SNSF Swiss Postdoctoral Fellowships Call 2022: Evaluation form for discipline-specific experts

1 Introductory remarks

All applications that meet the personal and formal requirements are evaluated scientifically. All discipline-specific experts are asked the same questions on the applicant, the project and the hosting arrangements, following the assessment criteria in section 5 of the Call document for SNSF Swiss Postdoctoral Fellowships 2022. The evaluation criteria are also reflected in the various sections of the research plan template.

2 Evaluation form

Questions on "Excellence"

“Excellence” is about:

- quality and pertinence of the research and innovation objectives
- soundness of the methodology
- relevance of interdisciplinary approaches, gender and diversity aspects
- quality of the planned open science practices
- quality of the supervision
- the researcher’s existing professional experience

1.1 Quality and pertinence of the project’s research and innovation objectives (and the extent to which they are ambitious, and go beyond the state of the art)
1.2 Soundness of the proposed methodology (including interdisciplinary approaches, consideration of the gender dimension and other diversity aspects if relevant for the research project, and the quality of open science practices)

See the SNSF open research data policy. The proposal includes also a Data Management Plan (DMP) set up according to the requirements issued by the SNSF. The content of the DMP is entered directly in the mySNF submission form. The DMP introduced separately in mySNF is NOT subject to evaluation.
Please refer in your evaluation of the research data management only to the points addressed in the research plan as integral part of the proposed methodology.

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

1.3 Quality of the supervision, training and of the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

1.4 Quality and appropriateness of the researcher’s professional experience, competences and skills

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

Questions on "Impact"

“Impact” is about:

- The enhancement of the researcher’s career perspectives and skills development expected through the proposal implementation
- Dissemination, exploitation and communication of the research
- Direct scientific, societal and economic impact of the proposal

2.1 Credibility of the measures to enhance the career perspectives and employability of the researcher and contribution to their skills development

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

2.2 Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]
2.3 The magnitude and importance of the project’s contribution to the expected scientific, societal and economic impacts

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

Questions on "Quality and efficiency of the implementation"

Quality and efficiency of the implementation" is about:

- Quality and effectiveness of the work plan
- Risk assessment and contingency plan
- Quality and capacity of all participating organisations, including non-scientific hosting arrangements

3.1 Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

3.2 Quality and capacity of the host institutions and participating organisations, including hosting arrangements

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

Question on "Overall appreciation"

Please write a summary about 8-10 lines including the overall appreciation (strengths and weaknesses) with the following structure:

1. **Excellence** (strengths and weaknesses)
2. **Impact** (strengths and weaknesses)
3. **Implementation** (strengths and weaknesses)

Your summary (points 1-3) may be integrated (as a whole or in part) in the decision letter (in case of a rejection). Please make sure to formulate your criticism, whether it is positive or negative, with respect to the evaluation criteria.