****

**WRITTEN EVALUATION FORM**

**FOR REVIEWERS**

**IAS 2025 PEP PROJECT**

**Postdoctoral Exchange Programme**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **«Project\_acronym»** | **«Project\_title»** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of the Hosting-PI at UL/UW** |  |
| **Name of the applicant** |  |
| **Fac/IC** |  |

The reviewers' assessments and conclusions may be provided to the candidates on request and in an anonymous manner. It is essential, therefore, that reviewers provide a constructive comment of at least five lines for each selection criterion and for the conclusion. This will enable candidates to better appreciate the evaluation outcome.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation, and we would kindly ask you to send the completed evaluation form before the deadline to: ias@uni.lu for UL applicants or ias@warwick.ac.uk for UW applicants.

Please refer to the guidelines for reviewers for more details on the written evaluation procedure.

**Introduction**

The “PEP” Exchange Postdoctoral Fellows Programme between the Institute of Advanced Study (IAS) at the University of Warwick (UW) and the Institute for Advanced Studies (IAS) at the University of Luxembourg (UL) is an academic exchange initiative designed to foster collaboration between these two institutions. It aims to establish long-term research collaborations between academic staff through international mobility, interdisciplinary research, and intellectual exchange by postdoctoral researchers.

**Purpose and Goals**

* Fostering International Collaboration: The programme provides opportunities for postdoctoral researchers to work in an international and interdisciplinary environment, allowing them to collaborate with scholars from different academic disciplines and institutions and by doing so establishing connections between permanent academic staff at both institutions.
* Interdisciplinary Research: The IAS at UW and UL are both known for encouraging interdisciplinary research. Postdoctoral fellows are expected to engage in projects that span multiple academic fields.
* Career Development: Participation in the programme will help postdoctoral fellows expand their academic networks, gain exposure to new research environments, and develop skills that enhance their academic careers.

**Structure of the Programme**

* Number of fellowships: 3 fellowships will be awarded per annum by each institution.
* Fellowship Duration: Postdoctoral fellows must spend 6 months at the host institution. The visit can take place over 6 consecutive months, or it can be split in two periods of 3 months each within one calendar year.
* Research Focus: Fellows are expected to engage in research activities that are aligned with the expertise of the host institution and their own scholarly interests. Fellows are also expected to demonstrate the added value of their visit to the host institution in terms of complementarity of skills, techniques, methods or approaches to a specified research domain. Both UW and UL offer a wide range of research fields, from humanities and social sciences to STEM fields.
* Mentorship and Support: Each fellow will join a mentor at the host institution who provides guidance and helps to integrate them into the academic community.

Additional information is available in the IAS Warwick Luxembourg PEP\_application guidelines\_2025 available on-line (UL: [Documents - University of Luxembourg I Uni.lu](https://www.uni.lu/research-en/ias/documents/)) or UW website <https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/cross_fac/ias/funding/iasvf/uluwpep>.

**The following criteria should be considered during the reviewing process:**

1. **Academic excellence (20 points)**
	1. **Competence of the PEP fellow and Hosting-PI (5 points)**

The PEP fellow’s competence will be assessed on their academic background, relevant research experience, and ability to contribute effectively to the project. Strong analytical and communication skills, motivation, and clear career goals aligned with the fellowship are essential. Leadership potential and a demonstrated commitment to professional growth will also be valued. The Hosting PI should have a proven track record of research excellence and experience mentoring early-career researchers. They must provide adequate institutional support and resources for the fellow. The PI’s commitment to capacity building and active participation in relevant professional networks are key factors in fostering the fellow’s development and success.

* 1. **Strength of the consortium (5 points)**

The strength of the consortium will be evaluated based on the complementary expertise, experience, and resources that each partner brings to the collaboration. A strong consortium demonstrates a well-balanced mix of institutions or organizations with proven capabilities in relevant research areas, capacity building, and project management. Effective collaboration among members, clear roles and responsibilities, and established communication channels are essential for ensuring smooth coordination. The thematic diversity within the consortium, as well as its connections to policy, academic, or industry networks, will be considered important factors that enhance the potential impact and sustainability of the project.

* 1. **Description of the visit (5 points)**

Key objectives of the visit include advancing the fellow’s research skills, contributing to joint publications or outputs, and fostering professional networks. The visit will also provide opportunities for the fellow to gain hands-on experience with specialized methodologies or resources available at the host institution, enhancing both their technical and professional development.

* 1. **Impact of career development of the fellow (5 points)**

The career development of the fellow is expected to significantly enhance their expertise, research capacity, and professional growth. Through targeted training, mentorship, and exposure to new research environments, the fellow will acquire advanced skills and broaden their knowledge base. This development will empower them to take on greater responsibilities, contribute more effectively to their field, and strengthen their future career prospects.

1. **Audacious character of the project idea (15 points)**
	1. **Novelty (5 points)**

The project idea demonstrates a high level of novelty by introducing innovative concepts, approaches, or methodologies that have not been previously explored or applied in the field. It challenges existing paradigms and offers fresh perspectives that have the potential to significantly advance knowledge or practice. The originality of the idea is evident in its ability to address gaps in current research, propose unconventional solutions, or open new avenues for inquiry.

* 1. **Originality (5 points)**

The project displays strong originality by presenting unique ideas or perspectives that distinguish it clearly from existing research or approaches. It avoids replication of prior work and instead builds on or departs from established knowledge in creative ways. The originality of the project lies in its potential to introduce new frameworks, hypotheses, or applications that have not been previously considered, thereby contributing distinct and valuable insights to the field. This originality enhances the project’s potential to inspire further innovation and to set new directions for future research.

* 1. **Risky (5 points)**

The project embraces a high degree of risk by tackling complex challenges or unproven hypotheses that have traditionally been considered difficult or unlikely to succeed. This riskiness reflects the project’s ambition to push beyond safe, conventional research boundaries and explore new, uncertain territories. While the outcomes may be unpredictable, the potential rewards, such as groundbreaking discoveries or transformative advancements, justify the risks involved. The project’s willingness to engage with these uncertainties demonstrates boldness and a commitment to innovation that could lead to significant breakthroughs.

1. **Interdisciplinarity of the project consortium (10 points)**
	1. **Project’s ability to encourage interdisciplinary working (5 points)**

The project actively fosters interdisciplinary collaboration by integrating diverse fields of expertise, methodologies, and perspectives. It is designed to break down traditional disciplinary barriers, encouraging team members from different academic or professional backgrounds to work together toward common research goals. By promoting such cross-disciplinary exchange, the project enhances creativity, broadens analytical frameworks, and enables more comprehensive solutions to complex problems. This interdisciplinary approach not only enriches the research process but also increases the potential for innovative outcomes that might not emerge within a single discipline.

* 1. **Interdisciplinarity of the project consortium internally and/or externally (5 points)**

The project consortium demonstrates strong interdisciplinarity both within its internal structure and through external partnerships. Internally, it brings together experts from diverse disciplines who collaborate closely, combining their distinct knowledge and skills to tackle complex research questions. Externally, the consortium establishes strategic alliances with organizations, institutions, or stakeholders from complementary fields, fostering broader knowledge exchange and resource sharing. This multifaceted interdisciplinarity strengthens the consortium’s capacity to address challenges holistically, promotes innovative thinking, and enhances the overall impact and relevance of the project.

1. **Contribution to advancement of knowledge and UL/UW’s research community well described (5 points)**

The project clearly contributes to the advancement of knowledge by addressing critical gaps and introducing innovative approaches that push the boundaries of current understanding. It promises to generate new insights, theories, or methodologies that will enrich the academic field and stimulate further research.

Moreover, the project actively strengthens the research community at UL/UW by fostering collaboration, building capacity, and promoting the exchange of ideas among scholars and practitioners. Through workshops, seminars, and joint publications, it will enhance the visibility and reputation of UL/UW as a hub for cutting-edge research and innovation, while also nurturing the development of early-career researchers within the institution.

**Evaluators' assessments and conclusions will be communicated to candidates anonymously.**

**Scoring (5 is the highest and 1 the lowest score):**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring** | **Meaning** | **Assessment of the application** |
| **1** | Very poor | The research is neither robust nor innovative, and the scientific or technical approach is fundamentally flawed. The proposal largely reiterates existing work without offering meaningful advancements. As such, it does not merit further pursuit. |
| **2** | Poor | The research is solid and contributes to new knowledge, making it worthy of support. However, it lacks a compelling level of innovation or excitement and is therefore a lower priority compared to proposals in the higher scoring categories. |
| **3** | Fair | The research demonstrates national-level competitiveness and shows strong potential to contribute significantly at the international level. |
| **4** | Very good | The work is anticipated to yield significant impact, demonstrating leadership at the national level, though it falls short of being internationally exceptional. |
| **5** | Excellent | The research is ambitious and cutting-edge, and is highly likely to exert a significant and lasting influence on the international scientific landscape. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | 1. **Academic Excellence**

(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 1 the lowest score) |
|  |  |  |  |  | Competence of the PEP fellow and Hosting-PI |
|  |  |  |  |  | Strength of the consortium |
|  |  |  |  |  | Description of the visit |
|  |  |  |  |  | Impact of career development of the fellow |

|  |
| --- |
| **Academic Excellence: detailed justification of the evaluation** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | 1. **Audacious character of the project idea**

(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 1 the lowest score) |
|  |  |  |  |  | Novelty |
|  |  |  |  |  | Originality |
|  |  |  |  |  | Risky |

|  |
| --- |
| **Audacious character: detailed justification of the evaluation**  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | 1. **Interdisciplinarity of the project consortium**

(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 1 the lowest score) |
|  |  |  |  |  | Project’s ability to encourage interdisciplinary working |
|  |  |  |  |  | Interdisciplinarity of the project consortium internally and/or externally |

|  |
| --- |
| **Interdisciplinarity: detailed justification of the evaluation** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | 1. **Contribution to advancement of knowledge and UL/UW’s research community well described**

(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 1 the lowest score) |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contribution to advancement of knowledge and UL/UW’s research community well described |

|  |
| --- |
| **Contribution to advancement of knowledge: detailed justification of the evaluation** |

|  |
| --- |
| **5. Conclusion and your overall judgment** |

|  |
| --- |
| **6. Any further remarks and recommendations for the candidates** |

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**Confidentiality:**

Reviewers' assessments and conclusions will be communicated to candidates anonymously.

**Reviewer’s contact details:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Last Name and First Name:** |  |
| **Faculty/IC and Department/Group** |  |

I, the undersigned, certify that I will treat as strictly confidential all information I have received and will receive in connection with the evaluation of the project.

Date of signature:

Signature: