



MASARYKOVA UNIVERZITA

**RESEARCH SUPPORT
PROGRAMME
IN MASARYK UNIVERSITY
2015**

**INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH
PROJECTS**

OBJECTIVES AND PRINCIPLES

Research support programme aims to enhance the prestige of research work, to increase success rate in obtaining international prestigious grants and to encourage the interdisciplinary innovative research with high added value. Research support includes 3 funding schemes. The key criterion for selection is scientific excellence of applicants and proposal quality. Support will be provided for projects of MU employees* who are engaged in research regardless of the focus on a basic or an applied research. Essentially, there will not be supported projects that are funded from other sources or are simultaneously submitted elsewhere**. The source of program funding is the institutional support for long-term conceptual development of the University and programme budget will be revised annually so that it does not exceed 5% of the institutional support for the year. In the event of unpredictable development of university funding the rector, in agreement with the deans, may reduce the limit of 5% or cancel the programme.

* MU employee *who is engaged in research, for the purpose of this document means the academic (according to Act No. 111/1998) or non-academic staff engaged in research activity. His time of work on MU must be higher than 20 hours per week.*

** *Any exceptions will be considered by the Program Council.*

GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

Grant will be usually awarded to larger research teams (more than 10 academic and research employees) consisting of at least two economic centers MU involved in a creation of institutional support¹. Individuals from outside the MU may participate in research but without the payment of costs. The research topics must be interdisciplinary, innovative, with high added value and those that are not generally supported by other sources and have not yet been solved at MU. An advantage, but not a prerequisite, is cooperation between programs with different specialization (for ex. science and humanities). Interdisciplinary research project can be planned for the maximum of 3.

REVIEW CRITERIA

The main evaluation criteria are interdisciplinary, originality and scientific quality of the project. It will also be assess the perspective of cooperation after project end and innovativeness/added value of interdisciplinary synergy of methodological approaches and expertise. The appropriate weight will be given a scientific proficiency of applicants. An obvious condition for allocation of funds is to propose a

research project that guarantees publications, patent or other quality outputs of the basic or applied research.

The grant may be awarded only by MU workers who are engaged in research, even if the rules permitted the participation of individuals outside the university.

FINANCIAL LIMITS AND ELIGIBLE COSTS

Interdisciplinary grants can be up to a **maximum of 5 000 000 CZK** for a **period of 3 years**. It is possible to support only **4 projects in 1 year**.

In the event of serious project implementation shortcomings identified on basic the progress report (see Reporting and Final report evaluation) or via the project reporter (see Peer review process), Programme Council or rector of MU may stop funding project.

Eligible costs:

- Personal costs (salary, special remuneration, employment agreement, contract for work).
- Consumables.
- Tangible and intangible assets (tangible assets under 40 000 CZK and intangible assets under 60 000 CZK).
- Services.
- Travel costs.
- Publishing costs and costs of putting research results into practice.
- Overheads (*Act MU n°. 10/2014 Rules for determining the share of administrative overheads in the current version*).

Not eligible costs:

- Investments (tangible assets over 40 000 CZK and intangible assets over 60 000 CZK).
- Costs, which are not eligible for institutional support (for example refreshments).

The amount of approved financial support for the calendar year will be allocated to economic units in form of the schedule adjustment.

Economic and administrative facilities of projects will be identical to the economic and administrative facilities represented in the workplaces which also cover common operating costs. PI is responsible for the scientific and administrative coordination of the project.

Transfers between items of budget to 30% may not justify. Transfers greater than 30% of the originally scheduled item must be consulted with the Research&Development Office, approved by the vice-rector for research and justified in the progress report or in the final report.

The investigators may transfer a maximum of 5% of the amount granted for the year to FUUP, except the last year of project implementation when the amount of financial support must be completely drawn.

HOW TO APPLY?

Proposal is submitted electronically via the electronic information system – ISEP (see Annex 2 Project proposal may be submitted as doc or pdf file). Form for application is available [here](#). The signed Affirmation (see Annex 3) and CV's of PI and co-PI(s) (maximum of 5 CVs) must be uploaded in the ISEP, too. An integral part of the proposal is budget divided into individual calendar years with a brief justification of expected costs.

PEER REVIEW PROCESS

The first level of review is carried out by a Science Advisory Board composed of scientists at MU, who were nominated by vice-deans for research (see Science Advisory Board on website of Department of research), and who have expertise in relevant scientific disciplines and current research areas. The second level of review is performed by Programme Council.

At first level, each application is evaluated at least by 3 reviewers. Reviewers declare Conflicts of Interest. Proposals will be evaluated by using the Evaluation Form (see Annex n°4). There are 6 essential criteria with point rating scale 1 (poor) – 6 (excellent). The maximum overall score can be 36. Other evaluated parameters of proposal and any comments may serve to modify financial requirements or to recommend the professional way of project implementation. In the event that MU experts will not be used for evaluation of proposals for any reason, external expert(s) will be invited to the peer review process. First, project proposals are evaluated individually by these committee members. After the individual review a meeting of committee members follows with the participation of vice-rector for research. The aim of the meeting is i) to choose proposals, which may be awarded and to agree on proposals for which funding is not recommended (of course, such proposals need not necessarily exist) and ii) to establish ranking of projects in given block according the overall score with regard to verbal comments. Results of the evaluation by committee members are transmitted to Programme Council. The Programme Council may assess the quality and relevance of evaluation and may exclude incorrect opinions. In this case it will be requested an additional expert opinion. Subsequently the Council decides on the final allocation of grants, based on a vote.

The Programme Council will also evaluate the adequacy of financial requirements. If it is necessary, the Council is authorized to propose a reduction of project budget.

MU evaluators are entitled to financial compensation that will be paid from institutional support allocated to PPV.

AWARD MANAGEMENT

Any arrangements for ethical issues must be clarified and addressed, if it's necessary. Copy of the relevant authorizations must be submitted not later than the beginning of the project.

Change of the PI is possible on the basis of a written request which will be delivered to the Research&Development Office. Requests are reviewed and approved by the vice-rector for research.

REPORTING

The PI is responsible for timely submission of project progress reports and final report (see Timetable). Project progress and final reports shall be submitted electronically on prepared forms (see Annex n°5 and n°6). The Programme Council may require additional report.

FINAL SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION

Completed projects will be evaluated by the Council on the basis of progress and final reports. The Council may require the presence of PI. The completed projects will be classified by marks A to D, where A is an excellent project and D represents an unsuccessfully project. Mark C excludes research teams from further competition for 2 years and D for 4 years. The university management will be informed about project results through the vice-rector for research (see Annex n°7 Final evaluation form)

INDICATIVE TIMETABLE

- Call opens on October 1, 2014.
- Deadline November 28, 2014.
- Peer review process from November 29, 2014 to February 28th, 2015.
- Results of the evaluation will be presented on the website of Research&Development Office on March 1, 2015.
- Funding of project will start immediately after the announcement of the results and end on 31st December of the third year of project implementation.
- Project progress reports must be sent electronically to the address of contact person on the Research&Development Office before 31 March.
- Final reports must be sent electronically to the address of contact person on the Research&Development Office within 3 months of project completion.

FORMS

Annex n° 2 „**Project proposal**“

Annex n° 3 „**Affirmation**“

Annex n° 4 „**Individual evaluation form**“

Annex n° 5 „**Project progress report** “

Annex n° 6 „**Final report**“

Annex n° 7 „**Final evaluation form**“

All forms will be accepted through ISEP application.

Annex n°2 „Project proposal“**Interdisciplinary research projects**

Project proposal
Research support program

MUNI/M/xxxx/xxxx
990000 xxxxx, 991700 xxxxx

Funding duration	from:	to:
Applicant		
Contacts (phone, e-mail)		

Proposal title:

Co-investigator(s) (*with their workplace*):

Abstract (*max. 300 words*):

Description of the project (*see evaluation criteria in Annex n° 4 „Evaluation form“*) (*max. 3000 words*):

Interdisciplinary nature of the project and added value (*max. 200 words*)

Methodology with relevant departments and holders of expertise (*max. 500 words*):

Applicant	Firts name and surname	
	Signature:	Date:

Annex n° 3 „Affirmation“

INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH PROJECTS

Affirmation

Principle investigator:

Project title:

I declare that the assignment here submitted is original. The piece of work, or a part of the piece of work has not been submitted for more than one purpose. It also has not been solved at MU.

Place and date:

Name of the PI

.....

Signature

.....

Annex n°4 „Individual evaluation form“

INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH PROJECTS

Individual evaluation form

INFORMATION ON THE PROPOSAL

Name of the evaluator	
In relation to PI(s)	
Proposal number:	
Proposal title:	
Faculty/HS:	
Departement:	
Principal investigator	
Co-investigator(s)	

EVALUATION REPORT

The evaluator fills in the pink field only.

A. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Vysvětlivky k hodnotící škále:

1-2=Relatively poor (based on evaluation of this parameter project is not recommended to funding);
3-4=Good (based on evaluation of this parameter project fulfills the lower limit for complex evaluation and in the case of very good or excellent ratings in other parameters and of sufficient funding it can be supported);

5=Very good (based on evaluation of this parameter project deserves a complex evaluation and in the case of very good or excellent ratings in other parameters deserves the support);

6=Excellent (based on evaluation of this parameter project definitely deserves the support).

Maximum is 6 points.

1. Investigator(s)	
Threshold:	4/6
Weight:	30%
Mark:	Degrees of certainty*
PI:	
the 1st co-PI:	
the 2nd co-PI:	

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Do they have appropriate experience and training?
- Are they proven their scientific successes?

* informative indicator only, it will not enter to calculation, use following scale 1 to 3, where 1=it's my expertise and I'm sure of evaluation, 2=it isn't my expertise but I'm sure of evaluation, 3=I'm not sure of evaluation.

Comments:

2. Quality, feasibility of the project from methodology

Threshold:	3/6	
Weight:	20%	Degrees of certainty (see the above scale 1-3).
Mark:		

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project?
- Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented?
- Is feasibility of experiments guaranteed?
- Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements?

Comments:

3. Innovation and originality of the project

Threshold:	3/6	
Weight:	20%	Degrees of certainty (see the above scale 1-3).
Mark:		

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field?
- How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

Comments:

4. Synergy between cooperating workplaces and teams, interdisciplinary added value

Threshold:	3/6	
Weight:	10%	Degrees of certainty (see the above scale 1-3).
Mark:		

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise?
- Is newly created cooperation between teams?

Comments:

5. Perspective of long-term cooperation between teams after the project completion

Threshold:	3/6	
Weight:	10%	Degrees of certainty (see the above scale 1-3).
Mark:		

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- May be assumed a cooperation continuing even after the project completion?

Comments:

6. The expected impact of the project results at the level of basic or applied research in local and/or international field

Threshold:	3/6	
Weight:	10%	Degrees of certainty (see the above scale 1-3).
Mark:		

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Lze očekávat dopad výsledků projektu na úroveň základního nebo aplikovaného výzkumu v lokálním a/nebo mezinárodním měřítku?
- Zaručuje řešení projektu vytváření kvalitních publikačních výsledků?

Comments:

B. THE OVERALL EVALUATION

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Overall remarks, highlights or another comments:

PROJECT EVALUATION OVERVIEW

Generated automatically

Overall criteria assessed	Weighting (%)	Thresholds	Given marks
1. Investigators	30%	4	
2. Quality, feasibility of the project from methodology	20%	3	
3. Innovation a originality of the project	20%	3	
4. Synergy between cooperating workplaces and teams, interdisciplinary added value	10%	3	
5. Perspective of long-term cooperation between teams after the project completion	10%	3	
6. The expected impact of the project results at the level of basic or applied research in local and/or international field	10%	3	
Final score (%)	100%	19	
	Maximum	36	100%

C. BUDGET COMMENTARY

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark:

- Are the costs adequate to the planned activities?
- Is the project feasible in the given budget range?
- Alternatively, have the team further funds for co-financing?

.....

Signature

Annex n° 5 „Project progress report “

INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH PROJECTS

Project progress report

Number of project:

Principal Investigator:

Workplace:

Contacts:

Proposal title:

Short summary of project implementation (max. 500 words):

List of project outputs:

Overview and justification of the use of project funds:

Changes in project implementation:

Personnel changes (in the past year or planned):

Annex n° 6 „Final report“

INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH PROJECTS

Final report

Number of project:

Principal Investigator:

Workplace:

Contacts:

Proposal title:

Short summary of project implementation (max. 700 words):

List of project outputs:

Overview and justification of the use of project funds:

Main result(s) (press news):

Any recommendations for rules of Program:

Annex n° 7 „Final evaluation“

INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH PROJECTS

Final evaluation

Number of project:

Principal Investigator:

Workplace:

Contacts:

Proposal title:

The Overall evaluation:

Classification:

A The excellent project with results of international importance, significantly moving the scientific level of involved disciplines and the whole university

Comments *:

B Very good project with results significantly exceeding the average of research at the university

Comments *:

C The average project limitedly thriving included fields however with little significance for the whole university

Comments *:

D Poor project with weak results without significant importance for involved disciplines

Comments *:

* Only if the reporter deems it desirable

.....
Name and signature of reporter