



Institute for
Advanced Studies

WRITTEN EVALUATION FORM

YOUNG ACADEMICS DOCTORAL FELLOWS IAS “YADIAS”

Written evaluations deadline:
31 March 2027 @ 2pm CET

«Project_acronym»	«Project_title»
Name of the candidate	

The evaluators' assessments and conclusions may be provided to the candidate on request and in an anonymous manner. For this reason, it is essential that evaluators draw up a comment of at least five lines for each of selection criteria as well as 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: yadias@uni.lu.

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

The oral pitch and scientific discussion take place before the Scientific Council and are not included in this evaluation form.

Introduction

The Institute for Advanced Studies (IAS) at the University of Luxembourg provides funding opportunities and a propitious interdisciplinary environment to attract talented doctoral candidates who wish to conduct their doctoral research in a multidisciplinary setting in research groups and with partners of the University of Luxembourg. The programme is explicitly open to all disciplines, topics, and sectors within the academic competences of the University of Luxembourg.

The following criteria should be considered during the peer review process:

The three main evaluation criteria are Excellence, Impact, and Implementation. The maximum score for the peer review is 60 points. Proposals scoring equal to or above 70% will be considered for progressing to the pitch. Other proposals will be rejected.

The peer review will be scored based on the following criteria:

<u>PEER REVIEW – for all applications</u>	
EXCELLENCE	
Academic Excellence of the candidate.	5 points
Degree of Interdisciplinary integration within the project.	5 points
Degree of Innovation within the project.	5 points
Adequate Research Training base to pursue a doctoral project.	5 points
Appropriateness of the methodology in relation to the project.	5 points
Potential of the researcher to reach or re-enforce professional maturity/independence during the fellowship.	5 points
Total score for EXCELLENCE	30 points
IMPACT	
Enhancing the future career prospects of the researcher after the fellowship.	5 points
Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results.	5 points
Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences.	5 points
Total score for IMPACT	15 points
QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION	
Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan.	5 points
Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management.	5 points
Relevance of the secondment in terms of complementarity.	5 points
Total score for IMPLEMENTATION	15 points
Total score for Peer Review	60 points

Reviewers and interviewers will score each criterion using a standardised scale (indicated in the table below).

Scoring	Meaning	Assessment of the peer review
0	-	Proposal fails to address criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
1	Poor	The criterion is inadequately addressed or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
2	Fair	Proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
3	Good	Proposal addresses the criterion well, but several shortcomings are present.
4	Very good	Proposal addresses criterion very well; small number of shortcomings are present.
5	Excellent	Proposal addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

1. Academic excellence of the candidate

0	1	2	3	4	5	
						(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 0 the lowest score)

(at least five lines are mandatory)

2. Degree of Interdisciplinary integration within the project

0	1	2	3	4	5	
						(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 0 the lowest score)

(at least five lines are mandatory)

3. Degree of Innovation within the project

0	1	2	3	4	5	
						(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 0 the lowest score)

(at least five lines are mandatory)

4. Adequate Research Training base to pursue a doctoral project

0	1	2	3	4	5	
						(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 0 the lowest score)

(at least five lines are mandatory)

5. Appropriateness of the methodology in relation to the project

0	1	2	3	4	5	
						(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 0 the lowest score)

(at least five lines are mandatory)

6. Potential of the researcher to reach or re-enforce professional maturity/independence during the fellowship

0	1	2	3	4	5

(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 0 the lowest score)

(at least five lines are mandatory)

7. Enhancing the future career prospects of the researcher after the fellowship

0	1	2	3	4	5

(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 0 the lowest score)

(at least five lines are mandatory)

8. Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results

0	1	2	3	4	5

(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 0 the lowest score)

(at least five lines are mandatory)

9. Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences

0	1	2	3	4	5

(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 0 the lowest score)

(at least five lines are mandatory)

10. Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan

0	1	2	3	4	5	
						(Please tick only one box per line, 5 is the highest and 0 the lowest score)

(at least five lines are mandatory)

11. Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management

(at least five lines are mandatory)

12. Relevance of the secondment in terms of complementarity

(at least five lines are mandatory)

13. Conclusion and overall assessment

14. Additional remarks and recommendations for candidates

CONFIDENTIAL

I confirm and accept the following statements (please tick the boxes):

☐ **Data Protection:** I agree that my personal data may be processed solely for the purpose of evaluating project proposals under the YADIAS programme. Reviewers' information (including names and institutional affiliations) will not be disclosed to applicants and will be retained only by the YADIAS support team for archiving purposes and the administration of evaluation-related payments.

☐ **Conflict of Interest:** I confirm that I have no personal, professional, or financial connections with the candidate or project that could influence, or be perceived to influence, my judgment.

☐ **Reviewer Declaration:** I declare that this evaluation has been completed solely on the basis of my own expert judgment and without the use of artificial intelligence (AI) or AI-assisted tools.

☐ **Confidentiality:** I acknowledge that evaluations and conclusions will be communicated to applicants in anonymised form. I also agree to maintain the confidentiality of all documents and information related to this evaluation and not to disclose any details to third parties.

Reviewer's contact details:

Last Name and First Name:	
Work Address: <i>(Institution, Street, Postal Code and City)</i>	
Telephone number:	
Email address:	

I, the undersigned, certify that I will treat in a strictly confidential way all the information I received and will receive within the framework of the project evaluation.

Date and signature: