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 methods  Appropriateness 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. |  |  |