TEAM TECH PROGRAMME CORE FACILITY PLUS

EVALUATION FORM FOR REVIEWERS

General information

1. Each application is evaluated by at least two reviewers.

2. The reviewer should evaluate the application according to the criteria and supplement the awarded marks with an adequate commentary pointing out the application's strengths and weaknesses. The sum of marks for all the criteria is a maximum of 20 points. Each criterion has a defined upper limit of points.

3. After awarding marks for a given set of criteria, the reviewer provides a final recommendation of the application as a whole on a scale of 1 to 5 and lists any issues that need to be clarified during the panel's interview with the applicant.

4. Apart from the evaluation of merit-based criteria, the reviewer may suggest certain issues to be clarified with the applicant(s) during the 3rd stage of merit-based evaluation and is encouraged to

highlight whether the proposal is of 'high-risk - high-gain' nature or of cutting edge or ground-breaking/transformative potential or presents important economic/social opportunities.

5. Invitations for interviews are subject to the position of the proposal in the ranking list created based on the overall score and recommendations and issued only to those applicants whose applications met all the criteria.

6. The reviewer's identity will not be revealed to the applicant, nor to members of the panel conducting the third stage of the evaluation. Marks and commentaries may be passed on to the applicant while maintaining the reviewer's anonymity.

7. If due to the interdisciplinary nature of the proposal or due to other reasons a certain part of the proposal may be considered beyond the scope of the reviewer's expertise, we would be grateful for noting so in the comments section.

8. The online data system requires reviewers to give a statement on their potential conflict of interests. The Foundation considers the following situations as requiring reporting in this category:

    a. Personal relations:

        i. being related to the applicant, being a legal guardian of the applicant or in a relationship with the applicant;

        ii. being in personal conflict with the applicant.

    b. Professional relations: having any professional ties to the applicant in the past three years or professional ties will arise as a result of the success of this application.

    c. Research ties:

        i. providing references for the applicant;

        ii. academic supervision over the applicant during the past five years;

        iii. joint publications and/or Joint research project or grant in the past three years;

        iv. being in direct competition with the applicant.

    d. Economic ties: the proposal can have economic consequences for the reviewer.

    The reviewer's reporting of a conflict of interest does not mean the Foundation will necessarily dispense with their evaluation. The reviewer should withdraw from the evaluation if he/she is unable to be impartial.

9. A reviewer's consent to review an application submitted for a Foundation competition is equivalent to that reviewer agreeing to treat as confidential any and all information received, including the applicant's name and other data contained in the application. Treating the data as confidential also means that the contents of the application may not be used for any other purpose than the evaluation of the proposal.

10. The reviewer will evaluate the application impartially and compare it with the highest scientific standards in a given field.

11. Withdrawal from an evaluation does not free the reviewer from the obligation to maintain confidentiality of information.

12. Meeting the evaluation deadline guarantees proper running of the application selection procedure and ensures equal chances for all applicants. The reviewer agrees to inform the Foundation immediately of his/her inability to complete the evaluation on time.

1.	Applicant's name	
2.	Project title	

Evaluation criterion No.1:

Evaluation of the originality of the applicant's scientific track record based on his/her achievements described in the application

The following achievements are subjected to evaluation: not more than 5 publications, implementations, patents or other achievements that are presented as the most valuable in the opinion of the applicant, enclosed to the application. The subject of the evaluation is the originality of the achievement (invention, discovery etc.), and not its relative number, i.e. quality vs. quantity. While assessing the originality of R&D output of the individual applicant, the experts shall minimize the use of bibliometric data. The experts shall evaluate the applicant's contribution to the described implementations or examples of commercialisation of the research results, whether the applicant successfully solved any practical problems, whether he/she is suitably experienced in introducing the industrial or process-related innovations. The experts shall take into account the relative stage of the career of the scientist who submits the application.

Strengths:
….

Weaknesses:
…

Evaluation criterion No.2:

Evaluation of the assumptions, methodology and project results management
Experts evaluate the project on the basis of its assumptions (or preliminary research) and its description in terms of applying appropriate procedures, methods and the data processing (project feasibility). Other important aspects include specifying the expected consequences of the project, assumptions concerning results management and potential recipients interested in the outcomes (project dissemination).
Strengths: …
Weaknesses: …

Additional commentary:

Please provide any additional comments that in your opinion seems to be valuable in the relation to the assessed proposal, i.e. its novelty, eventual interdisciplinary character, etc.
…

Please list any potential issues to be explained by the applicant during the pitch session / an interview with the interdisciplinary panel of experts, if the applicant qualifies for the subsequent stage of the competition.
…

Whether in your opinion the proposed project falls into the category of *"high risk – high gain"* proposals, i.e. whether it is a particularly breakthrough application that poses exceptionally bold or risky hypotheses, whose results, if verified positively, may be of potentially transformative importance for the given fields of science or areas of economy?

YES		NO	

If you marked 'YES' please provide the rationale behind it, i.e. why it is so.
…

Evaluation table:

Criterion	Score	Mark
1. **Evaluation of the originality of the applicant's scientific track record based on his/her achievements described in the application** *(score from 0 to 10)*	The score from 0 to 10, means that the application meets the criteria to the following extent: (10-9) – highest (8-7) – very good (6-5) – good (4-3) – average (2-1) – low 0 – insufficient	
2. **Evaluation of the assumptions, methodology and project results management** *(score from 0 to 10)*	The score from 0 to 10, means that the application meets the criteria to the following extent: (10-9) – highest (8-7) – very good (6-5) – good (4-3) – average (2-1) – low 0 – insufficient	
	Total (maximum number of points: 20)	

The criteria shall be deemed as fulfilled if the application receives an arithmetic average of scores awarded by all experts of at least 3 point. The fulfilment of merit-based criteria does not imply that the application will be qualified for further stage of evaluation.

Recommendation	Mark
General evaluation of the application: *5 - outstanding application that should certainly receive funding,* *4 - very good application that should receive funding,* *3 - good application that may receive funding if there are sufficient funds,* *2 - average application that should rather not receive funding,* *1 - poor application that should not receive funding.*	

In order to be qualified for the subsequent stage of evaluation the application has to meet all the criteria and, at the same time, receive an average recommendation of at least 3 points.