EVALUATION FORM – SHORT PROPOSALS

CLINICAL RESEARCH GROUPS 2022

**Proposal Details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of the Clinical Research Group** |  |
| **Head** |  |

Table 1: Evaluation scheme

| Score | Explanation | Description |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | Excellent | The research project meets the criterion very well and fully. |
| 5 | Good | The research project meets the criterion well and to a predominant extent. |
| 4 | Average | The research project meets the criterion in a sufficient manner. |
| 3 | Poor | The research project meets the criterion to an inadequate extent. There are significant weaknesses. |
| 2 | Very poor | The research project addresses/meets the criterion to a very inadequate extent. The weaknesses clearly outweigh the few strengths. |
| 1 | Insufficient | The research project does not meet the criterion. |

Table 2: Evaluation of criterions

| Criterion | Score (1-6) | Comment |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1) Fit to the scope, relevance, potential* Fit to objectives, aims, and topics of the call text
* Feasibility of aims and objectives of the research project
 |  |  |
| 2) Excellence, innovativeness, originality* Originality, innovativeness, and contribution to new strategic knowledge and breakthrough implementation
* Potential impact of the research project?
 |  |  |
| 3) Research design and methodsAppropriateness of the conceptual approach:* Are the research questions clearly formulated?
* Are the objectives achievable within the duration of the CRG?
* Are the deliverables for the first funding period (4 years) and, in case of extension, the expected outcomes of the 8-year funding period, clearly described?
* Are the work packages/sub-projects appropriately selected in terms of number and content, and are the relevant experts assigned? Is something missing?

Appropriateness of project- and people management |  |  |
| 4) Team composition, collaborative/ interdisciplinary aspects, gender aspects* Suitability of expertise, balance of substantial contributions of team members to the CRG
* Composition of the CRG compared to the topic’s needs and international relevance
* Interdisciplinary, cross-sectorial collaboration, and co-creation
* How well are the Head/Mentor qualified to carry out the proposed research?
* How would you assess the academic qualifications of the Head/Mentor?
* Track record and/or other key expertise of the CRG members
 |  |  |
| 5) Financial plan/budget* Appropriateness of costing
 |  |  |
| 6) Overall assessment* What is your overall impression of the CRG proposal?
* Specifically, what would you consider its key strengths and weaknesses?

Please give reasons for your answers, taking as much space as you need. |  |  |