# Evaluation grid for the University of Lille's Cross Disciplinary Projects (CDP)

Each Cross-Disciplinary Project (CDP) will be assessed by three external reviewers, which will be organised by the European Science Foundation-Science Connect. The evaluation form below includes four main sets of evaluation criteria, and space for an overall evaluation at the end. Points will be attributed for the sub-criteria in each set as indicated (questions and comments for each sub-criterion are provided to clarify what is being assessed). An overall comment will be provided for each of the four main sets of criteria. The reviewer will also give a summary evaluation of the project as a whole.

Projects may be designed for 4 or 8 years; however, for 8-year projects, targets for indicators at 4 years must be provided for the interim evaluation.

The reviewers' anonymous reports will be sent to applicants for the rebuttal stage, during which applicants will have the opportunity to comment on any factual errors or misunderstandings in a reviewer’s comments.

NB: The structuring effects of the project and its alignment with local strategy, as mentioned in the text of the call for projects, will be evaluated by the Board of Directors and are thus omitted from the evaluation grid.

1. **Quality of the project /50**
   * /10 Relation to the topic of transitions (as mentioned in the call)
     + How does the project contribute to the characterisation of transitions, or provide answers to scientific questions related to transitions?
   * /10 Interdisciplinarity
     + Is interdisciplinarity at the heart of the project?
     + Is interdisciplinarity clearly described?
     + Does interdisciplinarity add value to the project?
     + Is the methodology for the implementation of interdisciplinarity clearly detailed? Do the Work Packages allow for interdisciplinarity? Does the project include interactions between Work Packages?
   * /10 Relevance and ambition of scientific questions, potential for breakthrough
     + Are the scientific questions clearly stated?
     + Do the scientific questions aim for a conceptual breakthrough or an incremental advance (such as a conceptual or methodological enhancement)?
   * /10 Differentiation
     + How does the project compare with other French or international research groups working on the same issues (i.e. is it original)? Are the scientific questions original in relation to the state of the art?
   * /10 Scientific methodology used to address the research question
     + Is the proposed methodology appropriate for addressing the scientific questions?
     + Does the project develop a new methodology?

***Overall evaluation of the quality of the project (minimum number of words: 60)***

1. **Quality of the consortium /25**
   * /10 CVs of the Principal Investigator(s) and WP Leaders
     + Do the Principal Investigator(s) and WP Leaders (and/or the project coordination team) have a track record in international research?
   * /5 Consortium
     + Are the skills required for the project adequately covered by the consortium?
     + Are the synergies between the consortium members clearly described?
   * /5 Involvement of early-career researchers (NB: early-career researchers are defined as researchers hired on a permanent position on or after 1 September 2017; this will be verified before the applications are sent to the experts. Postdocs are not considered early-career researchers for the purposes of this criterion.).
     + Is their involvement clearly defined?
     + Are they coordinating (or helping to coordinate) part of the project?
   * /5 Is the governance structure clear and adequate for the project?

***Overall evaluation of the quality of the consortium (minimum number of words: 60)***

1. **Project implementation /10**
   * /4 Project organization, coherence of the WPs
     + Is the project well organized? Are the work packages organized coherently?
     + Are the human resources estimated for each work package sufficient to ensure successful implementation of the project?
     + Is the project calendar appropriate?
     + Is the proposed risk management appropriate?
   * /3 Are the indicators clearly stated?
     + Are targets clearly defined for each indicator? (NB: For 8-year projects, indicator targets for the 8-year mark are not required, only indicator targets for the first 4 years.) Indicators may be qualitative, but they must reflect practices in the area(s) concerned. Approximately 5 indicators must be provided.
     + Are the indicators relevant? Are they sufficient to ensure an evaluation at the end of the project?
   * /3 Budget
     + Is the total budget adequate for achieving the project's objectives (as the budget is allocated for 4 years, is the budget appropriate for the duration of a 4-year project or for the first 4 years of an 8-year project)?

***Overall evaluation of project implementation (minimum number of words: 60)***

1. **Impact/15**
   * /3 Impact on training
     + Does the project involve adequate training for master's or doctoral students?
     + Does the project propose an original approach to involving students in the project activities?
   * /3 Ability to leverage additional funding through European projects
     + Have specific calls been identified?
     + Does the project describe a concrete strategy for responding to EU calls for projects?
   * /3 Proposed plan for attracting external researchers
     + Does the project propose a concrete plan for attracting external researchers?
   * /3 Compliance with expectations in terms of gender parity (within the coordination team, for the recruitment of doctoral students and postdoctoral researchers, etc.).
   * /3 Open science, data management and outreach to students and to the general public.

***Overall evaluation of the potential impact of the project (minimum number of words: 60)***

**Overall assessment:**

* Appropriateness of the reviewer's profile with respect to the topics covered by the project, on a scale from 0 to 10 (10: reviewer who is an expert in the field, etc.). As the project should involve interdisciplinarity, the reviewer may specify that his/her report does not cover certain aspects of the project that may be outside his/her area of expertise.
* Overall score
  + A+ (the project responds to the criteria for a CDP in all respects, and is one of the best projects of its type that the reviewer has assessed in the last 3 years).
  + A (the project responds to the criteria for a CDP in most or all respects, and is among the very good projects of its type that the reviewer has assessed over the last 3 years).
  + B (the project meets the criteria for a CDP, but has a few weak points).
  + C (the project does not sufficiently meet the criteria for a CDP).
* ***Overall evaluation of the project (minimum number of words: 100)***