# Evaluation form

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **First name & Last name Evaluator:** | Click here to enter text. |
| **Acronym of the proposal:** | Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| **INSTRUCTIONS:*** *Fill out this evaluation form by* ***ticking the box(es)*** *that best represent(s) the aspect of the proposal, and by providing a* ***comment*** *for each subsection. Carefully consider the text above the tick boxes before marking them.*
* *Save the evaluation form in pdf and Word form as IndEval\_ACRONYM\_YourSurname*
* *Once you have completed the evaluation, please send the pdf and Word version to* *POST-COVID@belspo.be* *with as subject: Individual Evaluation [ACRONYM of the proposal].*

*For any questions please, contact* ***POST-COVID@belspo.be*** |

[ ]  *I certify there is no conflict of interest for evaluating this proposal and I will respect the rules of confidentiality.*

[ ]  *I confirm that I have read and accepted the GDPR and the BELSPO clauses referring to it.*

1. Scope of the Proposal
	1. Scope of the proposal with respect to the call text

*With reference to section C.1. of the proposal, provide a statement on the in/out of scope of the proposal.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **IN scope** | **Partially OUT of scope** | **OUT of scope** |
| The proposal is clearly in line with the philosophy and objectives of the call. | For part of the project, the link to the objectives of the call is loose or artificial. | The proposal fails to comply with the objectives of the call. The link to the call text is nonexistent or deficient. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. |

* 1. Scope of the proposal with respect to the state of the art (beyond/within)

*Section C.2. of the proposal does not require evaluation.*

1. Research Objectives and State of the Art
	1. How clear are the research objectives?

*With reference to section D.1. of the proposal, tick the box you most adhere to and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| The research objectives are very poor or insufficiently described and do not align. | The research objectives are unclear or do not align well with each other. | The research objectives are clear but could be improved. They align with each other in a plausible way. | The research objectives are very clear and align with each other in a convincing way. | The research objectives are very clearly stated with an outstanding alignment. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. |

* 1. Knowledge of the state of the art

*With reference to section D.1. of the proposal, tick the box you most adhere to and provide a comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| The proposal has major flaws regarding the state of the art. | The knowledge of the state of the art is rather poor. | The proposal demonstrates a sufficient knowledge of the state of the art in the domain, without critical omissions. | The proposal shows a good view of the state of the art in the domain, omissions are minimal. | The proposal shows a very good view of the state of the art in the domain, omissions are superfluous. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. |

* 1. Position of the research objectives with respect to the state of the art
		1. The team has declared to go BEYOND the state of the art

*With reference to section D.1. assess the way the proposal positions its research objectives with respect to the state of the art provided by the applicants. Tick the box you most adhere to and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| The proposal displays no added value to the state of the art. | The proposal displays a limited added value to the state of the art. | The proposal displays a reasonable added value to the state of the art without a pronounced innovative character. | The proposal displays great potential for innovation and interesting added value to the state-of-the-art. | The proposal is highly innovative and displays clear potential for progress beyond the on-going research efforts. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. |

* + 1. The team has declared to stay WITHIN the state of the art.

*With reference to section D.1. assess the way the proposal locates its research objectives with respect to the state of the art provided by the applicants. Tick the box you most adhere to and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| The catch-up effort with respect to the state of the art is non-existent and/or will not generate valuable results for Belgium. | The catch-up effort with respect to the state of the art is rather limited and will result in poor added value for Belgium. | The catch-up effort with respect to the state of the art is correct and promises to generate interesting results for Belgium. | The catch-up effort with respect to the state of the art is good and might generate useful results for Belgium. | The catch-up effort with respect to the state of the art is very good and will deliver important results for Belgium. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. |

1. Methodology
	1. How adequate is the methodology to address the research objectives?

*With reference to section D.3. of the proposal, assess the methodology and the way it is articulated to the stated research objectives. Tick the box you most adhere to and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| The methodology is underdeveloped and/or insufficiently argued, it does not provide pathways to the stated research objectives. | The methodology is underdeveloped and/or poorly argued, it does not provide sufficient pathways to the research objectives | The methodology is acceptable but not exempt of flaws. It provides reasonable pathways to (some of) the stated objectives. | The approach is appropriate and provides a good pathway to realize the objectives. | The approach is more than appropriate and provides confident pathways to realize the objectives. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

* 1. Data quality, expected end results and capacity to answer to the research objectives

*With reference to section D.3., assess the data (accessibility, description, quality), and the way it can generate end results that answer to the stated objectives. Tick the box you most adhere to and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| The data are insufficiently described to enable readers to form an opinion on the end results and how these answer the stated objectives. | The data have shortcomings and/or lacks details. The end results generated are difficult to assess wrt the stated objectives | The data are such that the objectives, methodology and expected outcomes form a coherent and reasonable unit, but possibly contain some gaps or shortcomings | The data is of quality and its use is elaborate, well matched to the objectives and expected outcomes. There is only room for minor improvement | The use of data is sophisticated, very well matched to the objectives and expected outcomes. There is no room for improvement. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

* 1. Multidisciplinary approach

*With reference to section D.4. of the proposal, assess whether the partnership is enabling the multidisciplinary approach requested for this project? Tick the box you most adhere to and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| The partnership brings no added value to the essential dimensions of the topic, hindering the realization of the project. | The partnership is insufficiently balanced in terms of disciplines, for the project to be achievable | The partnership is sufficiently balanced, for the project to be achievable. | The partnership is very well balanced in terms of the different dimensions, bringing a significative added value to the proposal. | The partnership is perfectly balanced in terms of all the different dimensions, making the whole partnership larger than the sum of its parts. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. |

* 1. Gender

*With reference to section D.3. and B.1., assess how the project considers aspects and/or issues related to gender/sex in the proposed research and in the composition of the partnership. Tick the box you most adhere to and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| Gender is not considered in the content of the project. There are serious gaps or shortcomings. | Gender is somewhat considered in the content of the project but contains serious gaps or shortcomings | Gender is sufficiently considered in the content of the project. There is room for improvement. | Gender is very well considered in the content of the project. It leaves little room for improvement. | Gender is perfectly and expertly considered in the content of the project. It leaves no room for improvement. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

* 1. Ethical aspects

*With reference to section D.3., asses the awareness of ethical issues of the project and ways to deal with these using appropriate channels. Tick the box you most adhere to and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| Ethical aspects are not or barely considered. | The evaluation of ethical issues has shortcomings and/or lacks details. | The proposal includes a sufficient evaluation of ethical issues and ways to deal with these. There is however room for improvement. | The proposal includes a good evaluation of ethical issues and ways to deal with these are thought through. | The proposal includes an exhaustive evaluation of ethical issues and expertly designed ways to deal with these. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

* 1. International/European approach

*With reference to section D.5. of the proposal, assess In what way the international/context is taken on board the project and against which existing evidence can the end results for Belgium be compared, if possible? Tick the box you most adhere to and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| The partnership has not considered the International/European dimension. | The partnership has overlooked this dimension and hardly provides any contextualisation of this aspect. | The partnership has considered this dimension and offers correct Int./Euro. context, although some evidence is omitted. | The partnership has more than sufficiently considered this aspect and only minor improvements are possible. | The partnership has perfectly integrated this dimension in its research design and will generate data for Belgium that enables an excellent reference point to the international/European context. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

1. Dissemination and Valorization
	1. Dissemination to scientific audiences

*With reference to section E.1. of the proposal, assess the quality of the dissemination to scientific audiences. Tick the box you most adhere to and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| The dissemination plan to scientific audiences is non-existent. | Scientific dissemination is minimal and not impactful. | Scientific dissemination is present but could be improved upon to gain impact | Scientific dissemination is well conceived and will prove impactful. | Scientific dissemination is very well conceived and will generate great impact on the scientific community. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

* 1. Follow-up committee during the scientific part of the project

*With reference to section E.2. of the proposal, Assess the coherence of the composition of the follow-up committee, its proposed role (informed, consulted, involved) and functioning (number of meetings, method of information exchange, etc.) with the foreseen impact of the project. Tick the box you most adhere to and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| This section is insufficiently documented and/or no committee is foreseen. | The proposal marginally involves stakeholders, and the functioning of the committee is poorly documented. | The follow-up committee members are sufficiently involved in the proposal in a way that will contribute to the realisation of the project. Improvements can be made in the composition or way of functioning. | The proposal provides very good and worthwhile interaction with pertinent and stakeholders that have a clear involvement. | The proposal depicts highly relevant, strong, dynamic interaction with stakeholders, including non-scientists, involving them in a highly synergetic manner (co-creation) from the early stages of the project |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

* 1. Impact plan

*With reference to section E.3.1 and E.3.2. of the proposal, assess the design of the impact plan (tasks, length, costs) and the willingness of beneficiaries (letters of support from policymakers and other non-academic stakeholders) to engage in discussions to convert the scientific evidence into meaningful lessons learned. Tick the box you most adhere to and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| The team has no real impact plan. | The impact plan offers weak engagement with pertinent policymakers and stakeholders. | The impact plan offers a decent engagement with stakeholders, the actions foreseen remain however classical in their design. | Policymakers and other stakeholders are well identified and willing to contribute in active ways to discuss the results and co-produce pertinent recommendations. | The team provides an excellent and original impact plan with clear adhesion of policymakers and other stakeholders to embark in innovative ways to turn the scientific results into meaningful lessons learned. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

1. Implementation
	1. Workplan and timetable

*With reference to section F.1. and F.2. of the proposal, assess the design of the workplan (work packages, list of deliverables and Milestones) and the timetable (including work intensity per partner). Tick the box you most adhere to and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| The work plan is ill designed, the workload is insufficient to realize the project and the work division between partners requires substantial adjustments. | The work planning is not adequately or sufficiently elaborated. Structural improvements are needed/the requested workload, and the investment of the partners calls for major adjustments. | The work planning is passably designed/the work distribution between partners calls for some improvement. | The work plan is elaborated in a well-thought manner, leaving room for minor improvements regarding efficiency, integration and synergy within the tasks. The work is well distributed between partners. | The work plan is very well designed. The requested level of person-power does not call for adjustments. The division of work between partners is excellently thought through. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

* 1. Data management

*With reference to section F.3., assess the way the data will be managed during and after the project and provide comments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| The data management is underdeveloped  | The data management contains significant shortcomings or gaps | The data management plan follows basic standards in making the generated data available | The data management plan follows very good standards, making the data easily available | There is an excellent data management plan in line with the highest standards to enable easy re-use of all data |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

* 1. Budget and cost justification

*With reference to section F.4.1., assess the way costs are justified, and how realistic the budget is against the objectives and expected outcomes and the way the budget is distributed amongst partners.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poor Quality – Insufficient Information** | **Medium Quality** | **Good Quality** | **High Good Quality** | **Exceptional** |
| The costs justification is insufficient and/or, insufficient information is provided regarding the budget required. | The cost justification is poorly in many areas and/or is not aligned with the objectives and expected outcomes of the project. | The cost justification is correct and realistic, leaving uncertainties in some areas. | The cost justification is more than adequate, promising value for money. | The cost justification is excellent, promising excellent value for money. |
|[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

1. STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*Provide comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, and highlight recommendations for the researchers and point(s) of attention for the panel.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strengths** | Click here to enter text. |
| **Weaknesses**  | Click here to enter text. |
| **Recommendations for improvement** | Click here to enter text. |
| **Point of attention to the panel**  | Click here to enter text. |

Other relevant comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |