

Postdoc.Mobility: Evaluation form for panel members and reviewers

1 Introductory remarks

All applications that meet the personal and formal requirements are evaluated scientifically. All panel members as well as all peer-reviewers (external reviews only upon request by referee) are asked the same questions on the applicant, the project and the research institution, following the assessment criteria in article 18 of the [Postdoc.Mobility regulations](#).

2 Evaluation form

Questions on "Applicant"

Q1: Career development (education, acquired expertise) and statement of mobility

Evaluate the applicant's career path on the basis of the CV and the major achievements. This document as well as the section "Current state of your own research and professional competences for the project" of the research plan should demonstrate the expertise necessary for the submitted project.

Assess the acquired competences while taking the net academic age and the statement of mobility into account. Please consider these elements in the context of the scientific discipline in question.

Comment also on the applicant's ability to conduct original research of high scientific quality. Note that the biological age must not be used as an evaluation criterion. It is not necessary to summarise the CV.

Evaluate the statement of mobility while referring the CV and the major achievements as well as the submitted project. Take into account both retrospective mobility and future mobility planned during the grant period. Please consider the different types of mobility: institutional and international mobility as well as networking activities; sectoral mobility; switching between disciplines and knowledge transfer activities. Focus on the quality, not the quantity of past and future mobility. Assess the overall mobility by the end of the project in view of the objective of the funding scheme.

ONLY for the applications for a return phase CH: Added value by the research period immediately after the applicant's return from abroad to a scientific or academic career in Switzerland.































Specific strengths * (4000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>B <i>I</i> <u>U</u>          </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div> </div>
Specific weaknesses * (4000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>B <i>I</i> <u>U</u>          </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div> </div>
Comments (8000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>B <i>I</i> <u>U</u>          </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px;"></div> </div>

Figure 1: Screenshot of comment fields.

Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

Rating *	
<input type="radio"/>	9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	8
<input type="radio"/>	7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	6
<input type="radio"/>	5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	4
<input type="radio"/>	3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	2
<input type="radio"/>	1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.

Figure 2: Screenshot of SNSF rating scale.

Q2: Major scientific achievements to date as outlined in the CV

The SNSF has signed the [San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment \(DORA\)](#), which states that the scientific content of the entire scientific output is significantly more important than publication metrics or the identity of the journal in which it was published.

Evaluate the applicant's scientific achievements to date using the CV and the extent to which the claimed achievements therein are supported by the evidence provided. Use your own scientific judgement when making this judgement. It is important that you also consider the applicant's net academic age (see CV). The net academic age spans from the date of the doctoral defence or equivalent qualification or from the date of the medical degree to the submission deadline, minus all non-academic activities calculated in full-time equivalents.

Please note: A journal-based metric (e.g., Journal Impact Factor) or career spanning metric (e.g. the H index) cannot replace a qualitative assessment of the achievements. Therefore, please refrain from using such values in your evaluation. You may however refer to number of citations to support your expert judgement of the applicant's achievements or impact in the research field, but this should be done with caution given influences on citations that are not necessarily related to impact and quality.

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

Questions on "Project"

Q1: Scientific relevance, quality, originality, and topicality

It is not necessary to summarise the project. Please assess the scientific relevance, quality, originality, and topicality of the project.

Scientific relevance: Mention whether and to what extent 1) the topic and the research problems or hypotheses of the planned project are relevant to the discipline and beyond; 2) the proposed project increases knowledge and coherence within the discipline and beyond; and 3) the proposed project has the potential to develop approaches and methods within the discipline and beyond.

Quality: Please evaluate the quality of the research project.

Originality: Indicate here to what extent the starting point or theoretical/methodical approach chosen for the proposed project is original. Originality can take the form of a question that has so far been neglected by researchers or an approach that offers unexpected or novel combinations of familiar aspects.

Topicality: Indicate whether and to what extent the subject of the proposed project is of current interest. Indicators of topicality are, on the one hand, the importance and new insights of recent scientific publications devoted to the subject. On the other hand, a proposed project may be considered topical if it addresses a recent development that is of importance for the discipline in question or even beyond it.

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

Q2: Approach, methodology and feasibility

Comment on the approach and methodology of the project based on the description in the research plan.

Comment also on the feasibility of the project as it is described. Take into account whether the applicant has sufficient expertise to implement the project.

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

Question on "Research institution"

Assess the added value of the chosen research institution: scientific support and suitability with regard to implementing the project, opportunities for continuous intellectual development and training, and fostering of the applicant's scientific independence.

[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 assessment"

Please provide a rating on the following scale for your overall assessment of the proposal, considering the strengths and weaknesses in the criteria-based assessment.

Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.


Rating *	
<input type="radio"/>	9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	8
<input type="radio"/>	7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	6
<input type="radio"/>	5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	4
<input type="radio"/>	3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	2
<input type="radio"/>	1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.

Please summarise the main reasons for your overall assessment by listing the **strengths** and **weaknesses** of the proposal.

This statement is the most important part of your recommendation, as it makes the reasoning behind your assessment transparent, it prepares the panel for the decision-making, and it provides the administrative office with the necessary information for the further processing of the proposal. A summary of your statement will be forwarded to the applicant, especially in the case of negative funding decisions.

Main reasons for your overall assessment *

(8000 characters (max.))



A rich text editor toolbar with icons for Bold (B), Italic (I), Underline (U), Bulleted List, Numbered List, Undo, Redo, Cut, Copy, Paste, Print, Spell Check, Font Color, and Background Color.

A large, empty white text area for writing the response.