

EVALUATION FORM FOR THE EXPERT'S ASSIGNMENTS RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GRANT AGREEMENT

Name of Expert	
Name of evaluator	
Date of evaluation	
The name of the programme under which the evaluation was carried	

Subject of the evaluation	Description	Scoring ¹ (scale 0-5 points)
Substantive preparation / Quality of substantive justifications / Reliability	<p>The expert has knowledge of the FENG and its objectives, the call documentation and the 'Project selection criteria' which are the subject of the Assignment. He/she is prepared to the meeting, provides concrete facts on which he/she bases his/her opinion on the project (presents the world/country situation, provides specific data figures, gives examples of publication titles or implementations, indicates specific names of specialists/companies in the field, etc.).</p> <p>He/she is familiar with the documentation of all projects in the evaluation of which he/she is involved (not only those where he/she is the lead expert) to such an extent that he/she makes objective and specific statements on a given topic.</p> <p>The justifications are objective, logical, specific, coherent, based on facts, reliable data, indicating all the circumstances that led to a given number of points being awarded or not for each of the assessed criteria. The assessment is complete (no omissions), internally consistent, reliable, unambiguous and does not require further analysis or revision.</p>	
Cooperation within the group of Experts	<p>Communicates effectively with other panel members, strives to achieve a collective opinion. Is able to communicate orally (or, if the situation so requires, in writing) information appropriate to the standpoint whilst maintaining the required form of expression and respecting other panel members and their opinions. Communicates in a precise and clear manner adapted to the level of the audience (does not misuse specific terms, bearing in mind that the panel is composed of representatives of both science and business). Maintains a logical and coherent speech.</p>	
Cooperation with FNP	<p>The evaluation covers the ongoing contacts with the FNP employee (the expert answers emails and phone calls). The expert takes a proactive approach to clarify any doubts that arise, to fill any missing information. Provides information on (non-availability in advance. Appears punctually at expert panel meetings (if applicable).</p>	
Reprezentowanie instytucji	<p>He/she communicates with the Applicant in a calm and controlled manner. His/her statements are understandable and adapted to the level of the audience and his/her behaviour reflects high personal culture and care for the image of the institution. He fulfils the requirements of the ethical code (e.g. his/her dress code is appropriate, moderate).</p>	
Terminowość	<p>Appears punctually at expert panel meetings. Delivers the results of assigned tasks within the timeframes set out in regulations and procedures or within the</p>	

¹ description of the scoring to the criteria: 0 - does not meet criterion ; 1 - insufficient ; 2 - average ; 3 - moderate ; 4 - good ; 5 - very good

	timeframes agreed with the FNP staff member. Reports any problems with deadlines to the FNP staff member.	
Total score²		
Additional remarks³:		

.....
Signature of the expert evaluator

.....
Signature of Director DP

² The expert scores positively when a minimum of 17.5 points (70%) is obtained.

³ Optional

EVALUATION FORM FOR THE EXPERT'S ASSIGNMENTS RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GRANT AGREEMENT

Name of Expert	
Name of evaluator	
Date of evaluation	
The name of the programme under which the evaluation was carried	

Categories under evaluation			Evaluation scale 0-5 ¹
1.	Knowledge on the object of the assignment ²	<i>The expert's opinion is based on the background documents provided by the IB and the information included in the Assignment.</i>	/0-5 points/
2.	Quality of substantive justifications	<i>The justifications are objective, logical, specific, consistent, based on facts, and reliable data. The prepared opinion is reliable, unambiguous and does not require further analysis and changes.</i>	/0-5 points /
3.	Cooperation with FNP, including communication	<i>Regular interactions with the FNP staff member; including in particular: keeping clarification up to date, performing reconciliations.</i>	/0-5 points /
4.	Availability	<i>Availability at the stage of assigning tasks</i>	/0-5 points /
5.	Timeliness	<i>Delivering assignment results within the timeframes set by regulations and procedures or as agreed with the FNP staff member. Reporting any problems within the deadline.</i>	/0-5 points /
Total score ³			

.....
Signature of the expert evaluator

.....
Signature of Director DP

¹ description of the scoring to the criteria: 0 - does not meet criterion ; 1 - insufficient ; 2 - average ; 3 - moderate ; 4 - good ; 5 - very good

² E.g. on the objectives of the FENG, documentation of the call, project selection criteria, mid-term evaluation criteria, eligibility guidelines, etc.

³ The expert scores positively when a minimum of 17.5 points (70%) is obtained.