

Call 4 – Research funding for 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 FOR THE INTERNAL RESEARCH FUNDING

Evaluation criteria:

1. Quality of the research project

Is the research topic of high relevance and up to date? Can a high gain in knowledge be expected after implementation and does this justify the costs incurred? Is the project embedded in a larger project context and/or do further project perspectives arise? Was sufficient preliminary work provided in terms of content and/or structure?

Criterion	Comments	Grade
Scientific relevance		
State of the art of the research topic		
Expected gain of knowledge/added value (also in relation to the costs inferred)		
Project context or project perspective given		
Content wise /structural preliminary work		
<i>Further comments</i>		

2. Objectives and working program

Have clear working hypotheses / research questions been derived? Are the objectives clearly defined and realistic? Is the topic localized reasonably? Are the chosen methods and/or models reasonably chosen and appropriate with respect to the achievement of the objectives? Is the working program reasonably structured and manageable in the planned time frame? If applicable: Is the integration of international cooperation partners into the work programme useful and necessary?

Criterion	Comments	Grade
Clear working hypotheses / research questions / clear objectives		
Reasonable focus on research topic		
Appropriateness of methods & models		
Feasibility (also with regard to the planned time frame) including the preparation of the manuscript within the project duration as well as, i.a., the		

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE INTERNAL RESEARCH FUNDING

integration of international cooperation partners		
Meaningful consideration of gender and diversity dimensions		
<i>Further comments</i>		

3. Personal aspects

How would you rate the competences of the project participants (when applying for one's own position in particular for the future holder of the position), their previous scientific achievements and 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 extend does the project support the scientific development of the project participants (when applying for one's own position in particular for the future position holder) and contributes to the applicants existent scientific competences (fit into the scientific profile)? How would you judge the contribution of the project towards the scientific career of the applicant?

Criterion	Comments	Grade
Qualification of the applicant		
Previous research achievements and activities		
Fit into the scientific profile		
Contribution of the project to the scientific career of the applicant		
<i>Further comments</i>		

4. Financial support & personal contribution

Is the applied financial support realistically planned and sufficiently justified?

Criterion	Comments	Grade
Justification for the applied financial support (Personnel, material and/or travel costs)		
If applicable: Justification of the requested funds within the framework of the module internationalisation.		
Realistic calculation		
<i>Further comments</i>		

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		
<i>Further comments</i>		

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?