

Guide for Applicants

2018 Competition Round



ORION has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement N° 741527.



Content

Introduction	3
Basic Information	3
1.1 Terms	3
1.2 Partner Universities	3
1.3 Eligible students	4
1.4 Eligibility Criteria	4
1.5 Time Schedule	4
Application Form	5
2.1 Applicant's CV	6
2.2 Co-creation Project	6
2.3 Team and Facilities	8
2.4 Preparing the Application	8
The Competition	9
3.1 Formal Review of Applications	9
3.2 Open Peer Review of Applications	9
3.3 Expert Review of Applications	9
Conclusion	11

Introduction to ORION and Open Science

ORION (Open Responsible research and Innovation to further Outstanding kNowledge) is a project funded under the Science with and for Society (SwafS) work programme within Horizon 2020. The objectives of the project are to trigger evidence-based, institutional, cultural and behavioural changes in Research Funding and Performing Organizations (RFPOs) targeting researchers, management staff and high-level leadership. The long-term vision of the project is to embed Open Science (OS) and Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) in RFPOs (RRI-principles include ethics, gender, governance, open access, public engagement and science education). One of the ways that the project seeks to implement its objectives is to design, execute and evaluate co-creation experiments with relevant stakeholders, including the general public. In order to efficiently design such activities and adapt them to local audiences, knowledge of the attitudes among the general public(s) is crucial. Citizens of the countries that take part in the project (Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom) will be involved in several activities planned in the project (e.g. public dialogue workshops and citizen science projects).

Dan Gezelter [2009] in his reflection of The Open Scientific Project defines four basic objectives of OS: 1. Transparency in experimental methodology, observation and data collection. 2. Public availability and reusability of scientific data. 3. Public accessibility and transparency of scientific communication. 4. Using web tools to enhance scientific cooperation. The study you are going to implement should carry these principles. More information about the concept of Open Science can be found here: <https://www.fosteropenscience.eu/content/what-open-science-introduction> or here: <https://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/index.cfm>.

In general, co-creation in the context of the ORION project is meant as a management initiative or proactive strategy that brings different parties together in order to jointly produce a mutually valued outcome. Co-creation brings a blend of ideas from different groups which in turn creates new ideas that contribute to solving societal challenges.

The representatives of the City of Brno, the South Moravian Region, JCMM, NGOs, academia, regional businesses and public formed a consortium to define local societal challenges/call conditions to be addressed in the co-creation projects elaborated by students.

The aim of this competition is to identify top 10 students and provide them with a 9-month support, an equivalent of € 5000 per person. The proposals have to fit one or more domains as described in chapter 2.2.

1. Basic Information

1.1 Terms

For the purposes of this competition, the following terms mean:

- 1) **provider** is the ORION consortium which provides financial support for the competition
- 2) **administrator** is the South Moravian Centre for International Mobility which is one of the ORION partners and organizes the competition
- 3) **applicant** is a student enrolled in a full time master's or doctoral study program at a partner university who applies for the scholarship
- 4) **evaluators** are experts in relevant fields in academia as well as professionals from the private sector and/or administration who provides expertise to evaluate submitted applications
- 5) **beneficiary** is an applicant who, based on the competition results, is awarded the scholarship

1.2 Partner Universities

The partner universities are:

- a) **Brno University of Technology**
- b) **Masaryk University**
- c) **Mendel University in Brno**
- d) **University of Veterinary and Pharmaceutical Sciences Brno**

- e) **University of Defence**
- f) **Janáček Academy of Music and Performing Arts in Brno**

1.3 Eligible students

The competition aims to support graduate and doctoral students. The selection of beneficiaries is based on excellent academic track record, experience and extraordinary activities of the applicants related to the research and open science or related activities. The quality of the submitted co-creation project and the team and facilities are also taken into account.

1.4 Eligibility Criteria

The competition is open and its rules set no quota of applicants for partner universities, faculties or departments. Therefore, do not hesitate to register. Ranking in the list is determined by the date of the first initial registration in the programme, no further changes in the application have any influence on the listing.

Eligibility Criteria:

- be a full-time student at a partner university as given in 1.2.
- are enrolled either in master's or doctoral study programmes along the whole duration of the project
- co-creation project falls in research domains and serves the benefit of the South Moravian Region / City of Brno

All applicants declare their compliance with the eligibility criteria before submitting the application. The declaration is part of an electronic form in the registration system. Only the selected beneficiaries document officially their compliance with the eligibility criteria before signing an agreement with the administrator. Compliance with the criteria can be documented by a study confirmation issued by a partner university.

All applicants must also grant the administrator their approval to process the data provided in the application and its transfer to the third parties in order to evaluate the application or to disseminate its outputs. The full name and academic degrees of the applicants and their supervisors, the co-creation project title and the training department can be made public.

If a beneficiary has a permanent residence in a country where double taxation agreement with the Czech Republic is not signed, the scholarship will be automatically taxed by 35% and the beneficiary will be granted only 65% of the announced amount.

Please note that stipendist of the Brno Ph.D. Talent 2016-2018 competition are not eligible applicants!

1.5 Time Schedule

The following schedule is indicative and minor changes may occur.

Table 1: Time schedule of the Orion Competition

Activity	Time period	Date
Competition Announcement		15/11/2018
Registration of Applicants	15/11/2018-15/1/2019	15/1/2019
Formal Review of Applications (1st Round)	16/1/2019-31/1/2019	31/1/2019
Open Peer Review of Applications (2nd Round)	1/2/2019-28/2/2019	28/2/2019
Expert Review of Applications (3rd Round)	1/3/2019-31/3/2019	31/3/2019
Publication of Competition Results		15/4/2019
Signing the Grant Contracts	15/4/2019 onwards	

Note: JCMM reserves the right to adjust the timetable in case of technical, administrative, legal circumstances.

2. Application Form

The applicants, who meet the eligibility criteria, can apply for the competition by submitting an electronic application. The applications are submitted during the registration period (see Time Schedule above) via a registration system available at our web page: http://www.icmm.cz/projekt/orion_en or <http://www.icmm.cz/projekt/orion>

The applicants register, create a personal account, fill in the online form and upload a PDF file. By the end of the registration period all applicants must confirm their application by clicking on the „register to the project“ icon.

The registration system is quite simple and provides guidance; therefore, this guide does not describe it in more details. The application will be during the review process also transferred to the 3rd party digital platform due to the Open Peer Review process listed above (more information about the Open Peer Review can be found at the section 3.2 of this guide)

The applicant is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the information provided in the application. If the applicant does not provide all the mandatory information, the application is formally invalid and cannot be accepted for evaluation. If the applicant provides inaccurate or incomplete information, it will be reflected in a reduced score. Applications containing false or unsupported data will be rejected. If any part of the application exceeds the maximum length allowed, then the extra pages will not be taken into account during the evaluation.

Overview of the application and its mandatory parts:

- **Applicant's CV** (1-2 pages)
 - name, surname, address, email/cell phone number
 - discipline and the start date of master's / doctoral studies, name of your university
 - education and qualification for solving the proposed project
 - professional practice/practical experience, internships, solved scientific projects
 - relevant results of scientific activities and academic awards
 - other relevant information
- **Co-creation Project** (2-3 pages)
 - motivation, objectives and original contribution
 - impact on/benefits for the South Moravian Region and City of Brno
 - theoretical framework, methods and techniques, basic references
 - time schedule and key milestones
 - use of co-creation principles (see <https://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/index.cfm>)
 - relation between the co-creation project and the applicant's research activity
- **Team and Facilities** (1-2 pages)
 - supervisor and expert consultants, their contribution to the project, their open science or related topics activities, their qualification for guiding the applicant, main research activities, selected results of scientific and pedagogical activities, awards and recognitions etc.
 - institution(s) where the project will be solved, including planned visits & interactions, the information about institutional approach towards opening science is welcomed here
 - other relevant information

All three parts of the application must follow the above structure and presented in a **single PDF**. The maximum size of the file is **10 MB**. The application should not be shorter than 4 pages, the maximum length is **7 pages of A4 paper size**. The application may begin with a start page, which contains the project title and the applicant's name and it is not counted in the page limit. The application must be uploaded into the registration system (file name has to be „surname_name_2018“).

A template is available on the Orion web page.

The document must have the following format: font Times New Roman (or similar) of size at least **11 points** (references and notes can be written in 10 pt. font); single spacing or higher; all margins at least 2 cm wide; the heading of each page must contain the applicant's name and the competition title "ORION Open Science Co-creation "; page number must be indicated at the footnote. Other text format and graphic layout depend on the needs and preferences of each applicant (tables, graphs, pictures, etc.).

2.1 Applicant's CV

The professional CV provides information on your education, qualification and achievements. Highlight the results of your previous studies, scientific and open science related activities, particularly those related to your discipline and the topic of your project. We also recommend mentioning student awards, language exams and other accomplishments.

The permitted length of the CV is **one to two pages**. Be brief and give only relevant and verifiable information. The evaluators may check the information and the administrator may require proof of the data given in the CV.

Mandatory content of the applicant's CV:

1) DISCIPLINE AND STUDIES

Provide your personal data, name of your training institution and your field of study, date of admission

2) EDUCATION AND QUALIFICATION FOR SOLVING THE PROJECT

Detail your education and qualification in logical sequence, so that it clearly explains your specific competencies and qualities. Emphasize those that will help you solve the proposed project. You can also provide a list of special courses you have attended.

3) PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE, INTERNSHIPS, SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS

Mention your experience with scientific and open science related projects that you have designed and solved yourself. You can also provide a list of scientific projects in which you have participated and explain how. Provide information on your practical experience and training including a brief job description. Give a list of your internships or participation in university and professional organizations. Mention also summer schools you have attended and indicate their focus.

4) RESULTS OF SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES AND ACADEMIC AWARDS

List the results of your scientific activities and academic awards during the course of your studies.

5) OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

Finally, you can mention the knowledge and skills you have acquired in your everyday activities, which are not necessarily evidenced by official certificates and diplomas. In other words, make the list of your skills, knowledge and qualification complete. Describe clearly your language, technical, computer, presentation and other skills and abilities acquired during your studies, through seminars or informal training courses and free-time activities.

2.2 Co-creation Project

Your co-creation project should be built around „local societal challenges“ and should actively seek innovative solutions that serve the South Moravian Region and/or City of Brno. For the purpose of your application a set of research domains have been defined and your co-creation project has to fit in one (or more) of the domains:

1. life science domain
2. environmental domain
3. social domain
4. economic domain
5. technical domain
6. medical domain

Example of a choice of topics in an environmental domain:

- water management/protection of resources (e.g. Brno dam pollution)
- natural resources optimization
- combating air pollution
- removing local old ecological burdens

The co-creation project may have a length from **two to three pages** of A4 paper size, including all charts, diagrams and references. Your supervisor can help you with its elaboration; however, do not forget to highlight your own contribution and explain the share of your work. Write the text for an expert in your discipline who is not informed about your specific project. Don't forget to mention how the principles of Open Science can help or spoil the aims of the project. Write clearly, be informative and brief.

Mandatory content of the co-creation project description:

1) MOTIVATION, YOUR ROLE, OBJECTIVES AND ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTION

Give a short overview of the proposed project. Explain clearly your personal role in the project and your motivation to solve the identified problem, reveal the expected benefits. The introduction should describe clearly and concisely the objectives and original contribution. Avoid general statements.

Explain how you plan to approach the problem addressed in the co-creation project so that the evaluators clearly understand what you intend to achieve. Also explain why your co-creation project is important, up to date and why it should be carried out. The evaluators will want to understand the main idea of the project as well as its importance and innovativeness.

2) IMPACT ON THE SOUTH MORAVIAN REGION AND CITY OF BRNO

Provide description what is the impact of your co-creation project for the benefit of the South Moravian region and/or the City of Brno

3) THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, METHODS AND TECHNIQUES, BASIC REFERENCES

In this part of the project, describe the project design. Demonstrate the viability and originality of the proposed approach and its professional level. Explain what techniques and methods you chose and why you prefer them. Describe briefly the current state of knowledge of the problem addressed in your co-creation project and mention the previous work on the topic (if any). Focus on key references to show that you are familiar with relevant literature and that you are able to manage the project in detail but refrain from excessive and redundant referencing.

4) TIME SCHEDULE AND KEY MILESTONES

The project should be divided into stages. Each stage should have its own target and the achievement of all stages should guarantee the accomplishment of the overall objective. Define the milestones and set them in a time frame so that you can monitor and evaluate the implementation of the co-creation project. The total length of the co-creation is 9 months.

5) USE OF OPEN SCIENCE PRINCIPLES

Make sure that co-creation creates sustainable value with end-users and other stakeholders. Seek and develop new solutions/techniques/services/products that improve the quality of life of individuals and communities in e.g. technology, social inclusion, health care, education, resource efficiency, environmental issue, local economy, labour market etc. Co-creation actively involves end-users and other relevant parties in a full development process, from the identification of a challenge to the implementation and tracking of possible solutions. Part of the project should be also devoted to communication with public and explaining the importance of your research (e.g. participation in a „science cafe“, etc.). The important part of this part is also to create your own and simple Data Management Plan (DMP) for your project. There is no need of any standardized way of doing DMP. You can find inspiration here: <https://dmponline.dcc.ac.uk/> or here: https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/docs/h2020-funding-guide/cross-cutting-issues/open-access-data-management/data-management_en.htm.

6) RELATION BETWEEN THE PROJECT AND THE APPLICANT'S STUDIES AND/OR THESIS

The title and the content of the project do not have to match fully the name or topic of your current studies. However, the project should be related to your studies or expected theme of your thesis (either master's or doctoral). Explain shortly the link(s) between them.

2.3 Team and Facilities

An effective supervision over the applicant's project and training as well as high quality facilities guarantee that applicant will successfully manage the proposed project. The permitted length is **one to two pages** A4.

1) SUPERVISOR AND EXPERT CONSULTANTS

Give a list of expert consultants who will significantly contribute to the project and ensure its professional quality. Explain their specific contribution, their qualification and key results of their previous work and open science related activities (if relevant) as well as their experience in supervision and mentoring of students. It is not necessary to mention all the consultants or collaborators.

2) DEPARTMENT AND COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS

High quality facilities may be crucial for successful implementation of the project. Describe briefly the facilities available at your training institution necessary for the proposed project. If your training institution lacks some special equipment, consider collaboration with other academic institutions or private sector and describe its rationale and benefits. Provide a list of planned visits and related open science activities of your or cooperating institutions.

3) OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

Finally, it is possible to provide other relevant information that you want to emphasize and which cannot be mentioned in other parts of the application.

2.4 Preparing the Application

Here are some general hints you should follow while preparing your application. Dedicating enough time to designing your co-creation project and writing the application is key for achieving the best results in the competition. The evaluators focus on your detailed state-of-the art knowledge of the chosen problem. The evaluators will also examine whether your project addresses an important and current scientific problems within a domain of your choice. The project design and viability are also very important criteria.

Your application should give clear answers to the following questions:

- **What problem is addressed in the project?**
- **Why are you interested in this topic and what is your role in the project?**
- **How do you plan to solve the problem?**
- **What are the expected results of the project?**

Keep in mind that the evaluators decide whether your project is worthwhile and well-designed, whether you are able to carry it out and the proposed outcomes are realistic. The addressed problem must be important, but not overly ambitious. It is important to clearly and strictly distinguish what you intend to do yourself and what will be done by your collaborators.

All of the above will be judged only upon your application. The evaluators will only learn the facts you provide them in your application. Your goal is to "sell" your previous results and achievements and to highlight your exceptional qualities in comparison to other applicants. Therefore, pay extra attention to make your application clear and informative. Avoid inaccurate or misleading data. Remember that vague or incomprehensible information may be the cause for a reduced score.

Ask yourself whether each sentence is clear and really necessary for understanding the project. Let your colleague or friend, who is not familiar with the project, read your proposal. Ask whether he or she understands your proposal. Such informal criticism can be very helpful.

3. The Competition

The competition has 3 rounds:

1. Formal review of applications
2. Open Peer Review of applications
3. Expert review of applications

In the first competition round the applications are formally reviewed. In the second the application is submitted through an open peer review platform (the specific one will be defined after the deadline for submissions ends) to enable an open peer review process of your application. Be aware, this means that your application and all the details in the application will be openly available on the internet for everyone to read and give comments. In the third round the content of the applications is evaluated. The last part of the evaluation process is anonymous; the names of the evaluators are not public. The results of each round are announced via the registration system or webpage and the administrator notifies the applicants by e-mail.

3.1 Formal Review of Applications

In the first competition round, the administrator carries out a formal review of applications. Only the applications that meet all the formal criteria pass to the second round for an open peer review or directly to third round to expert review, if the opt-out mode described below in the round two is used by the applicant. Applications that do not meet the formal criteria are invalid and cannot be accepted for further evaluation. JCMR reserves the right to contact applicants for further clarification in during the formal review stage.

The application is checked against the following formal criteria:

- The application has been submitted via the registration system during the registration period by the set deadline
- The application provides all the mandatory information specified in the second chapter of this guide
- The application is complete and provides all the required information
- The application has the required form, layout, length and language

3.2 Open Peer Review of Applications

This round serves to gather more insight and observation by the community of your field of study for the final decision of the evaluators in the third round. In case your project contains some part that cannot be shared openly, you have the possibility to point out this issue to the administrator of this call prior to submission of your application. In such case you need to describe clearly the reasons why you cannot submit part or all the application to the open peer review. The final decision about your application is based on the experts' recommendations and closing your application or part of it for this round will not alter your final results, but we strongly recommend to use this opt-out mode only if there is some legal or business reason for it.

3.3 Expert Review of Applications

In the third round of evaluation the applications are reviewed remotely by expert evaluators. The administrator ensures that each application is reviewed by at least 2 evaluators in order to establish the ranking of applicants. The evaluators review all assigned applications independently by scoring and commenting key parts of the application (applicant, project, supervisor & facilities). The aim of the comments is to provide feedback to the applicants, which they may use to improve their projects regardless of their result in the competition.

Table 2: Evaluation Scale

	EXCELLENT (100-81p)	ABOVE AVERAGE (80-61 p)	AVERAGE (60-41 p)	BELOW AVERAGE (40-21 p)	POOR (20-0 p)
Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + demonstrates excellent results, his or her level is unique compared to other applicants +shows great qualification and motivation for choosen studies, for reaching the project objectives and obtaining original and scientifically valuable results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +demonstrates very good results, which are above average compared to others +great motivation for successful studies and accomplishment of the project objectives, expectations of acquiring original and scientifically valuable results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +demonstrates average results +well motivated to complete the project +expected results may be a useful addition to the current knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +the information provided shows that results and experience of the applicant are below average +It can be assumed that the applicant is not sufficiently qualified and motivated to complete the project and obtain scientifically valuable results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +the information provided shows very poor results and experiece of the applicant +It can be assumed that the applicant is not qualified and motivated to complete the project and obtain scientifically valuable results
Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +very well designed, based on an original idea, with clear objectives +in terms of originality, importance and proposed solutions, the project proves an extraordinary quality which well exceeds the common level +the results promise a significant original contribution to the scientific knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +very well designed, based on a new idea, with clear objectives + In terms of originality, importance of ideas and proposed solutions, the project's quality is above average +the results may be useful for further development of scientific knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +based on correct assumptions, contains interesting ideas, the proposed solution is viable, its quality is average compared to other projects +the project design is generally correct but not fully clear in details and requires additional work + the project objectives can be achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +original contribution of the project is unclear, expected results have minimal impact on the development of scientific knowledge +methodology is incomplete and the objectives cannot be achieved without additional adjustments +the design and the time schedule are not suitable for reaching the objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + the original contribution of the project is negligible or none +the project is just a variation of a known solution +the methodology does not allow the achievement of the objectives, the time schedule is inadequate, it is not based on correct assumptions
Team and Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +supervisor, external consultants and department facilities provide a supportive and inspiring environment +their experience and excellent results guarantee successful project implementation and applicant's training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +very good department facilities and reputable supervisor and external consultants with necessary experience and significant results +It can be considered as a guarantee for successful project implementation and applicant's training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +department facilities, supervisor and consultants are at average level +standard results and experience +the team and facilities are sufficient for successful project implementation and applicant's training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +the information provided shows that the department, supervisor and consultants are below the average, demonstrate minimum international experience and collaboration +the team and facilities do not provide a credible guarantee for successful project implementation and applicant's training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +the information available suggests that the results of the department, supervisor and consultants are very poor +negligible or no international experience +the team and facilities do not guarantee successful project implementation and applicant's training

Table 3: Score Calculation

Evaluated Area	Partial score	Weight	Total points
Applicant	0 – 100 points	30 %	0 – 30 points
Project	0 – 100 points	50 %	0 – 50 points
Team and Facilities	0 – 100 points	20 %	0 – 20 points
Total	–	100 %	max. 100 points

In the next phase, the second review is made available to the evaluator for revision of his or her scoring and comments. At this stage, the evaluators can correct their views having taken into account the opinion of the second evaluator. If, after the revision, any two reviews of the same application differ significantly, the application will be reviewed by a third evaluator.

When all the applications are reviewed, the administrator sets up the ranking of applicants after the third competition round. The ranking of applicants is determined by the overall score of their application. The overall score is a simple average of two expert reviews. If there are three reviews, the overall score of the application is the simple average of two reviews with closer score.

The final results of the competition will be announced on the JCMM website. There is no legal entitlement to grant a scholarship.

Conclusion

The beneficiaries will sign an agreement with the administrator. The agreement is expected to be signed shortly after the announcement of the final results. One of the prerequisites to conclude the agreement is to provide a confirmation of student status of applicant and, if requested by the administrator, other documents referred to in the application.

The scholarship in the total amount of € 5,000 (equivalent in CZK) will be paid to the beneficiary in three instalments, 40% as prefinancing, 30% as interim payment and 30% after the final presentation and delivering the co-creation project. However, the beneficiary must fulfil a series of commitments stated in the agreement; otherwise the financial contribution will be withdrawn. A brief project description will be annexed to the agreement.

There is a commitment to submit a brief monitoring report in the middle of the period to be given interim payment. Furthermore, the beneficiary agrees to continue in his / her university study without interruption and notify the administrator of any change in his / her student status, as well as of any substantial change in the co-creation project. The beneficiary also confirms that he or she will observe the rules of publicity and open science principles and will cooperate with the administrator.

Grant holders could be invited to a seminar that will acquaint them with principles of open science and responsible research and innovation.

Beneficiaries will present their co-creation project to a stakeholder panel at a closing event. The dates and arrangements will be announced in due course.

Supervisors of the grant holders will be remunerated for their involvement in the selected projects.

Contact

If you have any further questions regarding the competition, please, do not hesitate to contact us.

Mr. Michael Doležal, ORION project manager; e-mail: michael.dolezal@jcmm.cz

Ms. Jana Musilová, ORION project manager; e-mail: jana.musilova@jcmm.cz