**Criteria for evaluation of projects in the Student Grant Competition to support projects of specific university research at UCT Prague 2024/2025 and method of evaluation by reviewers**

**Name or applicant:**

**Name of project:**

1. **Professional level of the project (evaluation of the current state and the benefit of the outcomes)**

**(0-10 points)**

*10 points: High-quality and logical introduction to the field that is evidence of the applicant’s erudition and that clearly shows that further research is needed.*

*5 points: The applicant clearly proves their knowledge of the field and relies on high-quality sources; however, the text simply lists the existing knowledge.*

*0 points: The applicant’s knowledge of the field and ability to compose a logical text are not convincing.*

**Number of points:**

**Comments:**

1. **Formulation of the objectives and feasibility of their achievement (method of research and its originality) (0-10 points)**

*10 points: The objectives are precisely defined, and are at the same time ambitious, original and achievable. The applicant has a clear idea of what they want to achieve.*

*5 points: The objectives are defined in a comprehensible manner, but the formulation creates doubts about whether the applicant knows what in particular they want to achieve, or the objectives are too ambitious or not very original.*

*0 points: The objectives are defined rather generally, the applicant’s research plan is not entirely clear, or the objectives are completely unattainable, or it is just a repetition of already published experiments.*

**Number of points:**

**Comments:**

1. **Methodology of the project (0-10 points)**

*10 points: The procedures to fulfil the objectives are described with precision and in detail. The applicant has a clear idea of how to achieve the objectives, including the analytical methods.*

*7 points: The procedures to fulfil the objectives are clear and are well described; however, from time to time the statements are too general.*

*5 points: The procedures to fulfil the objectives are comprehensible; however the description contains a lot of general statements.*

*3 points: The methodology is not entirely convincing, yet it can be believed that the applicant has thought it out and that they can finish it as part of the project.*

*0 points: The methodology is very general and the applicant has no clear idea of a specific method.*

**Number of points:**

**Comments:**

1. **Complexity of the project and adequacy of the financial requirements (0-10 points)**

*10 points: The size of the research team corresponds to the stated demandingness of the project; the financial resources are spent efficiently.*

*5 points: The size of the research team does not correspond to the stated demandingness of the project, or the financial resources are not spent efficiently.*

*0 points: The size of the research team does not correspond to the stated demandingness of the project and the financial resources are not spent efficiently.*

**Number of points:**

**Comments:**

1. **Qualifications of the applicant, their team and clarity of the tasks among the research team (0-10 points)**

*10 points: The research team has clearly defined roles and has available all the necessary equipment for the solution of the project.*

*5 points: The research team does not have clearly defined roles or has available only some of the necessary equipment for the solution of the project.*

*0 points: The involvement of individual members of the research team is not clear and it is not clear if the research team has access to the necessary equipment for the solution of the project.*

**Number of points:**

**Comments:**

1. **Overall verbal evaluation of the project proposal**

**Strengths of the project:**

**Weaknesses of the project:**

**Additional evaluation comments:**