfactory" by the Evaluation Panel shall be discussed by the Board. The JUNG Board shall submit a final proposal of the assessment of all projects to the Rector.
- g. In the event that the Board confirms the assessment as "Unsatisfactory" due to an insufficient activity of the mentor during the organization of the fulfilment of the scientific aims set for the project or for the project's financial management, then the mentor in question shall be excluded from participation in all internal grant competition during a period of two years.
- h. In accordance with the relevant proposal by the Board, the Rector is entitled to dismiss a project mentor and appoint a new mentor.

#### **12. Final assessment of projects**

- a. After the project has been terminated, the research team shall submit a final report on the

activities according to the template available in the system.

- b. After submitting the Final Activity Report, a presentation of the project results shall be held in front of the Evaluation Panel, that shall assess the professional aspect of the project and the degree of fulfilment of the aims and outputs required. The Competition Administrator shall check the formalities of the project (e.g. whether the final report has been correctly and entirely completed). In case of formal deficiencies, the final report shall be referred back to the investigators for completion.
- c. In case of a failure to fulfil the project outputs, the costs for the last month of implementation of the project shall be considered non-eligible. These non-eligible expenses shall be charged to the debit of the component part which the principal investigator is affiliated with.
- d. In case of a failure to defend the project results caused by an error made by an investigator, the investigator shall not be allowed to participate in the next editions of the competition for a period of no less than two years.

### **13. Impartiality, confidentiality, conflict of interest**

- a. All information related to the project evaluation process and to the content of the projects under assessment is confidential. A reviewer as well as a member of the Evaluation Panel/Board is obliged to maintain complete confidentiality towards all entities/persons except those responsible for controlling the project evaluation process; moreover, all members are obliged to ensure the indisputability of the entire evaluation process. Any doubts about a breach of this rule shall be investigated and may result in the termination of cooperation with the relevant reviewer/member of the Panel/member of the Board.
- b. All reviewers, members of the Panel/Board must sign a statutory declaration of confidentiality, independence, impartiality and objectivity, and that before the assessment begins. This statutory declaration is deemed signed if a reviewer/member of the Board/member of the Panel, after logging in to the system where the aforementioned person is unambiguously identified, ticks the consent to this Statutory Declaration in the system.
- c. *Wording of the Statutory Declaration: By signing, I confirm that I have assessed the project objectively and impartially, using all my knowledge. My assessment has not been affected by any form of benefits for me resulting from the results of the assessment. I declare that I am not dependent on the investigator, I am not his/her partner nor am I in any contractual relation with him/her. I was not involved in the preparation of this project and, if the project receives funding, I will not participate in its implementation. I undertake to maintain confidentiality of all data and facts that I was acquainted with during the evaluation process.*
- d. In the event that a reviewer fails to meet this obligation, he/she will not be paid the remuneration for the assessment carried out.
- e. Any reviewer who is at risk of a conflict of interest as a result of a connection with the investigator must notify the Competition Administrator of this fact without delay and immediately withdraw from the evaluation process. It is the responsibility of each reviewer to consider whether his/her possible current or past cooperation with the investigator brings about a conflict of interest as specified in the declaration signed, i.e. whether his/her impartiality is indisputable. The reviewer/arbitrator must approach the project under assessment objectively and impartially, using all their proficiency and knowledge, and, if required, using publicly available information. By no means is the reviewer/arbitrator allowed to contact the investigator in the course of the evaluation process, and that not even if in need of additional information or explanation of data entered in the project application.
- f. If a member of the Panel/Board finds out that he/she is linked to or connected with the projects under assessment which could affect his/her impartiality in the assessment of the project, the member shall inform the Chairperson of the Panel/ Board about this fact, including the reasoning, before the start of the relevant meeting. A member of the Panel/Board with a conflict of interest shall not participate in the discussion concerning the given project, i.e. the member shall leave

the conference room for the duration of the discussion or refuse to participate in the relevant meeting of the Panel/Board. Each of the members of the Panel/Board is obliged to consider a conflict of interest, while taking into account the possibility of challenging of impartiality throughout the entire approval process. A conflict of interest shall be identified both in labour-law relations as well as at the level of personal interests (e.g. a family member of the investigator). The Competition Administrator shall supervise the observance of non-bias rules by a member of the Panel/Board; the Competition Administrator has the power to exclude a member of the Panel/Board from a meeting where the relevant project will be discussed, if it has been proven that the member has a bias.

**14. Form of meetings of the Evaluation Panels and of the Board**

- a. Meetings are held in a standard manner on the premises of TBU. If circumstances do not allow it (e.g. due to a bad epidemiological situation), the meetings can be held online, e.g. using the MS Teams tool.

**Part 2: Project assessment criteria and the evaluation thereof**

Number of points	Assessment criterion (maximum number of points)(threshold value)/description of the evaluation according to the criterion
<b>1. Originality and scientific importance of the project (maximum number of points: 20)(15)</b>	
20-18	The project contains original principles of novelty, it is focused on acquiring new knowledge, it has an obvious novelty value compared to the current level of knowledge, it is aimed at the formulation of conclusions not yet applied or reinterprets results in a new manner.
17-15	The project shows the principles of a continuous scientific activity and is aimed at gaining new knowledge. The degree of novelty compared to the current level of knowledge is visible.
14-1	The degree of novelty of the project under assessment is unclear compared to the current level of knowledge.
0	The topic focused on within the project is dealt with in a routine and generally known manner, it does not extend the current state of knowledge in any way.
<b>2. Topical relevance and usefulness of the project (maximum number of points: 20)(15)</b>	
20-18	The project responds to current or future economic and societal needs and issues, the results of the project can have a practical impact, there is a prerequisite for a future development of the given topic and a potential continuation of the project within follow-up projects implemented by external providers on the national and international level. The usefulness of the project is persuasively evidenced.
17-15	The project responds to current or future economic and social needs and issues, the usefulness of the project is evidenced.
14-1	The usefulness of outputs of the project implementation is formulated in a general and vague manner.
0	The main topic of the project is completely out of date, its impact outside the project as such is negligible.
<b>3. Expected benefit of the project, applicability of results (maximum number of points: 10)(5)</b>	
10-9	The benefits are clearly and concretely formulated, they follow the long-term trends in the field and further develop them, significantly improving the current level of knowledge. The investigators described the method of applying the expected outputs/results understandably, providing sufficient information.

8-5	The benefits are concretely formulated and develop the knowledge in the relevant field only partially. The description of the method of applying outputs/results is rather general.
4-1	The benefits include marginal issues of the relevant field, they are insignificant for the development of the field, or merely confirm facts already known. The applicability of the results is problematic.
0	The benefits are not clearly and concretely formulated, they are not convincing, the applicability of results is unclear or not described at all.
<b>4. Preparation of the project proposal and aims of the implementation (maximum number of points: 10)(5)</b>	
10-9	In terms of formal requirements, the project has been carefully prepared, the texts are understandable, the text is free from obvious grammatical and stylistic errors, the aims of the project implementation are described in concrete terms, briefly and unambiguously.
8-5	In terms of formal requirements, the project has been prepared at a very good level, however, sometimes there are errors or typos, the texts are understandable, the aims of the project implementation are described in concrete terms, briefly and unambiguously.
4-1	The project has deficiencies as regards the formal requirements, the texts contain unclear wording and/or the aims of the implementation are described ambiguously.
0	The project is unprepared as regards the formal requirements, the texts are unclear and confusing, the English language used is incomprehensible and/or the description of the aims of the implementation is wholly insufficient or non-existent.
<b>5. Competence of the research team incl. mentors (maximum number of points: 10)(5)</b>	
10-9	The proposed research team shows a high level of competence necessary in order to meet the aims defined. The project mentor/mentors have experience in the successful management of project funded by external providers on the national or international level. The research team is well-balanced and the gender representation (which is not strictly required) among the members of the research team is also taken into account. Team members have experience in the implementation of external R&D projects.
8-5	The proposed research team shows a high level of competence necessary in order to meet the aims defined. The mentor/mentors of the project have experience in the successful management of project funded by external providers. The research team is well-balanced and the gender representation (which is not strictly required) among the members of the research team is also taken into account.
4-1	The ability of the proposed research team to implement the project to the extent specified is unclear. The mentor/mentors are short of experience related to a successful implementation of external projects.
0	The composition of the research team is not adequate to ensure a successful achievement of the aims of the project proposed.
<b>6. Concept, methodology, time schedule of work (maximum number of points: 10)(7)</b>	
10-9	The concept and methodology proposed produce new approaches, and, where appropriate, create new trends as well; it is very real that the aims of the project implementation will be achieved. The investigators have a clear idea of the progress of the work; the time schedule of work is set appropriately, and there is



	a high probability of fulfilment of the individual sub-stages.
8-7	Implementation strategies, concepts and processes are usually used at present, thus, the achievement of the goals set is feasible. The time period of the implementation is adequate; however, the breakdown into sub-stages is not optimal.
6-1	Implementation strategies, concepts and processes make it difficult to achieve the goals set, the sub-goals and the projected results are difficult to achieve in the proposed time schedule of work.
0	Implementation strategies, concepts and processes are not clearly and explicitly formulated; sub-goals and the expected results do not correspond to the proposed time schedule of work.
<b>7. Level of adequacy and substantiation of the funding required (maximum number of points: 10)(7)</b>	
10-9	The funding required is adequate and well reasoned in terms of amount and structure, providing the prerequisites for a cost-efficient organization of the implementation planned. Sufficient substantiation and quantification of the individual items of the project budget is provided.
8-7	While the total funding required is adequate, the cost structure does not fully correspond to the implementation method, to material provision, staffing and to the aims planned.
6-1	The amount of the funding required is too high, or, on the contrary, too low, and/or insufficiently substantiated and insufficiently quantified.
0	Specification of the provision of funding is vaguely defined and insufficient for the implementation.
<b>8. Fulfilment of the concept of interfaculty cooperation (maximum number of points: 10)(7)</b>	
10-7	The contribution by each component part to a successful implementation of the project is clearly defined, the involvement of the component parts is a prerequisite for the fulfilment of the project aims.
6-1	The involvement of the given component parts is appropriate, but not sufficiently specified.
0	Rules for interfaculty cooperation show obvious signs of cooperation of convenience; the involvement of other investigators is entirely formal and not necessary for the achievement of the project results.

### **Part 3: Structure, description and extent of individual parts of the project application**

- 1. Name of the student project**
- 2. Fields of enquiry (FORD)**
- 3. Surname, first name and academic degrees obtained of the principal investigator and of other investigators**
- 4. Name of the component part and of the department which the principal investigator and other investigators are affiliated with**
- 5. Mentor/Mentors**
- 6. Budget**
- 7. Annotation**
- 8. Presentation of the project implementation**
- 9. Project framework**

- 9.1. Purpose of the project**
  - 9.1.1. Usefulness and topical relevance of the project**
  - 9.1.2. Possibilities of application of results**
  - 9.1.3. Critical prerequisites for achieving the purpose of the project**
- 9.2. Aims and results of the project**
  - 9.2.1. Aims of the project**
  - 9.2.2. Project results**
- 10. Implementation methodology and time schedule of work**
- 11. Financial support for the project**
- 12. Competence and experience of investigators and mentors**
- 13. Summary of educational goals of individual investigators**
- 14. Substantiation of the involvement of individual component parts in the project**
- 15. Appendices:**
  - 15.1. CVs of the principal investigator, of other investigators and mentors (in the Europass format) including an overview of R&D activities carried out previously**
  - 15.2. Names of and opinions given by the supervisor/s of the principal investigator and of other investigators**
  - 15.3. Statutory Declaration and Authorization by the Rector for the Project Investigator approved by the Dean of the Faculty/Head or Director of the component part and by the Secretary to the Faculty/Financial Manager of the component part**
  - 15.4. Statutory Declaration evidencing that the topic of the student project is not identical to the topic of a doctoral thesis or to the topic of a project currently implemented by the members of the given research team and funded by the IGA competition in compliance with Article 2, Clause 4.**
  - 15.5. Request for an assessment of research data by the TBU Ethics Committee in the event that the research carried out within the project affects in particular man as a human subject of personal data processing. The formalities of the application are laid down in the Rules of Procedure of the TBU Ethics Committee.**

Chapters 1-7 shall be entered directly into the web application, while **the main scientific part of the project (Chapters 8-14, highlighted in red) shall be processed and uploaded to the web application as a single pdf file.** The maximum number of pages in the file shall be 10, with a font size of 11.

## **Detailed information regarding the completion of a project application:**

### **1. Name of the student project**

Enter the full name, do not use abbreviations.

### **2. Fields of enquiry (FORD)**

In the code list, select the appropriate classification of your project into the relevant field of research and development. You can select multiple areas.

### **3. Surname, first name and academic degrees obtained of the principal investigator and of other investigators**

### **4. Name of the component part and of the department which the principal investigator and other investigators are affiliated with**

## 5. Mentors

Enter the surnames, first names and academic degrees obtained of mentors as well as the component part/department which they are affiliated with.

## 6. Budget

Enter main items of the budget in the following structure:

- Personnel costs related to investigators (to be calculated automatically depending on the percentage of their workload included in the implementation of the project)
- Other types of expenses:
  - o Personnel costs related to mentors
  - o Material expenses
  - o Travel expenses
  - o Services
  - o Other expenses
  - o Overhead costs

## 7. Annotation

In the annotation of the project, briefly describe the content of the project, its main idea and aims planned.

## 8. Presentation of the project implementation

In the part involving the project presentation, describe the basic principles of the project implementation within higher education research and substantiate the originality of the project compared to the current state of knowledge in the given field. In this part, project reviewers must be able to see what the project is about and what the actual implementation of the project consists in. In this part, you must persuade the project reviewers of the correctness of the proposed implementation method, its originality and professional level. Furthermore, provide a description of the facts which you consider important and which you want to inform about in the project proposal. Describe possible alternative methods which can be applied when dealing with the issue focused on in your project proposal. Describe similar solutions to the same issue known to you in the Czech Republic and abroad. Attach a list of sources consulted.

## 9. Project framework

A project framework is the method used for the elaboration of a basic, well-arranged description of the project and of its scope, which defines the key elements of the project (The description includes the mission of the project, the project plan, project aims and implementation stages and results of the project implementation.). Because of its generality and clarity, the project framework forms the basis for the basic decision on the future fate of the project. The project framework must give answers to the following questions:

- What is to be achieved/done within the implementation of the project,
- why the project is implemented,
- how the project is implemented,
- when project tasks are to be carried out,
- what are the critical prerequisites for the project implementation,
- what are the indicators of achieving the goals – the results expected.

The following breakdown shall be used as a guide to answering the questions:

## **9.1 Purpose of the project**

Describe the project purpose to whose fulfilment this project will contribute. The purpose of the project will be achieved by applying the specific results achieved through the implementation of this project, with the contribution by other results or activities, and that usually only after the termination of this project.

### **9.1.1 Usefulness and topical relevance of the project**

Give reasons why it is precisely your project that should be implemented and precisely at this time. Describe whether and how your project responds to current and anticipated future economic and societal needs and issues (e.g. to an increased economic performance, demographic development, etc.). Indicate why the project should be supported from public resources.

### **9.1.2 Possibilities of application of results**

Describe the possibilities of application of the results of the project or another type of use thereof. Describe also such types of applications which you do not plan to use but which are real. Describe the method (including the procedure to be followed) which you plan to use in order to apply the project results (projected use of the results).

### **9.1.3 Critical prerequisites for achieving the purpose of the project**

Critical prerequisites for achieving the purpose of the project indicate what prerequisites/requirements must be met in order to achieve the purpose of the project specified above. Describe or indicate what other projects or activities must also be carried out (and who will ensure the implementation of the required projects/activities) in order to achieve the stated purpose of the project together with this project. Describe how you can ensure that any risks of failing to complete the implementation of the project are minimized.

Furthermore, describe those critical prerequisites that you cannot influence, ensure, or which are outside your control.

## **9.2 Aims and results of the project**

### **9.2.1 Aims of the project**

The aim of the project shall exactly describe what you want to accomplish through the implementation of this project. The aim of the project is then a specific commitment of the project. The specific results of the project and the manner in which they are handed over and processed must correspond to the set and defined aim of the project. State clearly and unambiguously what is to be achieved through the implementation of this project and what knowledge/results will be obtained through the implementation of this project.

### **9.2.2 Project results**

State the expected results of the project. The results must be published within 1 year after the end of the implementation of the project, with a confirmation of acceptance of the output for publication/implementation deemed to be a fulfilment of the requirement.

Indicate what results of the project guarantee that the set aim of the project will be achieved (e.g. the number and type of publications). Here, the result is interpreted as an output assessable according to the currently valid Methodology issued by the Research, Development and Innovation Council of the Government of the Czech Republic.

*Note: Project reviewers/experts can use the content of this chapter in particular for the purpose of evaluating the expected benefits of the projected results of the project (i.e. assessment of the adequacy of expected benefits, outputs of the project implementation and probability of achieving the expected results).*

## **10 Implementation methodology and time schedule of work**

Here, describe the approach, selected methods and procedures which you will apply during the implementation of the project submitted to the programme providing support to specific higher education research. Describe the time schedule for the implementation of the project.

This methodology shall be used a methodological guideline for the implementation, to be used particularly by the project and research team; the methodology will be assessed by project reviewers/experts.

This part of the project proposal is intended to help you clarify the matter-of-fact way of dealing with the issue.

We recommend that you structure the description of the methods according to the individual implementation stages.

## **11 Financial support for the project**

Here, describe and substantiate each budget item in detail.

## **12 Competence and experience of investigators and mentors**

Here, describe the results previously achieved by the proposers and their experience with the implementation of scientific and research projects.

## **13 Summary of educational goals of individual investigators**

In this section, describe the educational goals of each project investigator, what new knowledge he/she wants to gain.

The final report of the project shall include an assessment of the level of fulfilment of the goals set (e.g. in the form of a self-evaluation).

## **14 Substantiation of the involvement of individual component parts in the project**

Here, describe why and in which manner other investigators from other component parts, excluding the component part which the principal investigator is affiliated with, are involved in the project.