

**EXPERT'S WORK EVALUATION SHEET TEMPLATE  
AS PART OF THE PROJECT SELECTION PROCEDURE  
UNDER THE SMART GROWTH OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME<sup>1</sup>**

Expert's full name	
Full name of the evaluating person	
Evaluation date	
Name of the programme under which the evaluation is conducted	

<b>Evaluation objective</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Score<sup>2</sup> (from 0 to 5 points)</b>
<b>Substantive preparation / Quality of substantive justifications / Reliability</b>	<p>The expert displays the knowledge of up-to-date tender documentation, including "the project selection criterion." He/she is prepared for meetings, states the actual facts on which his/her opinion regarding the project has been based (he/she presents the global/national circumstances, along with detailed numerical data, as well as indicates exemplary publications or implementations, and names of specialists/companies operating in a given field, etc.). He/she has familiarised himself/herself with the documentation regarding all the projects discussed at a given meeting (not only those for which he/she has acted as the leading expert) to the extent that he/she is now able to formulate reliable and objective opinions on a given issue.</p> <p>His/her justifications are objective, logical, concise, coherent, based on facts and reliable data. He/she refers to all the circumstances behind giving, or not giving, a certain number of points under each of the assessed criteria. The conducted assessment is complete (free from omissions), internally coherent, reliable and unambiguous, and it does not require any further analyses or modifications.</p>	
<b>Cooperation within a group of experts</b>	<p>He/she efficiently communicates with other members of the expert panel, and aims at accomplishing their common objective. He/she is able to provide information orally (and in writing if the circumstances so require), relevant for a given opinion, by preserving the adequate form of utterance, and by respecting other members of the expert panel and their opinions. His/her statements are precise, understandable and adequate for the interlocutors' level (he/she does not overuse specialised vocabulary, bearing in mind that the panel is composed of representatives of both the scientific and business circles). His/her statements are logical and coherent. He/she is an active listener and provides ongoing responses.</p>	
<b>Cooperation with the FNP</b>	<p>The evaluation shall cover ongoing contacts with an FNP representative (with the expert responding to e-mails and phone calls). The expert takes an active approach when it comes to clarifying any doubts and eliminating the identified omissions. He/she reports his/her (un)availability well in advance. He/she arrives at expert meetings on time (where applicable).</p>	

<sup>1</sup> The evaluation outcome shall be positive if at least 17.5 points (70%) are obtained by the expert.

<sup>2</sup> Score description: 0 – failure to meet the criterion; 1 – insufficient ; 2 – mediocre ; 3 – average ; 4 – good ; 5 – very good

<b>Institution representation</b>	He/she takes a calm and well-mannered approach when communicating with the Applicant. His/her statements are understandable and adequate for the interlocutors' level, and he/she displays high personal culture and attention to the institution's image. He/she complies with the ethical code (e.g. through appropriate clothing).	
<b>Timeliness</b>	He/she arrives at meetings on time. He/she provides the results of entrusted tasks on the dates defined under separate provisions and procedures, or as agreed with the FNP representative. He/she reports any potential problems related to observing the set deadlines to the FNP representative.	
<b>Additional remarks<sup>3</sup>:</b>		

.....  
*Signature of the person conducting expert evaluation*

---

<sup>3</sup> optional

## THE EVALUATION SHEET CONCERNING THE WORK PERFORMED BY EXPERTS ISSUING INDIVIDUAL OPINIONS<sup>1</sup>

Expert's full name	
Full name of the evaluating person	
Evaluation date	
Name of the programme as part of which the evaluation is conducted	

Evaluation categories			Evaluation score (from 0 to 5 points <sup>2</sup> )
1.	<b>The knowledge and use of the Operational Programme guidelines</b>	<i>Justifications are objective and based on reliable data. The conducted assessment is unambiguous, and does not require any further analyses or modifications.</i>	/0-5 pts/
2.	<b>Quality of substantive justifications</b>	<i>Justifications are objective, logical, concise, coherent, and based on facts and reliable data. The conducted assessment is reliable, unambiguous, and does not require any further analyses or modifications.</i>	/0-5 pts/
3.	<b>Cooperation with the FNP, including communication</b>	<i>Ongoing contacts with an FNP representative, which includes in particular providing ongoing clarifications and making arrangements.</i>	/0-5 pts/
4.	<b>Availability</b>	<i>Availability at the stage of assigning applications for assessment.</i>	/0-5 pts/
5.	<b>Timeliness</b>	<i>Providing the results of entrusted tasks on the dates defined under separate provisions and procedures, or as agreed with the FNP representative. Reporting potential problems related to observing the set deadlines.</i>	/0-5 pts/

.....  
Signature of the person conducting expert evaluation

<sup>1</sup> The evaluation outcome shall be positive if at least 17.5 points (70%) are obtained by the expert.

<sup>2</sup> Score description: 0 – failure to meet the criterion; 1 – insufficient ; 2 – mediocre ; 3 – average ; 4 – good ; 5 – very good