

EXPERT WORK EVALUATION SHEET

Name and surname of the expert	
Name and surname of the evaluator, name of organisational unit	
Expert's work quality evaluation date <i>(from receipt of the results of the commissioned work, no later than:</i> - 7 calendar days for a panellist; - 14 calendar days for an individual opinion/review; - 14 calendar days from the end of the review for a contract involving a review; - 7 calendar days in other cases)	
Role of the expert	<input type="checkbox"/> Panel evaluation of the grant application and substantive evaluation at stage 2, in the case of two-stage substantive evaluation of the grant application (evaluation under criteria 1-4) <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation of the grant application at stage 1 of the substantive evaluation, in case of two-stage substantive evaluation of the grant application (evaluation under criteria 1-3)* <input type="checkbox"/> Review (evaluation under criteria 1-4)** <input type="checkbox"/> Individual review/opinion (evaluation under criterion 1 only) <input type="checkbox"/> Panel evaluation during project implementation and throughout its lifetime (evaluation under criteria 1-4) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state)
Subject of the assessment <i>(application no. in case of evaluation as part of selection of applications for funding, contract no. in other cases)</i>	

Evaluation criteria			Points***
1.	<p>Substantive preparation</p> <p>Quality of recommendations and statements</p> <p>Reliability</p>	<p>The Expert is familiar with the current programme and competition documentation. They have read the application/documentation and provides sound, concrete and accurate recommendations/justifications for the evaluation. The expert expresses themselves objectively and specifically on the topic. Scoring/assessment is coherent and consistent with the justification.</p> <p>Argumentation is factual, logical, concrete, coherent, based on facts, reliable data and includes an indication of all circumstances which determined the result.</p> <p>The opinion prepared by the Expert refers to the content of the documentation and is based on a thorough analysis thereof.</p> <p><i>NOTE: If the Expert's work indicates a lack of knowledge of the programme and competition documentation, this criterion cannot be scored higher than 2 points.</i></p>	0–5 points
2.	<p>Cooperation with NCBR</p> <p>Timeliness</p>	<p>The Expert communicates efficiently with the NCBR staff member (replies to e-mails, phone calls, etc.). Takes a proactive approach to clarifying doubts that have arisen, filling in gaps that have appeared. Communicates (non-)availability well in advance.</p> <p>The Expert delivers the results of the tasks assigned to him/her within the deadlines set by the regulations and procedures or within the deadlines agreed with the NCBR staff member. Reports in advance any potential issues with meeting the deadline for the completion of the work.</p> <p><i>NOTE: If the Expert is late with the work without providing a credible justification or contact is difficult, this criterion cannot be scored higher than 2 points.</i></p>	0–5 points
3.	Co-operation within the expert group/audit team	<p>The Expert communicates efficiently with other members of the group/team, strives to reach a common goal. Can communicate verbally (or in writing, if required by the situation) information relevant to the position, while maintaining the necessary form of expression and respecting other members of the group and their opinions. Communicates with accuracy and clarity. Keeps his/her communication logical and coherent. Listens actively and gives timely feedback.</p> <p><i>NOTE: If the Expert does not respect the opinions of other group members, this criterion cannot be scored higher than 1 point.</i></p>	0–5 points

4. Representation of the institution	<p>The expert communicates with the Applicant/Contractor in a calm and composed manner. Their statements are clear and tailored to the audience, and their behavior is characterized by high personal culture and care for the reputation of the institution. They follow the code of ethics (e.g. attire is appropriate and subdued).</p> <p><i>NOTE: If the Expert behaves aggressively or with disrespect to the other party, this criterion cannot be scored higher than 0 points.</i></p>	0–5 points
<p>Additional notes: (to be completed in case the Expert has distinguished themselves by something special or has broken the rules in a significant way or if the score(s) in the criterion(s) were awarded below 3 points).</p>		

* in the case of a grant application at the first stage of substantive evaluation, criteria 1, 2 and 3 are subject to evaluation (the average expert evaluation score is then calculated on the basis of 3 criteria)

** in case when the review is carried out by one expert, criteria 1, 2 and 4 are subject to evaluation (the average expert evaluation score for the review is then calculated on the basis of 3 criteria)

*** scoring may be graded in 0.5 point increments.

FINAL EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACT PERFORMANCE BY THE EXPERT

Average score for the criteria assessed for a given expert role (rounded up)****	
--	--

Points	Description
0 - 1.49	Requirement insufficiently fulfilled (negative)
1.50 - 2.99	Requirement fulfilled to a poor extent
3.00 - 3.49	Requirement fulfilled to a medium extent
3.50 - 3.99	Requirement fulfilled to a good extent
4.00 - 4.49	Requirement fulfilled to a very good extent
4.50 - 5	Requirement fulfilled to an excellent extent

**** - in the case of evaluation of an expert in the "Individual Review/Opinion" role, the score is equal to the number of points obtained under criterion 1