VYTAUTAS KAVOLIS TRANSDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

VYTAUTAS MAGNUS UNIVERSITY

KAUNAS, LITHUANIA

Evaluation Form for Junior Postdoctoral Fellowships Applications

STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL SCORE

The final score (FS) is based on the selection criteria listed above and is calculated according to the following formula: $FS = 0.3SP + 0.4RP + 0.3MI$, where:

- SP is the final scientific publication score in the ten-point system;
- RP is the final evaluation score of the research project;
- MI is the final score of the motivational interview.

In the event of a tie, the applicant with the highest research project mark will be placed higher in the competition queue.

EVALUATION TABLES

Evaluation score of the scientific publications (SP)		
Type of research work	*Measurement units*	*Points*
Research articles in publications referenced in the Clarivate Analytics Web of Science and/or Scopus databases	Author contribution*	4
Research articles in scientific publications referenced in other international databases	Author contribution	3
Research articles in other peer-reviewed scientific publications	Author contribution	2

Scholarly articles in peer-reviewed cultural, artistic and professional journals; conference proceedings	Author contribution	1
Other**	Author contribution	0–4
Total		
Final total***		

* The author contribution (AI) is calculated according to the formula AI=1/NA, where NA is the number of authors of the paper. For example: if the number of authors of an article is 4, the author's contribution will be 0.25, i.e. AI=1/4=0.25.

** The Committee has the right to evaluate the applicant's other scientific output not included in this table and to award additional points between 0 and 4.

*** The final scientific publication score will be converted into a ten-point system. The total score will be converted into the ten-point system as follows: 1) The sum of the scores of the applicant with the highest score (Smax) will be equal to 10 points; 2) Smax divided by 10 gives the constant k (k = Smax/10); 3) The sum of the points scored by the other applicants divided by the constant k gives the applicant's final score for scientific publications (rounded to the nearest hundredth of a number).

Evaluation score of the research project (RP)			
Evaluation criterion, aspects and explanations of the evaluation of the criterion	*Maximum score available [1]*	*Threshold estimate*	*Score awarded*

---

[1] Value of the estimate:

10 – 'excellent'. An application shall be evaluated as 'excellent' under the relevant criterion if, taking into account all the elements of its evaluation (exceptional quality). The strengths of the application shall be indicated under the evaluation aspects of the criterion (mandatory).

9 – 'very good'. For the relevant criterion, an application is considered 'very good' if, in all its aspects the deficiencies are minor. The evaluation aspects of the criterion shall indicate the strengths of the application and the strengths and weaknesses of the application (compulsory).

8 – 'good'. The application shall be evaluated as 'good' for the relevant criterion if, taking into account all aspects of its evaluation, has only minor shortcomings. The strengths and weaknesses of the application shall be indicated in relation to the evaluation aspects of the criterion (mandatory).

7 – 'moderate'. For a given criterion, an application shall be assessed as 'moderate' if not all aspects of its assessment are can be rated as good, but the weaknesses present do not jeopardise the viability of the project and/or do not significantly reduce the quality of the project. The strengths and weaknesses of the application shall be indicated in relation to the evaluation aspects of the criterion (mandatory).

6 – 'satisfactory'. The application has weaknesses under the relevant aspects of the assessment of the criterion which detract from the project the quality of the project but does not jeopardise its viability. The following shall be indicated in relation to the evaluation aspects of the criterion the strengths and weaknesses of the application (mandatory).

			during the evaluation
Relevance of the idea, possible contribution to the development of the scientific field(s). The evaluation shall assess whether the aim of the project is new and promising, whether the project will contribute to the solution of relevant scientific problems, and whether it is expected to make progress in relation to the state of research on the topic.	10	7	
The rationality of the tasks, methods and work plan and the reasonableness of the anticipation and management of potential risks. It shall assess whether the project objectives are clearly formulated, whether they are consistent with the purpose of the project, whether appropriate methods have been chosen, whether the project work plan is rational for addressing the objectives and achieving the project's results, and whether potential risks are foreseen and their and data management discussed.	10	7	
Planned project results and dissemination. The relevance of the planned project outputs to the objectives, the quality and level of maturity of the planned scientific publications, as well as the overall relevance of the planned project outputs, their potential social benefit or practical value, and their dissemination to the scientific community and to the general public shall be assessed.	10	7	
Total	30	21	

---

5 – 'weak'. The application has weaknesses under the relevant aspects of the assessment of the criterion which detract from the project the quality of the project and may jeopardise its viability. In relation to the evaluation aspects of the criterion, the following shall be indicated the strengths and weaknesses of the application (mandatory).

1-4 – 'unsatisfactory'. The application shall be evaluated negatively under the relevant evaluation criterion. Reasoned Identification of the substantial shortcomings of the application (mandatory), including the information/arguments for the criterion concerned lack of sufficient evidence to support the specific aspects of the evaluation.

0 - the application cannot be evaluated against the relevant criterion because insufficient information has been provided.

Motivational interview (MI)	
Total[2]	