**INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS RESEARCH PROJECTS FUNDING PROGRAM IN SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES**

**PROJECT PROPOSAL SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION FORM & RUNNING FOOT (\*)**

The scientific evaluation should be carried out according to the following criteria:

1. National Gain, Potential for Social and Public Benefit,
2. Aim And Objectives,
3. Innovative Aspect,
4. Methodology,
5. Project Management,
6. Impact

Descriptive/explanatory questions to measure each criterion are added to the relevant sections in order to provide assistance for evaluation.

When making their evaluations for each of the criteria mentioned above, the evaluators are expected to mark only one of the six-point scale scores in the form and to write down their reasons and explanations in detail, taking into account the definition of this score. Definitions regarding the level of meeting the criteria are added to the end of the form. If the space reserved for explanations is not enough, the writing area can be extended as needed.

It is essential to treat with complete confidentiality during the evaluation process, and the documents related to project proposal must be protected carefully. The principles and ethical rules which must be followed during individual evaluation are included in the signature page.

(\*) Information in the "Evaluation Forms" prepared for the projects to be evaluated by the remote evaluators contains the individual comments of the evaluator. The final evaluation report for the project is prepared by TÜBİTAK in line with the opinions of all evaluators.

**PRINCIPLES AND ETHICS THAT EVALUATORS MUST FOLLOW**

1. Projects must be evaluated objectively within the framework of scientific rules and criteria; equality of opportunity, personal / institutional relations and interpretations should not be taken into consideration.
2. If there is a conflict of interest with a person in the project team, no evaluation should be made. In such cases, the relevant Research Grant Group should be informed promptly. Situations that can be interpreted as conflict of interest are as follows:
   * *Being the thesis advisor / student,*
   * *Having collaborated together in the past three years, i.e. writing an article / paper / project / book together or planning to do so in the near future,*
   * *Being employed in the same institution or to be employed in the same institution in the near future,*
   * *Having made an opinion regarding the project and / or having contributed to the preparation of the project in any way,*
   * *To be the parties (adversaries) of disputes that have been submitted to the judiciary before,*
   * *Being relatives; even in the case of divorced relatives, having a blood relation in the third degree or being second degree relatives by marriage,*
   * *Having positive / negative thoughts or prejudices that prevent impartial action.*
3. Reviewers should be aware that all information related to the project proposal (names of the moderator, panelists, reviewers, evaluations or opinions of panelists/reviewers, content of panel meetings, and contents of Panel Joint Report etc.) and all correspondence between them and TÜBİTAK are confidential, and should act accordingly.
4. The content of the project proposal and panel information must not be shared with third parties and used by others.
5. The contents of the project proposal should not be used for personal purposes; Information in electronic form, written information, information notes, evaluations, and study and review notes must be destroyed upon the completion of the task.
6. Information regarding the evaluation of the project proposal must never be shared with the principle investigator or anyone from the research team (researcher, consultant, scholarship student).
7. Positive and negative reviews must be justified in the project proposal evaluations and these reviews must be prepared in such a way that the Research Support Group can notify the principle investigators in written form.
8. If the projects with the same or similar content belonging to the project team are also submitted to another national / international organization / institution, or have been supported/ are to be supported by another national / international organization / institution; or if another situation such as the violation of ethical rules has been notified the relevant Research Support Group must be informed by written notice and must be stated in the "Other" section of the form.

I acknowledge that I have read and agree to the above mentioned terms and conditions. I declare and undertake that there is nothing preventing me from evaluating the project proposal, the number and title of which are indicated on the first page. I also declare and undertake to be in compliance with the rules and regulations of TUBITAK in this form and in all other tasks for which I will provide reviews and evaluations as Reviewer/Panelist. I hereby agree and acknowledge that the matter will be the subject of an examination to be conducted by TÜBİTAK Ethics Committee for Research Publications (AYEK) in case I behave contrary to the above mentioned matters.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name-Surname :** | |
| **TR Identity Number:** | |
| **Address :** | |
| **Phone :** | |
| **GSM :** | |
| **E-Mail:** | |
| **Bank Name and Branch Code:** | **IBAN Number :** |
| **Date :** | **Signature :** |

**PROJECT PROPOSAL SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION FORM**

**PROJECT NO :**

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (PI) :**

**PROJECT TITLE:**

**(The opinions given under each heading should be explained in detail.)**

1. **NATIONAL GAIN, POTENTIAL FOR SOCIAL AND PUBLIC BENEFIT**

Has the importance of the project proposal in terms of national achievement been emphasized in detail?

Project type 1 - Progress in Humanities: Is there adequate information provided on how the studies to be done will lead to progress in the related branches of humanities? Is the information on how to enrich the historical, cultural and artistic accumulation of our country and thus the gains conveyed in detail?

Project Type 2 – Providing a Scientific Basis for the Development of Policies: : Is there adequate information provided on contribution of the R&D activity to better analysis of national and global development dynamics and shaping the future; to what extent it will contribute to the determination of global trends, data-based due diligence studies for our country, short-medium-long-term policy recommendations, and the development of innovative policy tools?

Project Type 3 - Revealing the Social Impacts of Scientific and Technological Advances: : Is there adequate information provided on the contribution of the project to reveal the scientific, technological, environmental, social, economic, social, cultural and similar impact dimensions of advanced technologies; and the necessary steps to be taken for being prepared to these effects?



|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Satisfactory | | Improvable | | Unsatisfactory | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
|  | |

**2. AIM AND OBJECTIVES:**

Are the aim and objectives of the project proposal defined in a way that is clear, measurable, realistic, and attainable throughout the project? Are the aims and objectives established in line with the realization of the achievements aimed by the project?



|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Satisfactory | | Improvable | | Unsatisfactory | |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**3. INNOVATIVE ASPECT :**

* 1. **National/International Literature Review:** Are the similarities and differences of national/international research with the project topic explained? In addition, has it been stated whether there is any preliminary research or application result related to the research area?
  2. **Innovative Aspect:** Is there adequate information about the innovative aspect of the targeted project output; the anticipated differences, advantages and superiorities compared to its counterparts in the field of scientific research or implementation? Does the project have the potential to increase knowledge (new approaches and methods and/or new data, etc.) in the research area?



|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Satisfactory | | Improvable | | Unsatisfactory | |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **National/International Literature Review:** 2. **Innovative Aspect:** |

**4. METHODOLOGY:**

Are the methods and research techniques (including data collection tools and analysis methods) to be applied in the project explained with reference to the relevant literature? How appropriate is the method(s) presented to achieving the envisaged goals and objectives? Is the methodology section presented clearly and consistently, covering the design of the research, its dependent and independent variables, and statistical methods?



|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Satisfactory | | Improvable | | Unsatisfactory | |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT:**

**a. Management Structure**: Are the work packages and objectives specified in the work-time schedule, by whom and in what time each work package will be carried out, appropriate to achieve the project goals and objectives?

To what extent is the project team adequate and appropriate in terms of quality and quantity, considering the activity and discipline(s) covered by the project? Are the tasks distribution and work packages compatible with the competencies of the people? To what extent are the success criteria measurable and traceable? If any, have the end users and/or information multipliers included in the project been determined appropriately?

**b. Risk Management:** Are the measures to be taken (Plan B) to ensure the successful execution of the project in the event of risks that may adversely affect the success of the project given by specifying the relevant work packages?

**c. Research Facilities:** Are the infrastructure and equipment facilities (database, software, archive, library, etc.) needed within the scope of the project and the plans for accessing these research facilities clearly stated?



|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Satisfactory | | Improvable | | Unsatisfactory | |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Management Structure:** 2. **Risk Management:** 3. **Research Facilities:** |

**6. IMPACT:**

Are the expected impacts from the project, the expected output(s) to be obtained from the project, and the activity(s)/service(s) for sharing and disseminating these outputs clearly explained?

Is the information about the end users, the target audience who will benefit from the project results (policy makers, other researchers, civil society/users, business and private sector etc.), and the needs of the end users and the areas of usage specified?

Are the expected impacts (Social/Cultural Impact, Public Policy Impact, Economic Impact, Academic Impact, National Security and Foreign Policy Impact) and activities specified clearly?

What is the potential for achieving the stated impact?



|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Satisfactory | | Improvable | | Unsatisfactory | |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**OTHER OPINIONS AND SUGGESTIONS ON THE PROJECT**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**OPINIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PROJECT DURATION**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**OPINIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PROJECT BUDGET**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**EXPLANATIONS ON THE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level of Meeting the Criterion** | **Point Value** | **Description** |
| Good | 6 | The project proposal meets the relevant criteria in all its dimensions. There is little to no shortcomings. |
| 5 | The project proposal meets the relevant criteria well. There are acceptable shortcomings in the proposal. |
| Avarage/ Improvable | 4 | The project proposal meets the relevant criteria in general, however; there are still some points that are open to improvement in the proposal. |
| 3 | The project proposal meets the relevant criteria at a moderate level, however; there are important points that need to be improved in the proposal. |
| Poor | 2 | The project proposal does not adequately meet the relevant criteria. There are important shortcomings in the proposal. |
| 1 | The proposal does not meet the relevant criteria.  There are significant weaknesses or shortcomings in the proposal. |