

**WRITTEN EVALUATION FORM**

YOUNG INTERNATIONAL ACADEMICS “YIA”

Call #2 written evaluations deadline:

31 July 2024 @ 2pm CET

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

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

The evaluators' assessments and conclusions may be provided to the candidate on request and in an anonymous manner. For this reason, it is essential that evaluators draw up a comment of at least ten lines for each of selection criteria as well as for the conclusion. This will enable candidates to better appreciate the evaluation outcome.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation and we would kindly ask you to send the completed evaluation form before the deadline to: [yia@uni.lu](mailto:yia@uni.lu).

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

The oral pitch and scientific debate take place in front of the Scientific Council and are not part of this evaluation form.

**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 peer review process:**

The peer review will be scored out of a maximum of 50 points based on the following criteria:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring** | **Meaning** | **Assessment of the written application** |
| 1 | *very poor* | Research work neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific/technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc.  Work not worthy of pursuing. |
| 2 | *poor* | Research work is solid but not exciting, generating new knowledge, worthy of support but with less priority than work in the below scoring categories. |
| 3 | *fair* | Work is competitive at the national level and will probably make a valuable contribution in the international field. |
| 4 | *very good* | Work is expected to make a significant contribution; nationally at the forefront of research but not exceptional internationally. |
| 5 | *excellent* | Work is audacious and at the forefront of knowledge and will most likely have an important and substantial impact on science internationally. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PEER REVIEW (weight 40%)** | |
| Academic excellence of the candidate (5) and appropriateness of the joint supervision (5) | 10 points |
| Audacious risk/boldness character of the project proposal in terms of novelty (5), and originality of the methodology (5) | 10 points |
| Interdisciplinarity, readiness of the candidate to work in an interdisciplinary team (5) and the team’s complementarity (5) | 10 points |
| Quality and efficiency of project implementation | 5 points |
| Appropriateness of the secondment to reach the project objectives | 5 points |
| Candidate’s career aspirations and quality of the Career Development Plan (CDP) | 5 points |
| Scientific, societal and economic impacts of the project as described in the PDEC (Plan for Dissemination, Exploitation, and Communication) | 5 points |
| **Total peer review** | **50 points** |

**1. Academic excellence of the candidate**

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

(at least ten lines are mandatory)

**2. Appropriateness of the joint supervision**

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

(at least ten lines are mandatory)

**3. Audacious risk/boldness character of the project proposal in terms of novelty**

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

(at least ten lines are mandatory)

**4. Originality of the methodology**

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

(at least ten lines are mandatory)

**5. Interdisciplinarity, readiness of the candidate to work in an interdisciplinary team**

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

(at least ten lines are mandatory)

**6. Team’s complementarity**

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

(at least ten lines are mandatory)

**7. Quality and efficiency of the project implementation**

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

(at least ten lines are mandatory)

**8. Appropriateness of the secondment to reach the project objectives**

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

(at least ten lines are mandatory)

**9. Candidate’s career aspiration and quality of the Career Development Plan (CDP)**

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

(at least ten lines are mandatory)

**10. Scientific, societal and economic impacts of the project as described in the PDEC (Plan for Dissemination, Exploitation, and Communication)**

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

(at least ten lines are mandatory)

**11. Conclusion and your overall judgment**

(at least ten lines are mandatory)

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

**13. Your degree of expertise in the research field of the proposal (please chose the one that corresponds best to your experience)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Expert |
|  | Generalist |
|  | Not very familiar |

**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: