

**Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment**

# CoARA Boost Cascade Funding Programme

## Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Sheet – Second Round

**Opening:** 21 February 2025

**Closing:** 21 April 2025 at 17:00 CEST

**Funding Call information, documents and templates:**

<https://coara.eu/second-call-for-cascade-funding/>

**Funding Call Application Platform:**

[https://esf.smartsimple.ie/s\\_signup.jsp?token=XVtQC1oGYV5ZSxtZXxJXR1JWYUIIH3Rt](https://esf.smartsimple.ie/s_signup.jsp?token=XVtQC1oGYV5ZSxtZXxJXR1JWYUIIH3Rt)

# Annex 3\_Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Sheet

*This annex is intended to provide information about how the scoring sheet will look like on the SmartSimple online platform.*

Reviewers will evaluate the proposals considering three criteria. Criteria will bear an equal weight in the assessment and each criterion will be qualitatively assessed following the scales provided in the table below. Scoring is complemented by comments from reviewers (min. 80 words per criterion).

Reviewers will score each award criterion on a scale from 0 to 5:

Score	Definition
0	Proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
1	Poor – criterion is inadequately addressed or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
2	Fair – proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
3	Good – proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
4	Very good – proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
5	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

The total score will be calculated as the sum of the scores for the three criteria. The threshold for each criterion will be three (3), while the overall score threshold will be ten (10). That means if a proposal receives less than 3 in one criterion or less than 10 in the overall score, the proposal will not be recommended for funding by the independent evaluators and will be automatically rejected.

In the final decision, panel chairs will strive for having a balanced portfolio of selected projects in terms of geographical diversity (no more than 4 projects should be funded from the same country, diversity of organisations (see the list of eligible organisation types, allocating funding to only one type of organisation e.g. universities will be avoided in case the pool of applicants allow for it) and types of projects (at least 3 projects from each project type: Teaming projects, Institutional change projects and Institutional pilot projects).

Please find below the scoring sheet:

Criterion	Guiding questions	Score (0-5)	Comments
<b>Alignment with the vision of ARRA</b>	Are mission, impact, work plan, and planned outputs of the project carefully and specifically aligned with the Agreement's vision as specified in the Agreement?		
<b>Expected impact and sustainability of the reform process, how it leads to institutional change*</b>	<p>For teaming projects: the rationale behind forming the team is well defined, clearly maps into the proposed impact and is key to tangible institutional change. Knowledge transfer mechanisms and mutual benefits are guaranteed.</p> <p>For institutional change projects: the proposed work plan and outputs provide the means to accelerate tangible and sustainable change in an organisation's procedures and processes.</p> <p>For pilot projects: the new assessment approaches are suitable, feasible and fit well into the overall research assessment strategy of the organisation.</p>		
<b>Feasibility and quality of the proposed work plan and outcomes/deliverables within the indicated timeframe and Resources</b>	Does the proposal come with a clear and specific vision that, regardless of the granularity, scope and type of the work, is very likely to provide a solid contribution to systemic change of research assessment within the institution? Is the proposed budget assigned to each deliverable realistic and are there safeguards in place for the implementation plan and respect? Is there a solid added value of the project over and beyond what is currently being done within the community,		

	<p>including CoARA Working Groups?</p> <p>Does the mission and proposed impact of the project translate well into the work plan and the Use of Resources? Does the work plan seem feasible within the proposed time frame and budget? Does the work plan come with clear and achievable milestones and deliverables as well as relevant Use of Resources presented in the Project budget?</p> <p>Are there mechanisms in place to engage those who are affected by the envisaged reform process (e.g. researchers at all career stages)?</p>	
<b>Total Scoring:</b>		<b>/15</b>
<b>Overall assessment</b>	Would you recommend this project to be funded?	To be funded To be funded if funding is available. Not fundable
	Please summarise the strengths and weaknesses of this project	

*\*See the definition in the Call.*