

Guidelines for evaluating proposed research projects

These guidelines are to be used, as appropriate, when evaluating proposed research projects to be funded by Vindval. The guidelines comprise four elements: 1) scientific evaluation; 2) relevance evaluation; 3) recommendation; and 4) other issues.

1. Scientific evaluation

The evaluation is made by a group appointed for the issues included in the call for research. The group comprises of one chairman and at least three researchers. The group must hold at least one minuted meeting. The minutes of the meeting must provide an account of the groups's joint evaluation of each of the projects, as well as how conflicts of interest have been dealt with.

The members in the evaluationgroup should before the meeting individually evaluate the following aspects on a five-point scale: Subject of study, method and feasibility and expertise.

The five-point scale is as follows

- 5 Excellent
- 4 Very good
- 3 Good
- 2 Acceptable
- 1 Poor

- *Subject of study – scientific objectives, innovation*

Are the scientific goals realistic? Has the project a high degree of general value and applicability? Are applicants aware of existing national and international literature and know-how in the area? Will proposed multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary collaboration add value? Does the project address the specific issues described in the call for research?

- *Method and feasibility – scientific method, work plan and budgeted costs*

Is the chosen methodology appropriate and of high standard in international terms? Are the costs justified in relation to the amount of work planned and the anticipated result?

- *Expertise*

Do the project leader and other participants have the necessary scientific skills and documented experience of management to run the project efficiently and achieve the scientific objectives? Do the project leader and other participants have the necessary experience of communicating research findings with stakeholders?

The evaluation group's overall assessment of the *scientific quality* of each project should be shortly motivated and classed as follows:

- A = application of high scientific quality
- B = application of acceptable scientific quality
- C = unacceptable application from a scientific viewpoint

2. Evaluation of relevance

The evaluation of relevance is made by part of the Vindval reference group. The group gets minutes from the scientific evaluation. The group must hold at least one minuted meeting. The minutes of the meeting must provide an account of the group's joint evaluation of each of the projects, as well as how conflicts of interest have been dealt with.

The following aspects should be considered, using the same 5-point scale as for the scientific evaluation:

- *Relevance to the Vindval programme*
Is the project capable of contributing to aim of Vindval?
- *Relevance to the call*
Does the project address the specific issues described in the call for research? Does the project offer potential for interaction with other relevant projects?
- *Dissemination of findings and communication with stakeholders*
Does the project have a credible plan for disseminating its findings and communicating with stakeholders? Is the project capable of adding to the collective contribution made by the programme in this field?

The evaluation group's overall assessment of the *practical relevance* of each project should be shortly motivated and classed as follows:

- A = application of great practical relevance
- B = application of acceptable practical relevance
- C = application of minor practical relevance

3. Recommendation

The Reference group report constitutes a recommendation. This means that the group is responsible for weighing up the results of the scientific evaluation and relevance evaluation. The project or projects recommended by the group must be clearly stated, along with a specified annual budget. The group is responsible for ensuring that the total cost of the recommended

project falls within the overall set budget framework. The reasons that the group has decided not to recommend other proposed projects (based on the scientific and relevance evaluations) should be attached.

4. Other issues

Gender aspects

The gender aspects should be considered by the groups.

Conflicts of interest

Vindval has adopted the same policy on conflicts of interest (disqualification rules) as the Swedish Research Council:

<http://www.vr.se/download/18.1fb0383014819e6484358f00/1409234072655/Vetenskapsr%C3%A5dets%2Bj%C3%A4vspolicy%2B2014.pdf>

It is up to the chairman to ensure that issues are properly dealt with and that they are noted in the report. It is incumbent on the members of the evaluation panel and the programme executive to notify the chairman of any circumstances that may constitute grounds for disqualification.