

Criteria for Evaluating Proposals for Student Scientific Projects within Internal Grant Competition

When preparing a report, the reviewer should follow the below mentioned criteria. However, when evaluating individual criteria, the reviewer can take account of the nature of the scientific field of the proposed project, and if this is taken into account, it must clearly be justified in the report.

	Criterion	Maximum number of points
1)	Project objectives	5
2)	State of knowledge	4
3)	Methodology	5
4)	Project management	3
5)	Quality of outputs	5
6)	Quality of the team	4
7)	Budget	4
	Total	30

1) Project objectives

Points	Description
5	The project objectives correspond to current trends in in the field and develop knowledge at international level. The project addresses important little addressed issues in the field of project submission, or the project uses new scientific methods to address issues in the field.
4	The project objectives largely correspond to current trends in the field and develop knowledge at international level. The project addresses remaining issues in the field of project submission, or the project uses relatively new scientific methods to address issues in the field.
3	The project objectives only partly correspond to current trends in the field and develop knowledge at national level. The project addresses normally addressed issues or only locally relevant issues. The project uses established scientific methods.
2	The project objectives only little correspond to current trends in the field and contribution to knowledge is marginal. The project addresses normally addressed issues. The use of adequate scientific methods is not quite clear.
1	The project objectives do not correspond to current trends in the field and contribution to knowledge is unclear. The project addresses normally addressed issues or irrelevant issues. The use of adequate scientific methods is unclear.

2) State of knowledge

Points	Description
4	The applicant used the most recent sources from prestigious world journals and prestigious conferences in the field to prepare the project. The applicant is very well acquainted with the state of world knowledge in the respective field and is able to clearly formulate the contribution of the project to world knowledge on the basis thereof.
3	The applicant used more recent sources from good-quality world journals and prestigious conferences in the field to prepare the project, too. The applicant is well acquainted with the state of world knowledge in the respective field and is able to clearly formulate the contribution of the project to international knowledge on the basis thereof.
2	The applicant used sources from average journals in the field to prepare the project. The applicant is at least partially acquainted with the state of world knowledge in the respective field but is not able to clearly formulate the contribution of the project to international knowledge on the basis thereof.
1	The applicant used mainly national literature, and foreign literature only marginally, to prepare the project. The applicant is not sufficiently acquainted with the state of world knowledge in the respective field. The applicant's ability to formulate the contribution of the project is limited even at national level.

3) Project methodology

Points	Description
5	The research set, data collection methods as well as data analysis methods are described in detail. They are fully appropriate for research questions and project objectives. These are advanced or innovative methods that are currently appearing in prestigious world journals in the respective field.
4	The research set, data collection methods as well as data analysis methods are largely described in detail. No substantial part is missing. The methods correspond relatively well to research questions and project objectives. These are methods that appear in good-quality world peer-reviewed journals in the respective field.
3	The research set, data collection methods as well as data analysis methods are described. In general, they correspond to research questions and objectives of the project. These are methods, which allow publication in average peer-reviewed journals.
2	The research set, data collection methods as well as data analysis methods are described but either of these areas is described insufficiently. They partially correspond to research questions and project objectives but the insufficient description presents risks. These are methods that allow publication rather in lower than average peer-reviewed journals.
1	The research set, data collection methods as well as data analysis methods are not described or are described only generally or in a vague manner, or are described even specifically but these are basic methods, the use of which is not sufficient for quality publications. The proposed research set or methods cannot provide answers to research questions or meet project objectives.

4) **Project management** – schedule, involvement of researchers

Points	Description
3	<p>The project schedule is fully described and justified, individual activities are described and their timing is adequately set. The activities listed in the project schedule are linked to the budget, enabling the achievement of the main project objectives.</p> <p>The way of involvement of researchers is clear. Researchers are appropriately involved in the project according to their experience and qualifications. The definition of positions and roles, their allocation to individual activities and allocated capacity support the achievement of the main project objectives.</p>
2	<p>The project schedule is described and justified, individual activities are described and their timing is set. The main activities listed in the project enable the achievement of the main project objectives.</p> <p>Their way of involvement of researchers is included. Their involvement corresponds to their experience and qualifications. The definition of positions and roles is not described in detail, the relation between allocated capacity and objectives is not quite clear.</p>
1	<p>The project schedule is not sufficiently described, or it does not allow for achieving the project objectives. It is not clear, which activities the project proposer intends to implement within the project.</p> <p>It is not clear how individual researchers are involved in project activities. The definition of positions and roles is not sufficiently described, the relation between allocated capacity and objectives is vague or is not corresponding.</p>

5) **Quality of outputs***

Points	Description
5	The authorial team targets at least two publications written in a global language in a prestigious world peer-reviewed journal (indexed in WoS). Target journals, which well match the objectives and the scope of the project, are listed.
4	The authorial team targets at least one publication written in a global language in a good-quality world peer-reviewed journal (indexed in WoS). Other good-quality publication outputs are also expected within the project. Target journals, which are adequate to the objectives, are described. Even monographs published in a prestigious world publishing house may be considered (Springer, Routledge, Palgrave, etc.).
3	The authorial team targets at least one publication written in a global language in an average world peer-reviewed journal (indexed in WoS or Scopus). Other good-quality publication outputs are also expected within the project. Target journals are described. Even a monograph published in a prestigious national publishing house may be considered (Academia, Karolinum, etc).
2	The authorial team targets publications written in a global language in average peer-reviewed journals indexed in WoS or Scopus. Other average publication outputs are expected within the project.

1	The authorial team targets only publications in the lowest quality journals indexed in Scopus, in other lower than average peer-reviewed journals or other lower than average publication outputs.
---	--

*The reviewer will check whether or not some of the target publications meet the characteristics of a predatory magazine or predatory publishing house, and if so, they will point them out in the verbal evaluation and reduce the score in this criterion accordingly.

6) Quality of the team

Points	Description
4	The professional focus and the previous publishing and creative activity of the proposer and researchers fully reflect the focus and objectives of the project. The previous publishing and creative activity of the proposer and researchers fully corresponds to the level of expected publication outputs within the project. The proposer has at least one output above the median in the field according to SJR.
3	The professional focus and the previous publishing and creative activity of the proposer and researchers reflect the focus and objectives of the project, largely corresponding to the level of expected publication outputs within the project.
2	The professional focus and the previous publishing and creative activity of the proposer and researchers reflect the focus and objectives of the project in a limited way, only little corresponding to the level of expected publication outputs within the project.
1	The professional focus and the previous publishing and creative activity of the proposer and researchers are either not documented, or do not reflect the focus and objectives of the project, or do not correspond to the level of expected project outputs at all.

7) Budget

Points	Description
4	The required funds correspond to the key outputs and individual activities in the project, they are neither overestimated nor underestimated in any of the budget items. The budget is sufficiently justified, including individual required partial amounts, meeting all the project rules and respecting the recommendations for drawing up the budget.
3	The required funds correspond to the key outputs and individual activities in the project, they are neither overestimated nor underestimated as a whole. The budget is justified, some required partial amounts are not sufficiently justified. The budget meets all the project rules and respects the recommendations for drawing up the budget.
2	The required funds are partly overestimated or underestimated to the key outputs or individual activities in the project. The budget is justified, some required partial amounts are not justified. The budget meets all the project rules and respects most of the recommendations for drawing up the budget.
1	The required funds are clearly overestimated or underestimated to the key outputs or individual activities in the project. The budget is justified to a little extent only. The budget meets most of the project rules, and it respects the recommendations for drawing up the budget in a limited way.