



**METODIKA**

## Reflections on the comments

[www.metodika.reformy-msmt.cz](http://www.metodika.reformy-msmt.cz)



INVESTICE DO ROZVOJE VZDĚLÁVÁNÍ

# Is the description of the proposed method for allocation of PRFS clear?



- **Overall picture**

- Yes: 55
- No: 10

- **Comments**

- „Yes, but too complicated“
- „No, because too complicated and / or far too long for busy people“

- **Specific issues**

- Role of funding and founding ministries
- Inclusion of PhD-students (no) and non-PhD-researchers (yes)
- Budgetary issues (starting point, inflation, calculation through the funding period)
- Questions regarding the New Evaluation Methodology

# Which of the two proposed methods of allocations of PRFS do you prefer?



- **Two options:**
  - based on size (person scores)
  - based on relative scores
- **Overall picture**
  - based on size: 26
  - based on relative scores: 29
  - undecided or none of both: 10 (+)
- **Issues**
  - definition of FTE
  - possibly different consequences for different types of RO → different solutions for different RO type?

# Do you consider leaving part of the funding for future development of institutions suitable (PA)? Is the proposed share of 5% optimal?



- **Overall picture**

- Yes: 47
- No: 14
- Undecided: 3

- **Issues**

- Empty promises?! Opens doors to corruption and clientelism.
- Too burdensome for 5%
- Capacities of providers?!
- Higher share (10%) – or no PA at all
- Different shares for different types of RO



# Do you consider the proposed division of the total budget of institutional funding into „pots“ for different types of RO suitable? Why?

- **Overall picture**

- Yes: 49
- No: 16

- **Issues**

- Agreement with proposal to differentiate RO by mission
- Disagreement with categorisation of ROs
- Which type of RO is my RO?
- What is an eligible RO at all?



# What is important for your RO?

- **Three options**

- budget volume
- stability of funding system and rules
- dynamics of funding system

- **Overall picture: Extremely important**

- budget volume: 30
- stability of funding system and rules: 33
- dynamics of funding system: 1
- undecided: 1

- **Issues**

- Many comments: volume AND stability are both extremely important

# Do you consider the proposed share of PRFS (15%) in the institutional funding to be the right proportion? Why (not)?



- **Overall picture**

- yes: 44
- no: 19
- undecided: 1

- **Issues**

- Strongly depends on fairness of the New Evaluation Methodology
- Share should be lower because of issues with the New Evaluation Methodology
  - peer review cannot be trusted
  - foreign reviewers do not understand the Czech situation and system
  - the evaluation criteria are not objective
- Share should be higher
  - to overturn „current rotten coffee mill“
  - because performance is most important
  - because Technopolis would not be credible if they suggested a lower share

# Are the proposed weights for evaluation criteria appropriate to your RO? If not, explain.



- **Overall picture**

- yes: 38
- no: 21
- unspecified: 6

- **Issues:**

- Various suggestions for different weights
- Voices for each of the different scenarios (default, medium, radical)
- RO are not homogeneous internally (faculties)
- Some issues with the evaluation criteria
  - management is contested most, considered too important
  - criteria are not completely independent



# Sammeln



- **Counting researchers**

- Only PhD-holders? Why not PhD-students or holders of Ing. and Mgr. degrees that do research?
- Disputed issue, not equally relevant to all RO
- Trade of: size-gaming vs. poor productivity ratings in the Evaluation
- Gaming only possible if person scores are used
- To be reconsidered

**What ratio of institutional funding to competitive funding do you consider optimal in your RO?**





**METODIKA**

**Děkujeme za pozornost!**

[www.metodika.reformy-msmt.cz](http://www.metodika.reformy-msmt.cz)



INVESTICE DO ROZVOJE VZDĚLÁVÁNÍ