

Annex 4

Academic Career Grants
Regulations for the Open Call for Proposals "Scientist Grants 2024" of
Riga Technical University

Project Proposal Evaluation Methodology and Individual/Consolidated Evaluation Form for the Project Proposal

Contents

I.	Terms Used	1
II.	Scientific Evaluation of the Project Proposal	2
III.	Individual Evaluation of the Project Proposal	2
IV.	Consolidated Evaluation of the Project Proposal	6
V.	Individual/Consolidated Evaluation Form for the Project Proposal	7

Introduction

The methodology for the evaluation of the Project Proposal and the Final Scientific Report of the Project (hereinafter - the methodology) has been developed for the Open Call for Proposals "Scientist Grants 2024" of Riga Technical University with a minimum Project implementation period of 12 months, for the preparation and evaluation of the necessary documentation.

The methodology is designed for the independent scientific experts (hereinafter - the expert) who carry out the scientific evaluation of the Project Proposal and the Final Scientific Report of the Project.

The methodology has been developed in compliance with Clause 29 of Cabinet Regulation No. 721 of 5 December 2023 "Implementation Regulations for the Second Round "Consolidation and Implementation Grants for Governance Changes" of Reforms 5.2 and of Investment 5.2.1.1.i "Research, Development and Consolidation Grants" of Reform 5.2.1.r "Higher Education and Science Excellence and Governance Reform" of Investment Direction "Ensuring the Change of the Higher Education Governance Model" (hereinafter - Cabinet Regulation No. 721. Riga, 5 December 2023 (Minutes No. 60, §59))

I. Terms Used

1.	Scientific Team	Scientific and academic staff and scientific support staff involved in the implementation of the Project. The Scientific Team is composed of the Project Leading Researcher, Project Implementers, including Student Project Implementers.
2.	Project Applicant	Project Leading Researcher and the Head of the Unit implementing the Project (Institute Director or Dean).
3.	Head of Scientific Institute	The Head of the Project Applicant's research institute, who approves the submission of the Project Proposal and takes responsibility for the achievement of the Project deliverables, and within whose institute the Project is implemented and is responsible for the execution of its parts, in accordance with the terms of the contract concluded.

4.	Project Leading Researcher	The scientist who proposes the Project, manages the Project, ensures its implementation - plans and supervises the performance of the Project's tasks, is responsible for his/her own performance and the performance of other persons involved in the Project in accordance with the Project's tasks and scientific ethics, and for the timely preparation and submission of documentation describing the overall progress of the Project.
5.	Project Implementer	A member of the Scientific Team who carries out individual scientific tasks in the implementation of the Project, including a student at the University ¹ (hereinafter - the Student Project Implementer).
6.	Student Project Implementer	A member of the Scientific Team - a student at the University (hereinafter - the Student) who carries out individual scientific tasks in the implementation of the Project.
7.	Expert	A foreign scientist who independently evaluates the Project Proposal and the Final Scientific Report of the Project and whose scientific qualifications, evaluation expertise and work experience are relevant to the scientific field and subject matter of the Project Proposal and the Final Scientific Report.
8.	Reporter	The expert who carries out the individual scientific evaluation of the Project Proposal, the Final Scientific Report of the Project and the consolidated evaluation of the Project Proposal, the Final Scientific Report of the Project, in agreement with the other expert.

II. Scientific Evaluation of the Project Proposal

1. The Latvian Council of Science (hereinafter - LCS), on behalf of RTU, shall organise and carry out the scientific assessment of the Project Proposals, involving two independent foreign experts for the evaluation of each Project Proposal.
2. The selection of foreign scientific experts by the LCS shall be carried out in accordance with established guidelines and guiding principles, ensuring the confidentiality of scientific information and research data, as well as the protection of personal data.
3. The experts declare that there is no conflict of interest and that the information relating to the content of the Research Project and its evaluation is confidential and cannot be disclosed to third parties or used for the expert's own interests. The scientific quality evaluation of the results of the Scientist Grant Project is anonymous with respect to the implementer of the Research Application and any third parties. The name, scientific degree and organisation of the expert shall be made known to the other experts assessing the Research Project after the completion of the individual scientific quality evaluation of the Research Application and before the consolidated assessment.
4. The scientific quality of Project Proposals shall be assessed by foreign scientific experts in accordance with the evaluation methodology and the evaluation criteria.

III. Individual Evaluation of the Project Proposal

5. The expert shall complete the Individual Evaluation Form for the Project Proposal (Annex 4) and approve the individual evaluation of the Project Proposal within two months from the date of conclusion of the Expert Contract and receipt of access to the Project Proposal and all necessary information, unless a different deadline is set in the Expert Contract.

¹in accordance with Article 44(1) of the Law on Higher Education Institutions

6. In the individual evaluation, the expert shall assess each criterion and provide a score in points for each criterion, taking into account the considerations set out in this methodology.
7. The criteria shall be evaluated by awarding between 1 and 5 points per criterion. If the Project Proposal's score in a given criterion exceeds the requirements of the previous lowest score but does not fully meet the requirements of the next highest score, the score may also be expressed as an intermediate score in increments of 0.2. Description of the score for each point:
 - 7.1. Excellent - 5 points (excellent submission, meets or exceeds the highest requirements of the criterion in the relevant scientific field, any imperfections in the Proposal are minor);
 - 7.2. Good - 4 points (good Project Proposal, meets the requirements of the criterion in the relevant scientific field, but there are some shortcomings);
 - 7.3. Satisfactory - 3 points (satisfactory Project Proposal, generally meets the requirements of the criterion in the relevant scientific field, with some shortcomings that will make it difficult to implement the Project and achieve high results);
 - 7.4. Weak - 2 points (weak Project Proposal, partial or only general compliance with the requirements of the criterion in the relevant scientific field, identifiable shortcomings that make it difficult to successfully implement the Project and achieve its objectives);
 - 7.5. Unsatisfactory - 1 point (unsatisfactory Project Proposal, does not meet the requirements of the criterion in the relevant scientific field, and the information provided is insufficient for the assessment in the criterion, and there are significant shortcomings that make the implementation of the Project and the achievement of the objectives questionable).
8. The experts' consolidated evaluation score of the Project Proposal shall be expressed in points in accordance with Section 42 of the Regulations.
9. Based on Section 42 of the Regulations, the weighting of the criteria against the total score in points of the Project Proposal shall be:
 - 9.1. the scientific quality of the Project Proposal - 50%;
 - 9.2. the impact of the Project's results - 30%;
 - 9.3. the Project's feasibility and provisions - 20%.
10. The expert shall provide a reasoned justification for the scores in points given for each criterion.
11. Within three (3) working days from the date of receipt of the expert's individual evaluation of the Project Proposal, the LCS shall assess the compliance of this individual evaluation with the criteria as well as the methodology of the expert evaluation, if necessary returning this evaluation to the expert for clarification/revision, justifying the reasons for the return, by sending a notification by e-mail. In case of a return, the expert shall, within three (3) working days from the date of receipt of the notification from the LCS, update, revise and approve the individual evaluation in the Information System.
12. The expert shall complete the individual evaluation in the Information System (see Annex 4 "Individual/Consolidated Evaluation Form for the Project Proposal") according to the following criteria and considerations:

Individual/Consolidated Evaluation of the Project Proposal		
Project title:		
Expert(s):		
1.	Criterion: Scientific Quality of the Project Proposal	Maximum 5 points
1.1.	Consideration: scientific quality, reliability and novelty of the research	<i>The expert shall justify the score in points given by taking into account the fulfilment of the criterion as a whole and the fulfilment of each criterion consideration.</i> <i>1. Specific information for the criterion is given in Chapter 1 "Scientific Excellence" of Part B "Description of the Project Application" of the</i>
1.2.	Consideration: scientific quality of the chosen research strategy and	<i>"Description of the Project Application" of the</i>

	methodological approaches, and relevance to the objectives	<i>Project Proposal, as well as Sub-chapter 2.1 "Project Scientific Results and Technological Insights and Their Dissemination Plan", but the evaluation of the criterion shall take into account the Project Proposal as a whole.</i>
1.3.	Consideration: ability of the Proposal to generate new knowledge or technological insights	<i>2. The scientific excellence of the Project, including the chosen research strategy and methodological approaches, as well as the ability to generate new knowledge or technological insights and the justification of the need for the Project and the novelty of the Project in the context of the field of research, shall be assessed according to the specificities of the relevant scientific field or fields and of the Project, as well as the specificities of the institutions of the Applicant and of the Project Cooperation Partners (if any). Particular attention shall be paid to the involvement of foreign research staff from the QS WUR 2024 TOP 500 universities.</i>
1.4.	Consideration: contribution of the Cooperation Partners (if any), their scientific capacity, the quality of the cooperation foreseen	
2.	Criterion: Impact of Project Results	Maximum 5 points
2.1.	Consideration: expected transfer of generated knowledge and skills to further activities and scientific capacity building	<i>A project website is not a project requirement. The expert shall justify the score in points given by taking into account the fulfilment of the criterion as a whole and the fulfilment of each criterion consideration.</i>
2.2.	Consideration: opportunities for research development, including contributions to the preparation of new projects for submission to the European Union's Horizon Europe calls for proposals and other research and innovation support programmes and technology initiatives	<i>1. Specific information for the criterion is given in Chapter 2 "Impact" of Part B "Description of the Project Application" of the Project Proposal, but the assessment of the criterion shall take into account the Project Proposal as a whole. 2. The results and their expected impact, including the intended transfer of results to further activities and scientific capacity building, opportunities for further development of research (e.g. new research project preparation, engagement in international cooperation networks, in particular with QS WUR TOP 500 universities), shall be assessed according to the specificities of the relevant scientific field or fields and of the Project, as well as the specificities of the Applicant's Unit and of the Project Consolidation Partner (if any).</i>
2.3.	Consideration: the research will generate knowledge relevant to the sector, the economy and society	
2.4.	Consideration: sustainability of the knowledge generated and a qualitative dissemination plan, including planned scientific publications (Q1 publications with co-authors from QS WUR TOP 500 universities) and raising public awareness	

2.5.	Consideration: the implementation of the research contributes to strengthening the scientific capacity, including cooperation with QS WUR TOP 500 universities, of the research staff, including students.	<p><i>3. The expert shall assess the plans described in the Project Proposal for identifying stakeholders, applying the right forms of cooperation and transferring the knowledge generated by the Project (e.g. in recommendations, guidelines, prototyping, etc.).</i></p> <p><i>4. The expert shall assess how well the Project has involved students and DSc candidates. Information on the workload of the Project Scientific Team, including students and DSc candidates, can be found in Chapter 2 "Project Implementation Team" of Part A of the Project Proposal.</i></p> <p><i>5. The sustainability of the Project's results shall be assessed in relation to the expected scientific publications and the dissemination of the Project's results in scientific conferences. Consideration shall be given to whether original scientific articles included in Q1 quartile journals indexed in SCOPUS or Web of Science databases, and written with co-authors from QS WUR 2024 Top 500 universities, are foreseen. The highest score shall be awarded only if such articles are foreseen in Q1 journals.</i></p> <p><i>6. The expert shall assess whether the Project will contribute to raising public awareness, to ensure the transfer of knowledge and increasing their understanding of the knowledge generated by the Project, and to contribute to society in addressing the specific issues discussed in the Project. It shall be assessed whether the Project plans for the involvement of stakeholders in the use of the results. The potential of the Project to raise public awareness of the Project's results and to increase the socio-economic impact of the Project's results shall be assessed (in Part B "Description of the Project Application", Subchapter 2.2 "Socio-economic Impact and Publicity of the Results" of the Project Proposal).</i></p>
3.	Criterion: Project Feasibility and Provisions	Maximum 5 points
3.1.	Consideration: quality of the research work plan and its relevance to the objective. The resources foreseen are adequate and sufficient to achieve the objective. The research aims to ensure efficient use of resources. The planned work steps and tasks are clearly defined, relevant and reliable	<i>The expert shall justify the score in points given by taking into account the fulfilment of the criterion as a whole and the fulfilment of each criterion consideration. Specific information for the criterion is given in Chapter 3 "Implementation" of Part B "Description of the Project Application" and in Part C "Curriculum Vitae" of the Project Proposal, but in assessing the criterion the Project Proposal as a whole shall be taken into account.</i>
3.2.	Consideration: scientific qualifications of the Project Scientific Supervisor and	

	the Project Implementers, as indicated in the curriculum vitae (CV) submitted	<i>The feasibility of the Project, including the research work plan prepared, the research management and quality management foreseen, the resources foreseen, the infrastructure available, shall be assessed according to the specificities of the relevant scientific field or fields and of the Project, as well as the specificities of the Applicant and of the Consolidation Partner (if any).</i>
3.3.	Consideration: appropriate research management, including quality management, is foreseen. The management organisation allows to follow the progress of the research. Potential risks have been assessed and a plan developed to avoid or mitigate them	<i>The Applicant has the possibility to involve other consolidation partner, if this is necessary to achieve the Project's objectives.</i>
3.4.	Consideration: the research plans to involve researchers from QS WUR TOP 500 universities, the necessary research infrastructure is in place, including access to Cooperation Partners' facilities (if applicable)	<i>Particular attention shall be paid to the involvement of foreign scientific staff from QS WUR 2024 TOP 500 universities and the highest score can be obtained if such staff is employed in the Project for at least 3 months.</i>
3.5.	Consideration: the institution carrying out the research and the Consolidation Partner (if applicable) have the necessary knowledge and expertise	<i>The expert shall assess the relevance of the scientific qualifications and experience of the Project Scientific Leader and the Project Implementers to the achievement of the Project's objectives and the intended task performance, based on the curriculum vitae submitted in Part C "Curriculum Vitae" of the Project Proposal (which must be submitted by the Project Scientific Leader and the Implementers); It shall be noted that the duration of the implementation of the Project cannot be less than 12 months. The planned implementation of the Project shall be assessed in relation to the completed Part A, Chapter 4 "Project Budget" of the Project Proposal, which provides for the costs of the salaries of the Scientific Team, material and technical support, travel and publication costs regarding the Project. There are no conditions for mutual costs sharing within the Call for Proposals. The maximum amount of funding per Project is EUR 100,000.</i>

IV. Consolidated Evaluation of the Project Proposal

13. The Reporter shall, in accordance with the terms of reference and deadlines of the Expert Contract, prepare a consolidated evaluation score in points of the Project Proposal in accordance with Annex 5 "Individual/Consolidated Evaluation Form for the Project Proposal" to the Regulations. The Reporter shall prepare a consolidated evaluation score in points for the Project Proposal taking into account the individual scores of the two experts on the Project Proposal and agree on it with the other expert before submitting it to the LCS Information System.
14. The Project Secretary shall assess the conformity of the consolidated scores in points of the Project Proposal with the methodology within three working days and validate them in the Information System. If the consolidated evaluation score in points of the Project Proposal is inadequate or does not provide sufficient reasoning for the evaluation given, it shall be returned to the Reporter,

indicating the shortcomings and weaknesses of the Project Proposal. Within three working days from the date of receipt of the notification of the returned evaluation by e-mail from the Information System, the Reporter shall revise the consolidated evaluation score in points of the Project Proposal and submit it in the Information System for approval by the LCS, subject to prior agreement with the other expert.

Individual/Consolidated Evaluation Form for the Project Proposal

Project title:		
Expert(s):		
1.	Criterion: Scientific Quality of the Project Proposal	Maximum 5 points
1.1.	Consideration: scientific quality, reliability and novelty of the research	(justification)
1.2.	Consideration: scientific quality of the chosen research strategy and methodological approaches, and relevance to the objectives	
1.3.	Consideration: ability of the Project to generate new knowledge or technological insights	
1.4.	Consideration: contribution of Cooperation Partners (in particular QS WUR 2024 TOP 500 universities and their scientific staff), their scientific capacity, the planned quality of the cooperation	
2.	Criterion: Impact of Project Results	Maximum 5 points
2.1.	Consideration: expected transfer of generated knowledge and skills to further activities and scientific capacity building	(justification)
2.2.	Consideration: opportunities for research development, including contributions to the preparation of new projects for submission to the European Union's Horizon Europe calls for proposals and other research and innovation support programmes and technology initiatives	
2.3.	Consideration: the research will generate knowledge relevant to the sector, the economy and society	
2.4.	Consideration: sustainability of the knowledge generated and a qualitative dissemination plan, including planned scientific publications (Q1 publications with co-authors from QS WUR TOP 500 universities) and raising public awareness	

2.5.	Consideration: the implementation of the research contributes to strengthening the scientific capacity of the postdoctoral researcher, including cooperation with QS WUR TOP 500 universities.	
3.	Criterion: Project Feasibility and Provisions	Maximum 5 points
3.1.	Consideration: quality of the research work plan and its relevance to the objective. The resources foreseen are adequate and sufficient to achieve the objective. The research aims to ensure efficient use of resources. The planned work steps and tasks are clearly defined, relevant and reliable	(justification)
3.2.	Consideration: scientific qualifications of the Project Scientific Leader and the Project Implementers, as indicated in the curriculum vitae (CV) submitted	
3.3.	Consideration: appropriate research management, including quality management, is foreseen. The management organisation allows to follow the progress of the research. Potential risks have been assessed and a plan developed to avoid or mitigate them	
3.4.	Consideration: the research plans to involve researchers from QS WUR TOP 500 universities, the necessary research infrastructure is in place, including access to the facilities of the Consolidation Partners (if applicable)	
3.5.	Consideration: the institution carrying out the research and the Consolidation Partner (if applicable) have the necessary knowledge and expertise	

Criteria	Scientific quality	Impact	Implementation	TOTAL
Points				
Weight	50%	30%	20%	