Criteria for evaluation of student grant projects within the framework of the student grant competition

The student grant competition is funded by the Research, Development and Education Operational Programme within the Internal Grant Schemes of Mendel University in Brno project (abbreviated name "IGRÁČEK MENDELU"), CZ.02.2.69/0.0/0.0/19_073/0016670.

While elaborating his/her evaluation, the reviewer follows the criteria listed below, in which the nature of the scientific field of the student grant project which is submitted is taken into consideration. The total number of points which may be allocated for individual evaluation criteria by one reviewer is 50 points per student grant project.

1) The quality of the proposed student grant project, including the stated outputs

10 points	The proposal for the student grant project addresses topical subjects in the given field of science according to classification of research and development (Frascati manual, 2015) and develops knowledge on an international level. It uses new scientific methods for resolution of little-explored issues from the given field of science. Outputs are planned in prestigious journals in the given field of science. The number of outputs and their quality is adequate.
8 points	The proposal for the student grant project for the most part addresses topical subjects in the given field of science according to classification of research and development (Frascati manual, 2015) and develops knowledge on an international level. It uses the latest but already established methods for resolution of issues in the given field of science which have not been fully resolved yet. Outputs are planned in well-known and highly rated journals in the given field of science. The number of outputs and their quality is adequate.
6 points	The proposal for the student grant project to a lesser extent addresses topical subjects in the given field of science according to classification of research and development (Frascati manual, 2015) and it develops knowledge on a national level. It uses established scientific methods for resolution of issues in the given field of science. Outputs are planned in above-average and average journals in the given field of science. The number of outputs and their quality is mostly adequate.
4 points	The proposal for the student grant project addresses topical subjects in the given field of science according to classification of research and development (Frascati manual, 2015) only peripherally and its contribution to science is low. The scientific methods and procedures used are set up in an unclear way. Outputs are planned in slightly below-average journals in the given field. The number of outputs and their quality is mostly inadequate.

2 points	The proposal for the student grant project does not address topical issues and subjects in the given field of science according to classification of research and development (Frascati manual, 2015), the benefit is unclear and the issues are issues that are addressed routinely or that are irrelevant. The scientific methods used to address the subject covered by the student grant project are inadequate, unclear or wrong. Outputs are planned in below-average journals in the given field of science. The number of outputs and their quality is absolutely inadequate and achieving such goals is not feasible.

2) The quality of the student grant project team, especially the proposer and mentor

5 points	The professional specialisation of the whole of the student grant project team fully corresponds to the subject being addressed. The publication history of all members of the student grant project team corresponds to the anticipated publication outputs of the student grant project. The mentor or the principal investigator have at least one publication in a Q1 magazine. A foreign stay is planned for the principal investigator and the educational objectives of all of the researchers are beneficial and feasible.
4 points	The professional specialisation of the whole of the student grant project team fully corresponds to the subject being addressed. The publication history of the members of the student grant project team mostly corresponds to the anticipated publication outputs of the student grant project. The mentor or the principal investigator have at least one publication in a journal indexed in WoS. A foreign stay is planned for the principal investigator and the educational objectives of all of the researchers are beneficial and feasible.
3 points	The professional specialisation of the whole of the student grant project team mostly corresponds to the subject being addressed. The publication history of the members of the student grant project team mostly corresponds to the anticipated publication outputs of the student grant project. The mentor or the principal investigator have at least one publication in a journal indexed in SCOPUS. A foreign stay is planned for the principal investigator and the educational objectives of all of the researchers are mostly beneficial and feasible.
2 points	The professional specialisation of the whole of the student grant project team corresponds to a lesser extent to the subject being addressed. The publication history of the members of the student grant project team hardly correspond to the anticipated publication outputs of the student grant project. A foreign stay is planned for the principal investigator and the educational objectives of all of the researchers are mostly of no benefit and unrealistic.
1 point	The professional specialisation of the whole of the student grant project team does not correspond at all to the subject being addressed. The publication history of the members of the student grant project team does not correspond to the anticipated publication outputs of the student grant project. A foreign stay is planned for the principal investigator and the educational objectives of all of the researchers are of no benefit and unrealistic.

3) The scientific relevance and topicality of the chosen topic

10 points	The student grant project addresses topical, relevant and new issues in the given field of science on an international level. The topic of the proposal for the student grant project has the potential to be of great benefit to the development of scientific knowledge.
8 points	The student grant project addresses topical and relevant issues in the given field of science on an international level and has the potential to bring new knowledge to the given field of science.
6 points	The student grant project mostly addresses topical and relevant issues in the given field of science and has the potential to noticeably enhance the already existing knowledge in the given field of science.
4 points	The student grant project does not address wholly topical and relevant issues, it only touches on them. The potential for enhancement of the existing knowledge in the given field of science is lower.
2 points	The student grant project addresses issues which have already been investigated, with no great benefit for the given field of science.

4) The feasibility of the objectives of the student grant project

10 points	Achieving the determined objectives of the student grant project is very feasible. The activities of the student grant project team are linked to the budget and allow achievement of the determined objectives.
8 points	Achieving the determined objectives of the student grant project is likely. The activities of the student grant project team are linked to the budget and allow achievement of the determined objectives.
6 points	Achieving the determined objectives of the student grant project is doubtful. The activities of the student grant project team are not clearly linked to the budget and allow achievement of the determined objectives with difficulties.
4 points	Achieving the determined objectives of the student grant project is unlikely. The activities of the student grant project team are unclear, their link to the budget is minimal and achievement of the determined objectives is unlikely.
2 points	Achieving the determined objectives of the student grant project is unrealistic – intrinsically as well as from the point of view of allocation of financial and/or human resources.

5) The concept and methodology chosen for the investigation

10 points	The chosen procedures/methods are described in detail and are adequate for the objectives of the student grant project and allow them to be achieved. The methods chosen for carrying out the student grant project are advanced or innovative. So far, they only appear in prestigious journals of global renown.
8 points	The chosen procedures/methods are mostly described in detail. They match the objectives of the student grant project very well and allow them to be achieved. The methods chosen for carrying out the student grant project are new, appearing in high-quality global journals in the given field of science.
6 points	The chosen procedures/methods are described sufficiently and as such allow for publication in average journals in the given field of science.
4 points	The chosen procedures/methods are sometimes described insufficiently. They correspond to the determined objectives, but thanks to their not wholly specific description, it is uncertain whether they can help to achieve these objectives. The methods allow for publication in rather below-average journals in the given field of science.
2 points	The chosen procedures/methods are described insufficiently or are not described at all. They are by their nature elementary and outdated. They do not facilitate meeting of the determined objectives of the student grant project.

6) The adequacy of the financial costs

5 points	Costs correspond to key outputs. They are neither underestimated nor overestimated and as a whole, the budget is sufficiently justified in full.
4 points	Costs correspond to key outputs. However, certain items are overestimated or underestimated. The budget is sufficiently justified in full.
3 points	Costs correspond to key outputs. However, certain items are overestimated or underestimated. The budget is justified with the exception of certain individual items.
2 points	Costs mostly correspond to key outputs, however, the number of underestimated or overestimated items is high. A large part of the budget is not justified.
1 point	Costs do not correspond to key outputs, they are grossly overestimated or underestimated. The budget is justified very poorly.

Strengths and weaknesses of the student grant project

Strengths of the student grant project (at most 1000 characters)
Provide a brief description of the strengths of the student grant project.

Weaknesses of the student grant project (at most 1000 characters)
Provide a brief description of the weaknesses of the student grant project.