

UGC - EVALUATION FORM

A) Binary criteria

1. Educational objectives of the project are formulated and sufficiently described YES x NO
2. Obligation to reach at least 1 publication in journals with IF or SJR is declared YES x NO

Comments (in case of at least one "NO" only):

B) Evaluation criteria (max. 100 points)

1. Overview of the current knowledge of proposed topic

- overview is well elaborated, covers the latest as well as basic knowledge 25 points
- overview covers well the latest knowledge but omits the basic sources 20 points
- overview is well elaborated but the very latest knowledge is missing 10 points
- overview is incomplete but provides at least the basic information 5 points
- overview is poorly elaborated, does not cover the core literature on the topic 0 points

Comments (in case of points reduction only):

2. Objectives and hypotheses

- objectives and hypotheses well formulated and appropriate 20 points
- objectives and hypotheses well formulated, hypotheses not easily answered 14 points
- objectives clearly defined, hypotheses not clear and difficult to prove 6 points
- objectives not clearly defined, hypotheses relevant 3 points
- objectives and hypotheses are wrongly formulated 0 points

Comments (in case of points reduction only):



3. Methods

- methods selected for the research are appropriate and well described 15 points
- methods selected for the research are appropriate but not well described 12 points
- methods selected for the research are partially appropriate, but well described 5 points
- methods selected for the research are partially appropriate, not clearly described 2 points
- methods are inappropriate, cannot support the successful completion of the project 0 points

Comments (in case of points reduction only):

4. Team members involvement and (work)loads

- roles of team members are clearly defined, loads correspond to the activities of the project 15 points
- roles of team members are clearly defined, loads do not correspond to the activities of the project 11 points
- role team members are not clearly defined, loads correspond to the activities of the project 7 points
- role of team members are not clearly defined, loads do not correspond to the activities of the project 3 points
- role of team members are defined insufficiently 0 points

Comments (in case of points reduction only):

5. Publication potential of the project in relation to the aims, team members and, mentor(s)

- high potential for top journals (D1/Q1*) 15 points
- high potential for good journals (Q2) 12 points
- potential for publication in lower ranked journals (Q3) 9 points
- publication potential low (Q4) 6 points



- no publication potential 0 points

**according to IF or SJR*

Comments (in case of points reduction only):

6. Risk analysis

- all major risks are mentioned and identified, methods of their elimination and prevention described sufficiently 10 points
- all major risks are mentioned, however, their identification, prevention and solutions are not sufficiently described 7 points
- some major risks are not mentioned, however, identification and prevention or solutions mentioned risks are sufficient 5 points
- some major risks are not mentioned and identification and prevention or solutions mentioned risks solutions are not sufficient 2 points
- risk analysis is insufficient 0 points

Comments (in case of points reduction only):

C) Final recommendations and comments

Strengths of the project (in bullet points only)

Weaknesses of the project (in bullet points only)

Overall recommendation (declare, whether you recommend the project for financing or not)

