

Standard evaluation form

This form is made available to applicants who may wish to arrange an evaluation of their proposal themselves (e.g., by an impartial colleague) prior to final editing, submission and deadline. The aim is to help applicants identify ways to improve their proposals and provide an overview of the standard evaluation questions.

The forms used by the experts for their evaluation reports will be broadly similar, although the detail and layout may differ.

SCORING

Scores must be in the range 0-5. Evaluators will be asked to score proposals as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes were to be made. When an evaluator identifies significant shortcomings, he or she must reflect this by awarding a lower score for the respective criterion.

Interpretation of the scores

0 – The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.

1 – Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed and there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2 – Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses and the proposal lacks precisions and relevant details / in-depth information.

3 – Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.

4 – Very Good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.

5 – Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

Thresholds & weighting

The standard threshold for individual criteria is 3. To ensure a diverse and inclusive portfolio of institutions and pilots that cover all innovation areas, institutions sizes and geographical areas, grants will not be awarded only based on ranking. Proposals might be also weighted to ensure a diverse enough representation of the three above dimensions, provided that these applications attain all thresholds.





EVALUATION FORM

Individual evaluation

Proposal No.:

Acronym:

1. Pilot Idea Excellence

Quality and strength of the idea: Is the idea realistic and can it be achieved on the scale proposed? How does the pilot fit into the organisation's overall strategy?

Innovation potential linked with the organisational context: Does the pilot project fit into one of the innovation areas? Is the idea innovative in its specific institutional setting/context and obtains a long-term potential?

Relevance to the call: How will the pilot benefit from participating in the DOORS incubation programme?

Score: (x)

Threshold: (3/5)

2. Impact

Value proposition: What challenge(s) will the pilot address and how? Is the expected outcome relevant for the pilot idea and realistic? What are the end benefits of the pilot for the organisation itself, its staff, its audience and external stakeholders (if relevant)?

Timing: Can the pilot be developed from the initially proposed concept to the final targeted stage within the DOORS timeframe?

Sustainability: How is the organisation planning to ensure the sustainability of the pilot beyond the DOORS project's lifespan/end of funding?

Score: (x)

Threshold: (3/5)

3. Implementation and organisational context

Motivation: What is the motivation for applying to the DOORS incubation program and what benefits are foreseen to the organisation's long-term strategy?

Resources: How many staff members are to be involved in the project and how will they benefit from the DOORS incubation programme? Does the pilot imply new staff hires/adding new staff members or involving external expertise? Are any infrastructural acquisitions intended within the realisation of the pilot and if yes, what part of the budget (in %) is planned to be respectively allocated?

Equity, diversity and inclusion: What is the general approach to equity, diversity and inclusion in the institution?

Score: (x)

Threshold: (3/5)

REMARKS

Total Score: (x)

Threshold: (9/15)