
List of questions for the assessment of Agora application

SNSF Agora 2018

The SNSF asks for your scientific or communication expertise to assess the present Agora project.

The Agora scheme aims to foster the dialogue between scientists and society. It encourages researchers to communicate their current research to a non-specialist audience. Agora projects have to initiate a dialogue between researchers and the target audience in which they interact and listen to each other.

Note that overly positive or critical reviews with no justification cannot be taken into account.

Text entries are to be made in English.

Comments must be succinct and substantiate the marks awarded. They should briefly set out the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. They should refer neither to the applicant's age, gender, nationality or any other personal matters, nor to other proposals and other assessments. The anonymized comments will be included in the evaluation report that is made available to the applicants.

1. Declaration concerning conflict of interests

By checking the box, you confirm that your assessment has not been affected by any conflict of interest or that you have declared any potential conflict of interest by inserting a comment.

I have no conflict of interest or have declared potential conflict of interests.

Declaration of conflicts of interests:

Please keep all documents strictly confidential. Your review will be treated confidentially and will be anonymised when passed on to the applicants.

2. Quality of the content to be communicated

The content to be communicated has to be connected with the current research of each applicant of the project. It can consist of research results, as well as general questions concerning scientific research, science as a profession, scientific methods, research complexity, uncertainties, limits, controversies, etc. The projects may also be concerned with basic scientific knowledge, if it is related to the current research of the applicants. Section 2.1 (Context) of the project plan should contain all the information needed to assess this criterion.

To what extent is the content to be communicated relevant, clearly defined and of high quality?

General comments:	
Specific strengths:	Specific weaknesses:

Based on your above comments, rate the project with respect to the following statement:

The content to communicate is of high quality and connected to the current scientific research of each applicant.

<input type="checkbox"/> Fully agree	<input type="checkbox"/> mostly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> partly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> partly disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> mostly disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> fully disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Not considered
--	---	---	--	--	---	---

3. Suitability of the methods or the communication concept in view of the defined target group

*In principle, all communication formats are accepted, provided the project **includes elements of a dialogue** with the public in which the researchers and the public play an active role. The financing of books, films or other non-intrinsically interactive formats is covered only to the extent that they are integrated within such a dialogue strategy. Section 2.2 (Methods) of the project plan should contain all the information needed to assess this criterion.*

Are the methods and communication concepts suited to reach the target group?

Does the project promote dialogue, interactivity and public participation?

General comments:	
Specific strengths:	Specific weaknesses:

Based on your above comments, rate the project with respect to the following statement:

The proposed communication methods allow for a high-quality dialogue between scientists and the target group.

<input type="checkbox"/>						
Fully agree	mostly agree	partly agree	partly disagree	mostly disagree	fully disagree	Not considered

4. Expertise of the project team

The assessment of the project team's expertise should be based on the CVs of the applicants and, when available, the CVs of project partners and collaborators. Furthermore, the roles and responsibilities of the persons involved in the project, as well as their specific expertise relevant to the project, should be explained in section 2.3 (Implementation) of the submitted project plan.

Does the project team (applicants, project partners, collaborators and third parties) have the necessary expertise to carry out the project?

Is the current scientific work of the applicant(s) related to the content to be communicated?

General comments:	
Specific strengths:	Specific weaknesses:

Based on your above comments, rate the project with respect to the following statement:

The proposed project team has the needed expertise to drive the project.

<input type="checkbox"/> Fully agree	<input type="checkbox"/> mostly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> partly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> partly disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> mostly disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> fully disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Not considered
--	---	---	--	--	---	---

5. Feasibility of the project

The proposed communication design, project team, schedule and budget must be devised to reach the goals of the submitted project. Sections 2.2 (Methods), 2.3 (Implementation) and 2.4 (Expected impact) of the project plan should contain all the information needed to assess this criterion.

Can the targets/milestones be reached in the given time and with the available resources in terms of personnel and funds?

If applicable, is the risk management plan well described and sound?

General comments:	
Specific strengths:	Specific weaknesses:

Based on your above comments, rate the project with respect to the following statement:

The proposed project will reach its goals in the given time and with the proposed communication methods.

<input type="checkbox"/> Fully agree	<input type="checkbox"/> mostly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> partly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> partly disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> mostly disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> fully disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Not considered
--	---	---	--	--	---	---

6. Expected impact

The expected impact of an Agora project must be assessed through quantitative and qualitative criteria. Sections 2.2 (Methods) and 2.4 (Expected impact) of the project plan should contain all the information needed to assess this criterion.

Will the project create or increase awareness, stimulate interest and promote critical thinking about the communicated research topic and its challenges?

Are the described measures to create awareness about the project well planned and likely to effectively reach the target group?

If the size of the target group is small, can it act as a multiplier for a wider public?

To what extent could the proposed project continue beyond the funding period?

General comments:	
Specific strengths:	Specific weaknesses:

Based on your above comments, rate the project with respect to the following statement:

The proposed project has the potential to have a positive impact on society.

<input type="checkbox"/> Fully agree	<input type="checkbox"/> mostly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> partly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> partly disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> mostly disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> fully disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Not considered
--	---	---	--	--	---	---

7. Overall assessment of the project

General comments:	
Main strengths:	Main weaknesses:

I recommend that the Agora panel supports the proposal with:

<input type="checkbox"/> highest priority	<input type="checkbox"/> high priority with some reservation	<input type="checkbox"/> low priority	<input type="checkbox"/> no opinion
---	--	---	---

8. Your area of specialisation

- Please tick which of the following applies: the topic of the project falls: within your area of specialisation
- within your wider area of specialisation
- other