

Form approved by  
the Order No V- 167 of the Chairman  
of the Research Council of Lithuania of 25 March 2026

(Sample form of Expert Evaluation)

15<sup>th</sup> CALL FOR THE RESEARCH GROUPS PROJECTS

EXPERT EVALUATION FORM

Registration number of proposal .....  
Project title.....  
Principal investigator .....

**I. Have the project implementers planned due solutions for ethical issues related to project activities?**

YES                       NO                       NOT APPLICABLE

If NO, please explain: .....

***Advice for the expert.***

*It is assessed whether the proposal provides a justified explanation as to whether the project implementation will or will not involve ethical aspects (Subsection 3.2.7. of the proposal). If the project will involve such aspects, it is assessed whether the questions in the proposal related to these aspects have been answered appropriately.*

- *If the project implementation involves ethical aspects, the proposal must explain how these aspects will be addressed.*
  - ***Please note:*** *the statement indicating that the institutions or a professional ethics committee will be consulted is considered insufficient.*
- *If evaluation of this criterion is NO – the proposal becomes ineligible for funding.*
  - *Even though the assessment is NO, the expert must still provide a thorough evaluation according to all other evaluation criteria, because: the individual score for this criterion may change after expert discussions during the group evaluation of the proposal, or if the principal investigator indicates a possible mistake made by the expert committee.*

More information on research ethics is provided in the [Guidelines for Ethical Review](#).

## II. Evaluation according to the criteria:

Evaluation criteria <sup>1</sup>	Maximum possible score <sup>2</sup>	Weighting factor <sup>3</sup>	Score given	Threshold score	Explanation of evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengths and weaknesses (mandatory for each evaluation criteria). *When a criterion is assessed with the maximum score, weaknesses do not need to be indicated.</li> <li>• Comments must be directly related to the criterion being evaluated.</li> <li>• Evaluation must be in line with the given score.</li> </ul>	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
<b>1. Scientific vision of the project: scientific excellence, project aim and objectives</b>						
<p><b>1.1. Vision and scientific excellence</b></p> <p><i>Evaluate the scientific vision and scientific excellence of the project, taking into account:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>the current state of knowledge and the problem to be addressed, as well as the importance of the scientific challenge;</i></li> <li><i>the clarity of the research questions, hypotheses and/or propositions;</i></li> <li><i>the originality, novelty and ambition of the project.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Evaluate whether the project has the potential to make a significant contribution to the advancement of science.</i></p>	5	2		3	Strengths:	Weaknesses*:

<p><b>1.2. Clarity and soundness of the project aim and objectives</b></p> <p><i>Evaluate whether the aim and objectives of the project are clear and scientifically sound.</i></p>	5	2		3	Strengths:	Weaknesses*:
<p><b>2. Project implementation, competence of the implementing team and expected scientific results</b></p>						
<p><b>2.1. Feasibility and methodology</b></p> <p><i>Evaluate the feasibility of the proposed research methods, taking into account:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. the suitability of the methods to achieve the project's aim;</i></li> <li><i>2. the validity of the research design, data, instruments and/or other resources (if relevant to the research field);</i></li> <li><i>3. the justification of the methodology based on existing research and possible alternatives;</i></li> <li><i>4. the measures foreseen to ensure the reliability, transparency of the research and, where applicable, reproducibility of the research results.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>When evaluating, it is essential to consider whether the proposed methodology is feasible, properly justified, and capable of reliably achieving the project objectives.</i></p>	5	1,2		3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• The information for evaluating the proposal may be provided in any subsection of section 3.2. or, for example, in section 5.1.</i></li> </ul>	
					Strengths:	Weaknesses*:

<p><b>2.2. Work plan, its feasibility and risk management</b></p> <p><i>Evaluate the quality and feasibility of the work plan, taking into account:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>the sequence of activities and their interrelations;</i></li> <li>2. <i>the coherence of the work plan with the project aim and objectives;</i></li> <li>3. <i>the allocation of responsibilities among project implementers;</i></li> <li>4. <i>access to the necessary resources, if relevant;</i></li> <li>5. <i>the measures foreseen to avoid duplication of activities and the risk of double funding, if relevant.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>When evaluating, it is essential to consider whether the work plan is coherent, properly justified, and enables the effective achievement of the project objectives.</i></p> <p><i>Evaluate whether potential scientific, methodological, organisational and other risks have been identified, and whether their management is adequately addressed in order to ensure the timely and proper implementation of the project.</i></p>	5	1		2	Strengths:	Weaknesses*:
---	---	---	--	---	------------	--------------

**2.3. Composition of group of implementers and allocation of tasks; project partners**

*Evaluate the appropriateness of the composition of the project implementation group and the allocation of responsibilities, taking into account:*

1. *the justification of the group composition;*
2. *the match between the competences of the principal investigator and primary implementers and their assigned tasks;*
3. *the allocation of responsibilities;*
4. *the alignment between the composition of the group and the work plan.*

*When evaluating, it is essential to consider whether the project implementation group has sufficient competences to successfully implement the proposed project.*

*Evaluate the justification of the contribution of project partners (if there are any) and the interaction between the implementing institution and partners, taking into account:*

1. *the necessity of partners for achieving the project objectives;*

5	1	2
---	---	---

- *If the project proposal was submitted by a single PI without indicating group of implementers, PI should be evaluated as a group of implementers.*
- *When evaluating the composition of the project implementation team, consider the information provided in any subsections of sections 3.2 and 5.1 of the proposal.*

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses\*:**

--

--

<p>2. <i>the complementarity of the institutions involved;</i></p> <p>3. <i>the competences and resources of the partners;</i></p> <p>4. <i>the justification and feasibility of the collaboration.</i></p> <p><i>When evaluating, it is essential to consider whether the partnership is justified and creates added value to the project.</i></p>						
<p><b>2.4. Expected scientific outcomes and deliverables of the project and their dissemination</b></p> <p><i>Evaluate the quality of the expected scientific outcomes and deliverables of the project and the justification of their dissemination, taking into account:</i></p> <p>1. <i>whether the expected outcomes are logical, feasible and appropriately planned in relation to the aim and objectives;</i></p> <p>2. <i>whether the planned deliverables and their dissemination are appropriate for achieving the project objectives and ensuring scientific advancement;</i></p> <p>3. <i>whether diversity and feasibility of dissemination measures are ensured.</i></p>	5	1,5		2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Evaluate the integrity between the project outcomes and dissemination.</i></li> <li><i>Do not take into account only quantitative criteria (such as number of scientific papers and other dissemination activities, journal quartiles according to their Journal Impact Factor, etc.).</i></li> </ul>	
					Strengths:	Weaknesses*:

**3. Expected impact of project activities and scientific results**

<p><b>Impact of the project on science and society</b></p> <p><i>Evaluate the expected impact of the project, taking into account:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>the contribution of the project to the advancement of science;</i></li> <li>2. <i>the potential wider benefits for society, public policy, practice or the economy (if relevant);</i></li> <li>3. <i>the impact on human resource development and professional development (if relevant);</i></li> <li>4. <i>the directions of use, engagement and dissemination of results (if relevant);</i></li> <li>5. <i>the expected long-term value and sustainability (if relevant).</i></li> </ol> <p><i>When evaluating, it is essential to consider whether the expected impact is clearly justified and whether it covers both scientific advancement and, where relevant, wider benefits.</i></p>	5	1,2		2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The assessment of impact should not be based on quantitative indicators, but rather on the significance and justification of the expected benefits.</i></li> </ul>
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1382 438 1715 480" style="width: 50%;"><b>Strengths:</b></td> <td data-bbox="1715 438 2085 480" style="width: 50%;"><b>Weaknesses*:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1382 480 1715 1225" style="height: 400px;"></td> <td data-bbox="1715 480 2085 1225" style="height: 400px;"></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Strengths:</b>	<b>Weaknesses*:</b>			
<b>Strengths:</b>	<b>Weaknesses*:</b>				
<p><b>4. Scientific competence and experience of the principal investigator (PI)</b></p>	5	1,5		2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Use qualitative indicators while assessing the competences.</i></li> <li>• <i>Please avoid mentioning the quantitative statistics such as the number of published papers or citations, h-index, the quartile of the journal, etc.</i></li> </ul>

<p><i>Evaluate the scientific competence and experience of the principal investigator, taking into account:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. contribution to the development of new ideas, methods and knowledge;</i></li> <li><i>2. ability to communicate scientific ideas and results;</i></li> <li><i>3. obtained funding, awards and key achievements;</i></li> <li><i>4. experience in mentoring, training and collaboration;</i></li> <li><i>5. contributions to the scientific community and broader impact on society.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>When evaluating, it is essential to consider whether the principal investigator has sufficient scientific competence, experience and leadership skills to successfully implement the proposed project.</i></p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• PI experience, scientific expertise and outputs should go along with the thematic of project proposal, if it is relevant.</i></li> </ul>	
					Strengths:	Weaknesses*:
<b>The total score<sup>4</sup></b>			<b>57</b>	<b>29<sup>5</sup></b>		

<sup>1</sup> Projects will be ranked by the total score in descending order. If multiple proposals are awarded the same total score, proposals are ranked higher according to the following conditions in this particular order: 1) score according to the sum of criterion 1.1 and 1.2 is higher, 2) score according to the sum of criteria 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 is higher, 3) score according to the criterion 3 is higher, 4) score according to the criterion 4 is higher. If these conditions are insufficient proposals are ranked higher according to the following conditions in this particular order: 5) score according to the criterion 1.1 is higher, 6) score according to the criterion 1.2 is higher, 7) score according to the criterion 2.1 is higher. These conditions shall be applied until all proposals are ranked in order of priority. If these conditions are insufficient, the expert commission must collegially determine the ranking of the proposal after an additional analysis of such proposals.

<sup>2</sup> Score meanings in criteria 1.1–4 (on a five-point scale, with an accuracy of 0.5 point):

5 – ‘excellent. According to the relevant criterion, a proposal is evaluated as ‘excellent’ if, taking into account all aspects of its evaluation, there are no shortcomings, or they are insignificant. According to the evaluation aspects of the criterion, the strengths of the proposal are indicated (mandatory).

4 – ‘good. According to the relevant criterion, a proposal is evaluated as ‘good’ if, taking into account all aspects of its evaluation, there are only minor shortcomings. According to the evaluation aspects of the criterion, the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal are indicated (mandatory).

3 – ‘acceptable. According to the relevant criterion, a proposal is evaluated as ‘acceptable’ if not all aspects of its evaluation can be assessed well, but the existing shortcomings do not jeopardize the implementation of the project and/or do not significantly reduce the quality of the project. According to the evaluation aspects of the criterion, the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal are indicated (mandatory).

2 – ‘weak. According to the relevant criterion, a proposal is evaluated as ‘weak’ if it has significant shortcomings. According to the evaluation aspects of the criterion, the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal are indicated (mandatory).

1 – ‘poor. According to the relevant criterion, a proposal is evaluated negatively. Essential shortcomings are identified in a reasoned manner, including lack of information (arguments) to support specific aspects of the criterion (mandatory).

0 – the proposal cannot be evaluated by the relevant criterion due to insufficient information.

<sup>3</sup>The weighting factor is only intended to determine the final sum of scores (total score) given for all criteria and is not used to determine how the given scores meet the threshold scores.

<sup>4</sup>The total score is calculated by summing the scores for all criteria after multiplying them by their weighting factors:  $(5*2)+(5*2)+(5*1.2)+(5*1)+(5*1)+(5*1.5)+(5*1.2)+(5*1.5)=57$

<sup>5</sup>The threshold score is 10 points higher than the sum of all threshold scores of each criterion.

### III. Other remarks

.....

### IV. Final conclusion (the project is declared to be not eligible for funding if at least one of the following is true:

- 1) the proposal is evaluated negatively under the evaluation criterion I,
- 2) the proposal receives less than the threshold score (before multiplying by weighting factor) under at least one of the other criteria,
- 3) the total score under all criteria (before multiplying by weighting factor) is less than 29):

PROJECT IS ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

PROJECT IS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

I, the undersigned expert, confirm that I will have no direct or indirect tangible or intangible benefits in the event of the success or failure of this project.

I hereby confirm that **no** artificial intelligence (AI) tools, such as Generative AI or AI-assisted technologies (e.g. ChatGPT or similar services), were used in the preparation of this evaluation report, except for language editing.

I hereby confirm that this report responsibly prepare by myself and I accept full responsibility for the content of this report.

Expert

*(In case of individual evaluation)*

.....  
*(Name, surname)*

Head of the expert commission

*(In case of summary evaluation)*

.....  
*(Name, surname)*

Date .....

\_\_\_\_\_