

# Guidelines on Grant Proposal Evaluation 2011

All six criteria are evaluated with the following rating scale: 1 – poor; 2 – satisfactory; 3 – good; 4 – very good; 5 – excellent. It is allowed to use also the ratings 1.5; 2.5; 3.5 and 4.5.

We ask the evaluators to bear in mind that ideally, no more than 10% of all proposals should be rated as “excellent”, and no more than 25% as “very good”. As general practice, the proposals with average overall rating “3.5” and below will not receive financing.

Please add your comments to all criteria.

## 1. Scientific quality and innovativeness of the proposed project

- 5 – The proposed project is at a very high international level. The research ideas are innovative and of great interest to science, and/or with a potential broad impact on the development of economy and society.
- 4 – The proposed project is at a high international level. The research ideas are original and of interest to science, and/or with a potential impact on the development of economy and society.
- 3 – The proposed project is at a satisfactory international level. On principle, the research ideas are of interest to science, and/or with a potential impact on the development of economy and society.
- 2 – The proposed project does not reach an international level.
- 1 – The proposed project is of poor scientific value and lacks novelty.

## 2. Competence of the applicant and the research team

- 5 – The applicant and the research team are among the leading in their field. The publications and/or monographs are at a remarkable international level. The articles are published in the best peer-reviewed journals, or proceedings, which are indexed in the leading databases of the field. The monographs are published by internationally acknowledged publishers. The impact of the applicant (**number of citation**; the scientific level of the journals, where the articles are published) is, in the respective field, at a remarkable international level.
- 4 – The applicant and the research team are in the top of their field. The publications and/or monographs are at a good international level. The articles are published in respectable peer-reviewed journals, or proceedings, which are indexed in the leading databases of the field. The monographs are published by internationally acknowledged publishers. The impact of the applicant (**number of citation**; the scientific level of the journals, where the articles are published) is, in the respective field, at a good international level.
- 3 – The applicant and the research team are known in their field. The articles are published in peer-reviewed journals or international proceedings. The monographs are published by acknowledged publishers. The impact of the applicant (**number of citation**; the scientific level of the journals, where the articles are published) is, in the respective field, at a satisfactory international level.
- 2 – The applicant and the research team are not well known. The articles are published in journals and proceedings which are not indexed in the leading databases of the field. No monographs have been published. The impact of the applicant (**number of citation**; the scientific level of the journals, where the articles are published) does not reach an international level.
- 1 – The researchers’ scientific contribution and publishing productivity have been weak. The impact of the applicant (**number of citation**; the scientific level of the journals, where the articles are published) is of poor scientific value.

## 3. Relevance of the research topic

# Guidelines on Grant Proposal Evaluation 2011

- 5 – The proposed research topic is very timely and relevant both internationally and locally. The prospective results make a substantial contribution to the development of science, technology, and/or society.
- 4 – The proposed research topic is relatively timely and relevant both internationally and locally. The prospective results make a good contribution to the development of science, technology, and/or society.
- 3 – The proposed research topic is of interest, but not very timely and relevant. The prospective results make a moderate contribution to the development of science, technology, and/or society.
- 2 – The relevance of the proposed research topic is questionable. The prospective results do not make a significant contribution to the development of science, technology, or society.
- 1 – The proposed topic has been exhaustively studied by previous research. The prospective results have no scientific significance.

## **4. Justification of the methodology**

- 5 – The proposed methodology is at a very high international level.
- 4 – The proposed methodology is at a high international level.
- 3 – The proposed methodology is satisfactory.
- 2 – The proposed methodology is weak.
- 1 – The proposed methodology or the exposition of the methodology is deficient.

## **5. Planned participation of master's degree and doctoral students**

- 5 – Planned participation of master's degree and doctoral students is potentially very efficient.
- 4 – Planned participation of master's degree and doctoral students is efficient.
- 3 – Planned participation of master's degree and doctoral students is sufficient.
- 2 – Planned participation of master's degree and doctoral students is insufficient.
- 1 – Planned participation of master's degree and doctoral students is nonexistent.

## **6. Overall evaluation (does not have to be the mathematical average of the above ratings)**

- 5 – Excellent (among 10% of top-quality projects, strongly recommended for funding).
- 4 – Very good (among 25% of the best projects, recommended for funding).
- 3 – Good (among 50% of good projects, recommended for funding in case of available means).
- 2 – Satisfactory (among 80% of good projects, funding is not feasible).
- 1 – Poor (among 20% of poor projects, not recommended for funding).