

Doc.CH: Evaluation form for panel members

1 Introductory remarks

All applications that meet the personal and formal requirements are evaluated scientifically. All panel members are asked the same questions on the applicant, the project and the research institution, following the assessment criteria in article 14 of the [Doc.CH regulations](#).

2 Evaluation form

Questions on "Applicant"

Q1: Career development (education, acquired expertise) and major achievements, incl. the master's thesis

Use your own scientific argumentative judgement to evaluate the applicant's career path on the basis of the CV and the major achievements. The evaluation has also to take into account the situation of researchers at the very beginning of their career.

It is important that you also consider the applicant's net academic age and the CV. The net academic age spans from the date of the master degree to the submission deadline, minus all non-academic activities. Please note that the biological age must not be used as an evaluation criterion.

Please consider the following criteria:

- Academic qualification, incl. evidence of very good marks in the master's degree
- Scientific quality of the CV and the major achievements, incl. a positive assessment of the master's thesis
- Achievements since obtaining the master's
- Expertise required for the submitted dissertation project




Specific strengths * (4000 characters (max.))	 <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>
Specific weaknesses * (4000 characters (max.))	 <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>
Comments (8000 characters (max.))	 <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px;"></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: Statement of mobility and career plan

Evaluate the statement of mobility while referring to the career plan, 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 applicant's career goal (career plan) and the objective of the funding scheme.

The career plan is evaluated in regard to a precise representation of the further career steps as well as the significance of the project for the scientific activities after the end of the grant.

[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, originality, topicality, applicant's contribution towards the topic and concept of the dissertation project

It is not necessary to summarise 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) as well as the proposed project has the potential to develop approaches and methods within the discipline and beyond.

Originality: Indicate 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.

Applicant's contribution: Indicate to what extent the applicant contributed towards the topic and concept of the dissertation project.

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

Q2: Approach and methodology, feasibility (status of the project in the event that work on the dissertation has already been started)

Approach and methodology: Consider whether and to what extent the methods are suited to answering the questions set out in the application. This includes the methods chosen, their combination and the research plan (timing and logical sequence of steps).

Feasibility: Indicate whether and to what extent the proposed project is feasible. Take also 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 "Environment"

Assess the quality and suitability of the research institution in view of supporting the dissertation scientifically, particularly through the dissertation supervisor, as well as in terms of facilitating continual, intellectual development and education (if applicable, incl. integration in a doctoral school); qualifications of the co-supervisor of the dissertation and quality of any other locations envisaged.

[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.

<p>Main reasons for your overall assessment *</p> <p>(8000 characters (max.))</p>	 <div style="border: 1px solid gray; height: 200px; width: 100%;"></div>
---	---