

Evaluator's Impartiality towards Projects

applying for funding in programmes of the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic

When perceiving impartiality, the essential aspect is the **potential benefit (any form of profit, advantage, etc.) to the evaluator or his/her employer (relative, close person) arising from the result of the evaluation or any harm to an applicant as a result of the evaluator's evaluation.** Beside the clear, verifiable and enumerative cases (see below), it is at each evaluator's personal consideration in other analogous situations whether there is any (even potential) bias and whether he/she is, under the given circumstances, not in conflict with the signed sworn statement on impartiality and the concluded framework agreement. Examples of other potential biases are listed below.

There is a clear bias if:

- the evaluator is in an **employment relationship with the applicant** (i.e. any member of the consortium) or is a member of the applicant's executive body (**in the case of a university, the evaluator is considered biased with regard to all projects of the university where he/she is employed as the applicant; bias is not limited to the participating faculties of the given university!**),
- the evaluator **participated in the preparation** of the given evaluated **project**,
- the evaluator is a **person close** to the applicant or the project solver, i.e. an immediate family member, sibling, spouse or partner, or in other family or similar relationship if the harm perceived by such person would be perceived as a harm to the evaluator, including the relatives by marriage (i.e. relatives of the spouse) and persons living permanently in the same household,
- the evaluator is an **employee of the company** that declared, via a letter attached to the project proposal, **interest in the results of the project or the subject acting as the application guarantor in the project.**

There is a potential bias if:

- the evaluator and the applicant (i.e. any member of the consortium) **have concluded a work performance agreement or a contract for work** (in the majority of the cases, this should be perceived as a bias; unless, for example, the evaluator on the basis of an agreement or contract gives several lectures at one of the faculties of the university, the evaluated project concerns a different faculty with no relation to the evaluator, and the evaluator is convinced of his/her impartiality and the ability to defend such impartiality if accused of a bias; in such a case, the evaluator may accept the project evaluation after signing the sworn statement on impartiality),
- the evaluator is in a **business or a similar relationship with the applicant or project solver** (in this case, the intensity of the relationship and potential interest of the evaluator in the result of the evaluation matters; the decision is a matter of personal integrity of the evaluator),

- the evaluator and the **applicant or solver are in a personal or other similar relationship** that could (either positively or negatively) affect the impartiality of the evaluator during the evaluation,
- the evaluator **is involved in the solution of another project together with the applicant or solver of the evaluated project**. In this case, another project means any implemented project or project applying for funding with the TA CR or other funding provider (in particular, in the case of universities, it is up to the evaluator to decide whether he/she feels biased towards the project of a faculty he/she is not connected to in any way),
- the evaluator is a **member of the applicant's body with no executive power** (in this case, the involvement is crucial; e.g. the evaluator may be a member of the supervisory board of the applicant, and, due to the nature of his role, he/she may not have any interest regarding the applicant's results),
- the applicant is a **university where the evaluator is currently studying** (depends on the intensity of the relationship with the individual solvers or institutions of the university involved in the project; there is no bias if, for example, the evaluator is not studying at the faculty involved in the project and has no close ties to the solvers; on the other hand, there is likely to be a bias if the solver involved in the project is the supervisor of the evaluator's dissertation thesis).

There is no bias if:

- the applicant is the **university where the evaluator has studied in the past**, and the evaluator has none of the aforementioned links to the university or its employees.

If, before signing the sworn statement, the evaluator has any doubts regarding his/her impartiality, the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic will assess the situation, and the evaluator in question will sign, if necessary, a statement on potential bias that will be attached to the sworn statement, and where the problematic applicant/solver will be specified along with the reason for the evaluator's impartiality.