



Institute for
Advanced Studies

PITCH and SCIENTIFIC DEBATE EVALUATION FORM

YOUNG ACADEMICS DOCTORAL FELLOWS IAS “YADIAS”

Selection meeting with the IAS Scientific Council:
05 - 09 April 2027

«Project_acronym»	«Project_title»
-------------------	-----------------

Name of the candidate	
-----------------------	--

The Scientific Council’s assessments and conclusions may be provided to the candidate in an anonymous manner. For this reason, it is essential that the Scientific Council comment on each selection criteria as well as formulate a conclusion. This will enable candidates to better appreciate the evaluation outcome.

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

This evaluation form is only for the oral pitch and scientific debate taking place in front of the Scientific Council.

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 pitch and scientific debate:

The 30 best candidates of eligible proposals will be invited to present and defend their project in front of the IAS Scientific Council in an oral pitch of 10 minutes, followed by a Questions & Answers session of 10 minutes (via video conference only). The Head of IAS and Scientific Council members will rank the proposals based on the written reviews and the pitch and will recommend the final 15 candidates and their proposals for funding to the rector for final decision.

The oral presentation and scientific debate will be scored out of a maximum of 20 points based on the following criteria:

<u>PITCH and SCIENTIFIC DEBATE – for the 30 best ranked applications</u>	
Quality of the pitch presentation.	5 points
Persuasiveness in defending the project proposal during the scientific debate.	5 points
Persuasiveness in defending the methodology for its implementation during the scientific debate.	5 points
Communication skills to describe a complex and interdisciplinary project.	5 points
Total score for Pitch and Scientific debate	20 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.

The top 15 projects are selected for funding based on this ranking. In case of a tie or non-consensus among the SC members, the scores of the first 3 criteria will be the deciding factor by the following order:

1. Academic excellence of the candidate.
2. Degree of interdisciplinary integration within the project.
3. Degree of innovation within the project.

A reserve list of 3 applicants will be maintained to cover potential withdrawals. If an applicant withdraws, candidates on the reserve list will be offered funding in descending order of their scores. Once all 15 positions are filled and contracts are accepted, remaining reserve list applicants will be informed that their applications are no longer under consideration. The reserve list will remain active for six months.

1. Quality of the pitch presentation

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. Persuasiveness in defending the project proposal during the scientific debate.

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. Persuasiveness in defending the methodology for its implementation during the scientific debate.

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. Communication skills to describe a complex and interdisciplinary 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. Conclusion and overall assessment

--

6. Additional remarks and recommendations for candidates

--

CONFIDENTIAL

I confirm and accept the following statements:

Data Protection: I agree that my personal data may be processed for the only 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 solely by the YADIAS support team for archiving purposes and for the administration of evaluation-related payments.

Confidentiality: Reviewers' evaluations and conclusions will be communicated to applicants in an anonymised form. Reviewers' contact details will not be shared with applicants.

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

Reviewer's contact details:

Last Name and First Name:	
----------------------------------	--

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: