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

Each Cross-Disciplinary Project (CDP) will be subject to three assessments by external reviewers , which will be organised by the European Science Foundation-Science Connect. The evaluation form below includes four main evaluation criteria , and an overall opinion will be expressed. Each sub-criterion will be rated as indicated (the questions and comments are added to clarify the assessment), and a comment will be sought on each of the four main criteria. The expert will also give a summary opinion on the project as a whole.

Projects may require deployment over 4 or 8 years, however, the indicators must be provided after 4 years for an interim evaluation. The anonymised expert's reports will be sent to the applicants, for the rebuttal step where the applicants will be able to comment on any factual errors or misunderstanding in reviewer’s comments.

1. **Quality of the project /50**
	* /15 Relevance and ambition of scientific questions.
		+ Are the scientific questions clearly stated?
		+ Are the scientific questions original in relation to the state of the art?
		+ Do the scientific questions aim for a conceptual breakthrough or an incremental advance (such as a conceptual or methodological deepening)?
	* /15 Interdisciplinarity
		+ Is interdisciplinarity at the heart of the project?
		+ Is interdisciplinarity clearly stated?
		+ Does interdisciplinarity add value to the project?
	* /10 Differentiation
		+ How does the project compare with other French or international research groups working on the same issues (is it original) ?
	* /10 Scientific methodology used to address the research problem
		+ Does the proposed methodology seem appropriate for addressing the scientific questions?
		+ Does the project develops a new methodology?

 ***Opinion on the quality of the project (minimum number of words: 60)***

1. **Consortium quality /25**
	* /15 CV of the project leader and WP leaders
		+ Do the project leader and WP leaders (and/or the project coordination team) have an international research track record ?
		+ Are the skills required for the project covered by the consortium involved?
	* /5 Involvement of early-career researchers (NB: early-career researchers must have had a permanent status since 09/2018 at the latest; this will be checked before the applications are sent to the experts. Postdocs are not considered as early-career researchers for 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 satisfactory given the nature of the project?

 ***Opinion on the consortium quality (minimum number of words: 60)***

1. **Project implementation /10**
	* /4 Project organisation, WP consistency
		+ Is the project properly organised? Are the work packages organised coherently? Do the Work Packages allow for interdisciplinarity? Are interactions between Work Packages foreseen?
		+ Are the estimated human resources? displayed for each work package sufficient to ensure correct deployment of the project?
		+ Is the project planning consistent?
	* /3 Are the indicators clearly stated?
		+ Are project success indicators clearly defined? NB: For projects with the duration of 8 years, 8-year indicators are not required, only 4-year indicators. The indicators may be qualitative, but they must reflect practices in the area(s) concerned. A limited number of indicators will be provided, of the order of 5.
		+ Are the indicators relevant? Are they sufficient to ensure an evaluation at the end of the project?
	* /3 Budget
		+ Is the total budget appropriate to achieve the project's objectives (since budget is allocated for 4 years, is the budget appropriate over 4 years or over the first 4 years of an 8 years project)?

 ***Opinion on the implementation of the project (minimum number of words: 60)***

1. **Impact /15**
	* /3 Contribution to 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?
	* /3 Impact on training
		+ Does the project sufficiently involve training for masters or doctoral students?
		+ Does the project propose an original approach to involve students in the project activities?
	* /3 Ability to leverage European projects
		+ Have specific calls for proposals been identified?
		+ Does the project contain a concrete strategy for responding to EU calls for projects?
	* /3 Proposed approach to attracting external researchers
		+ Is there a concrete approach to attract external researchers described in the proposal?
	* /3 Compliance with expectations in terms of gender parity (mainly within the coordination team, attention paid to gender parity for the recruitment of PhD et postdocs…), open science and communication with the general public.
	* ***Opinion on the impacts of the project***

**Overall assessment:**

* Positioning of the assessor's expertise in relation to the topics covered in the project (score from 0 to 10, 10: expert perfectly competent in the field, etc.). As the project should involve interdisciplinarity, the expert may specify if his/her report does not cover certain aspects of the project that may be out of its own expertise.
* Overall score
	+ A+ (the project corresponds perfectly to the criteria for a CDP, and is one of the best projects of this type that I have had to assess in the last 3 years)
	+ A (the project broadly meets the criteria for a CDP, and is one of the very good projects of this type that I have had to assess 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 opinion on the project submitted (minimum number of words: 60)***