

**PITCH and SCIENTIFIC DEBATE EVALUATION FORM**

YOUNG INTERNATIONAL ACADEMICS “YIA”

Call #2 selection meeting with the IAS Scientific Council:

24 & 25 September 2024

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **«Project\_acronym»** | **«Project\_title»** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of the candidate** |  |

The Scientific Council’s assessments and conclusions may be provided to the candidate on request and in an anonymous manner. For this reason, it is essential that the Council comment on each selection criteria as well as formulate a conclusion. This will enable candidates to better appreciate the evaluation outcome.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation. We kindly ask you to validate or amend, in a timely manner, the completed evaluation form that will be compiled and sent to you by the YIA project team via e-mail after the oral pitch and scientific debate.

Please refer to the “guidelines for reviewers” for more details on the written evaluation procedure.

This evaluation form is only for the oral pitch and scientific debate taking place in front of the Scientific Council.**Introduction**

The Institute for Advanced Studies (IAS) at the University of Luxembourg provides funding opportunities and a propitious interdisciplinary environment to attract talented postdoctoral candidates who wish to conduct their postdoctoral research in a multidisciplinary setting in research groups and with partners of the University of Luxembourg. The programme is explicitly open to all disciplines, topics, and sectors within the academic competences of the University of Luxembourg.

**The following criteria should be considered during the pitch and scientific debate:**

Following the written evaluations, the 15 top-ranked candidates of eligible proposals will be invited to present and defend their project in front of the IAS Scientific Council in an oral pitch of 15 minutes, followed by a Question & Answers session of 15 minutes (face-to-face or video conference, both are possible).

The oral pitch and scientific debate will be scored out of a maximum of 25 points based on the following criteria:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring** | **Meaning** | **Assessment of the candidate’s performance in the pitch and scientific debate** |
| 1 | *very poor* | Candidate fails to address the criterion, or the criterion cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information. |
| 2 | *poor* | The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses. |
| 3 | *fair* | Candidate broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses. |
| 4 | *very good* | Candidate addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present. |
| 5 | *excellent* | Candidate successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion; any shortcomings are minor. |

|  |
| --- |
| **PITCH and SCIENTIFIC DEBATE (weight 60%)** |
| Quality of the pitch presentation (5) and oral (5) | 10 points |
| Persuasiveness in defending the project proposal (5) and the methodology for its implementation (5) during the scientific debate | 10 points |
| Communication skills to describe a complex and interdisciplinary project | 5 points |
| **Total peer review** | **25 points** |

A weighting percentage will be applied to the scores given for each evaluation criterion for the peer evaluation phase resulting in a weighted score. A weighted total score will be calculated based on the scores of both individual criteria (peer review and pitch and scientific debate) and converted into a percentage of the maximum score.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria for evaluation, section, and final ranking** | **Maximum** |
| **PEER REVIEW (weight 40%)** |
| **Total peer review** | **50 points** |
| **Total peer review weighted average (40%)** | **20 points** |
|  |
| **PITCH and SCIENTIFIC DEBATE (weight 60%)** |
| **Total pitch and scientific debate** | **25 points** |
| **Total pitch and scientific debate weighted (60%)** | **15 points** |
| **Final evaluation MAXIMUM points** | **35 points** |

Based on the final scoring, the Head of IAS and Scientific Council members will finally recommend the final 5 candidates and their proposals for funding to the rector for final decision.

In case of a tie or non-consensus among the scientific council members, the sum of the scores of the first 3 criteria will be the deciding factor:

1. Academic excellence of the candidate and appropriateness of the joint supervision.

2. Audacious risk/boldness character of the project proposal in terms of novelty, and originality of the methodology.

3. Interdisciplinarity, readiness of the candidate to work in an interdisciplinary team and the team’s complementarity.

In case the tie remains, female candidate will be favored. If these measures fail to select a candidate, the final decision belongs to the vice-rector for research.**1. Quality of the pitch presentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 1 the lowest score) |

**2. Quality of the oral pitch**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 1 the lowest score) |

**3. Persuasiveness in defending the project proposal**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 1 the lowest score) |

**4. Methodology for its implementation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 1 the lowest score) |

**5. Communication skills to describe a complex and interdisciplinary project**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 1 the lowest score) |

**6. Conclusion and your overall judgment**

**7. Any further remarks and recommendations for the candidates**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

|  |
| --- |
| **Data Protection Policy** |
|  | I hereby consent to the processing of my data for the purpose of evaluating project proposals under the YIA programme. |
|  | I hereby do not consent to the processing of my data for the purpose of evaluating project proposals under the YIA programme. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Confidentiality** |
|  | I agree that my identity may be indicated to the candidate(s). |
|  | I do not want my identity to be revealed to the candidate(s). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conflict of interest** |
|  | I do not have any relationships with the main project participants that may affect my judgment. |
|  | My relationship with the main project participants may affect my judgment. Please specify: …. |

**Evaluator’s contact details:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Last Name and First Name:** |  |
| **Work Address:***(Institution, Street, Postal Code and City)* |  |
| **Telephone number:** |  |
| **Email address:** |  |

I, undersigned, certify that I will treat in a strictly confidential way all the information I received and will receive within the framework of the project evaluation.

 Date: