Call 3 – Start-up financing for DOCTORAL STUDENTS (in the late phase of their PhD) and POSTDOCS

Application	
Applicant	
Institute/s	
Reviewer	

Conflict of interest: YES ☐ NO ☐

If yes, please explain:

Notes for the assessment:

Please rate each criterion with A, B, C, D, E or F (A = excellent, B = good, C = average, D = sufficient, E = not convincing, F = not assessable) and justify your rating with a short comment. Please also submit your overall grade (A, B, C, D, E or, if applicable, F) and funding recommendation (funding YES/NO) for the application at the end of the form. The University commission for research will make a final decision on all applications based on your assessment and comments.

Please note: In order to give our young researchers feedback on their applications and the opportunity to improve them for internal or external funding calls, both your criteria evaluations and your comments will be sent to the applicant in *anonymous form*. If you wish to send confidential information to the advisory council, which should not be given to the applicant, please mark it separately.

The evaluation process is subject to confidentiality and **all applications must be treated confidentially.**

The scientific content of the application reviewed must under no circumstance be used for your own and/or external scientific purposes.

Evaluation criteria:

1. Personal aspects

Is the research topic of high relevance and currently relevant? Can a high level of knowledge gain be expected after implementation and does this justify the costs incurred?

Is the project embedded in a larger project context and/or are there further project perspectives? Has sufficient preliminary work been done in terms of content and/or structure? Does the research project fit into the intended funding programme?

Criterion	Comments	Grade
Qualification of the applicant		
State of the art of the research topic		
Expected knowledge gain		
Project context or project perspective given		
Previous research achievements and activities		
Fit to the intended funding programme		
Further comments		

2. Objectives and preparatory activities for the application

Have clear working hypotheses/research questions been derived? Are the objectives clearly defined and realistic? Has the topic been meaningfully narrowed down? Have the preparatory activities for the proposal been chosen sensibly and are they appropriate? Are they feasible within the planned timeframe? If applicable: Is the integration of international cooperation partners into the work programme reasonable and necessary? Is the publication of an OA publication reasonable and necessary for the success of the proposal to be prepared?

Criterion	Comments	Grade
Clear working hypotheses / research questions / clear objectives		
Reasonable focus on research topic		
Appropriateness of the preparatory activities for the application, i.a., submission of an open access publication		
Feasibility of the application		

preparation activities and the preparation of the third-party funding application within the project duration as well as, i.a., the integration of the international cooperation partners		
Meaningful consideration of gender and diversity dimensions		
Further comments		

3. Personal aspects

How would you rate the competences of the applicant/ project partners and their previous scientific achievements as well as activities (e.g. quality of publications, awards, if applicable external funding, patents, research stays, international research activities etc.) under the aspect of their biographic circumstances (e.g. family phases)? To what extent does the proposed project contribute to the applicant's further scientific development while also building on his/her existing scientific competences (fit with the scientific profile)? To what extent does the implementation of the project contribute to supporting the applicant in his/her own academic career and independence?

Criterion	Comments	Grade
Qualification of the applicant		
Previous research achievements and activities		
Fit to the scientific profile		
Contribution to the academic career and independence of the applicant		
Further comments		

4. Financial support

Is the applied financial support realistically planned and sufficiently justified with respect to the achievement of the objectives?

Criterion	Comments	Grade
Justification for the applied financial support (Material and/or travel costs, and/or personell costs)		
If applicable: Justification of the requested funds within the framework of the module internationalisation.		

Realistic calculation		
Further comments		

5. Formal aspects

How do you judge the general formal impression of the application? For example: Is the application understandable and well written? Is the application structured reasonably and stringent? Are all required aspects covered sufficiently?

Criterion	Comments	Grade
General formal impression of the application		
Further comments		

Overall grade of the application (A – E, if applicable F) ☐

Funding recommendation ☐ YES ☐ NO

Further hints and suggestions for the applicant

Are there any other hints for the implementation of the planned project or for the composition that that could be helpful for the applicant and that you would like to convey?