

# Practice-to-Science: evaluation form for panel members and external reviewers

## 1 Introductory remarks

All applications that meet the personal and formal requirements are evaluated scientifically. All panel members as well as peer-reviewers (external reviews are made for each application in the phase 2 of the evaluation) are asked the same questions on the applicant, project and research institution, following the assessment criteria in article 10 of the [Practice-to-Science regulations](#).

## 2 Evaluation form

### 2.1 Section “Applicant”

When evaluating the questions regarding the applicant, please consider in particular the following documents:

- CV, including the major achievements\*
- Career plan
- Statement of practical experience and achievements

You may find detailed explanations here:


































[Careers factsheet DORA](#), [Slides on evaluation standards \(video modules\)](#)

\* The SNSF has introduced a standardized CV format in October 2022, which also describes the applicant's major achievements as a researcher. Consult the Factsheet to learn more about the format and its use in the evaluation.

### **Career development (education, acquired expertise and independence of scientific achievements to date)**

Evaluate the applicant's career path on the basis of the documents “CV and major achievements” and “Statement of practical experience and achievements”. These documents as well as the section “current state of own research” of the research plan should demonstrate the expertise necessary for the submitted project.

Assess the acquired competences and the independence of scientific achievements to date while taking the net academic age into account. Please consider these elements in context of the scientific discipline in question.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Specific strengths *<br>(4000 characters (max.))  | <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>B</b> <i>I</i> <u>U</u>         abc   </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div> </div> |
| Specific weaknesses *<br>(4000 characters (max.)) | <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>B</b> <i>I</i> <u>U</u>         abc   </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div> </div> |
| Comments<br>(8000 characters (max.))              | <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>B</b> <i>I</i> <u>U</u>         abc   </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px;"></div> </div> |

Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Rating *              |  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.               |
| <input type="radio"/> | 8  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.        |
| <input type="radio"/> | 6  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.    |
| <input type="radio"/> | 4  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses. |
| <input type="radio"/> | 2  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.          |




### **Scientific achievements to date (publications, monographs, etc.)**

The SNSF has signed the [San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment \(DORA\)](#), which states that the scientific content of the **entire scientific output** is significantly more important than publication metrics or the identity of the journal in which it was published.

**Evaluate the applicant's scientific achievements to date** using the document “CV and major achievements” and the extent to which the claimed achievements therein are supported by the evidence provided. Use your own scientific judgement when making this judgement. It is important that you also **consider the applicant’s net academic age** (see document “CV and major achievements”). The net

academic age spans from the date of the doctoral defence or equivalent qualification to the submission deadline, minus all non-academic activities calculated in full-time equivalents.

**Please note:** A journal-based metric (e.g., Journal Impact Factor) or career spanning metric (e.g. the H index) cannot replace a qualitative assessment of the achievements. Therefore, please refrain from using such values in your evaluation. You may however refer to number of articles or citations to support your expert judgement of the applicant's achievements or impact in the research field, but this should be done with caution given influences on citations that are not necessarily related to impact and quality.




|   |  |
|---|--|
| Specific strengths *<br>(4000 characters (max.))  | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>   |
| Specific weaknesses *<br>(4000 characters (max.)) | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>   |
| Comments<br>(8000 characters (max.))              | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px;"></div> |

Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

| Rating *              |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> | 9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.               |
| <input type="radio"/> | 8  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.        |
| <input type="radio"/> | 6  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.    |
| <input type="radio"/> | 4  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses. |
| <input type="radio"/> | 2  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.          |

## Practical experience and achievements

Evaluate the practical experience and practical achievements while referring to the document " Statement of practical experience and achievements ". In particular, it is important to consider the added values/advantages/gained skills of the practical experience for leading the Practice-to-Science project.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Specific strengths *<br>(4000 characters (max.))  | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>   |
| Specific weaknesses *<br>(4000 characters (max.)) | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>   |
| Comments<br>(8000 characters (max.))              | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px;"></div> |




Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

| Rating *              |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> | 9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.               |
| <input type="radio"/> | 8  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.        |
| <input type="radio"/> | 6  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.    |
| <input type="radio"/> | 4  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses. |
| <input type="radio"/> | 2  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.          |

### Potential for a scientific career and career plan

Evaluate the career plan with regards to a precise representation of the further career steps as well as the significance of the project for the scientific activities after the end of the grant. Considering the academic and practical experience to date as well as the career plan, try to determine the potential of the applicant for a scientific career. Please remember that Practice-to-Science is a Career funding scheme and aims at creating more professor positions with a protected time devoted to research at Universities of Applied Sciences/Universities of Teacher Education.

Note that the net academic age can be considered, but not the biological age.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Specific strengths *<br>(4000 characters (max.))  | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>   |
| Specific weaknesses *<br>(4000 characters (max.)) | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>   |
| Comments<br>(8000 characters (max.))              | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px;"></div> |

Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Rating *              |  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.               |
| <input type="radio"/> | 8  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.        |
| <input type="radio"/> | 6  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.    |
| <input type="radio"/> | 4  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses. |
| <input type="radio"/> | 2  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.          |

## 2.2 Section “Project”































If the applicant has chosen to declare her/his proposal as [use-inspired research](#), its broader impact has to be assessed (e.g., on economy, industry, policy or administration).

If several of the following aspects are met, the project is likely to be use-inspired and generate a broader impact:

- **Aim:** the project aims to produce scientific insights and solve practical problems.
- **Cognitive/Conceptual:** although the project is primarily concerned with basic science, it might help to resolve practical problems or issues.
- **Source of the research question:** the question was defined by scientists in collaboration with a user/practitioner community.
- **Implementation in the near future:** the project has the potential to be implemented in the near future (e.g. by means of technology transfer financed under an Innosuisse grant).
- **Types of output:** the project will produce academic and non-academic publications.
- **Target audience:** the results will be made accessible to a lay public outside academia.
- **People involved:** the research team collaborates with practitioners.

### **Scientific relevance, originality, topicality and independence of the project**

It is not necessary to summarise the project, but rather assess the scientific relevance, originality, topicality and independence of the project. By independence we mean the ability of the applicant to lead the project themselves even if they are dependent on collaborations in their proposed host institution. Thus, you should **assess the ability to lead the proposed project** on the basis of their past achievements as evidenced in the document “CV and major achievements” and status of research in the science case. If relevant, comment on the use-inspired aspect of the project.




|   |   |
|---|---|
| Specific strengths *<br>(4000 characters (max.))  | <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>B</b> <i>I</i> <u>U</u>        abc   </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div> </div> |
| Specific weaknesses *<br>(4000 characters (max.)) | <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>B</b> <i>I</i> <u>U</u>        abc   </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div> </div> |
| Comments<br>(8000 characters (max.))              | <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>B</b> <i>I</i> <u>U</u>        abc   </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px;"></div> </div> |

Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Rating *</b>         |  |
| <input type="radio"/> 9 | Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.               |
| <input type="radio"/> 8 |  |
| <input type="radio"/> 7 | Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.        |
| <input type="radio"/> 6 |  |
| <input type="radio"/> 5 | Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.    |
| <input type="radio"/> 4 |  |
| <input type="radio"/> 3 | Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses. |
| <input type="radio"/> 2 |  |
| <input type="radio"/> 1 | Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.          |

## Approach and methodology

Comment on the approach and methodology of the proposed project based on the description in the research plan.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Specific strengths *<br>(4000 characters (max.))  | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>   |
| Specific weaknesses *<br>(4000 characters (max.)) | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>   |
| Comments<br>(8000 characters (max.))              | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px;"></div> |


































Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Rating *</b>         |  |
| <input type="radio"/> 9 | Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.               |
| <input type="radio"/> 8 |  |
| <input type="radio"/> 7 | Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.        |
| <input type="radio"/> 6 |  |
| <input type="radio"/> 5 | Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.    |
| <input type="radio"/> 4 |  |
| <input type="radio"/> 3 | Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses. |
| <input type="radio"/> 2 |  |
| <input type="radio"/> 1 | Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.          |



## Feasibility

Comment on the feasibility of the project as it is described. Take into account whether the applicant has sufficient expertise to implement the project.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Specific strengths *<br>(4000 characters (max.))  | <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p> <b>B</b> / <i>I</i> <u>U</u>           abc    </p> </div>                       |
| Specific weaknesses *<br>(4000 characters (max.)) | <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p> <b>B</b> / <i>I</i> <u>U</u>           abc    </p> </div>                       |
| Comments<br>(8000 characters (max.))              | <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p> <b>B</b> / <i>I</i> <u>U</u>           abc    </p> </div> |




Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Rating *              |  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.               |
| <input type="radio"/> | 8  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.        |
| <input type="radio"/> | 6  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.    |
| <input type="radio"/> | 4  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses. |
| <input type="radio"/> | 2  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.          |

### 2.3 Section “Research institution”

#### Research institution

**Assess the added value of the chosen research institution:** scientific support and suitability with regard to implementing the project, opportunities for continuous intellectual development and training, and fostering of the applicant’s scientific independence.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Specific strengths *<br>(4000 characters (max.))  | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>   |
| Specific weaknesses *<br>(4000 characters (max.)) | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>   |
| Comments<br>(8000 characters (max.))              | <br><div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px;"></div> |

Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Rating *              |  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.               |
| <input type="radio"/> | 8  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.        |
| <input type="radio"/> | 6  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.    |
| <input type="radio"/> | 4  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses. |
| <input type="radio"/> | 2  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.          |

## 2.4 Overall assessment

Summary, special characteristic, etc.

According to the SNSF definitions:

- **Interdisciplinary research is defined as** research across disciplinary boundaries. In order to achieve the research objectives, it is necessary to integrate elements (theories, methods, concepts, etc.) from two or more disciplines. A similar degree of importance is attached to all the disciplines involved. Proposals that involve only one discipline or one main discipline supported by auxiliary disciplines are not to be funded by Sinergia.
- **Collaborative research means that** the research goals can only be achieved if two or more applicants combine their complementary expertise and knowledge in a new, joint research approach.
- **Breakthrough research** questions or goes beyond existing models, theories, doctrines, research approaches, methods, etc. It is often of a high-risk, high-reward nature.

In general, consider the scientific expertise of applicants based on their entire research outputs (including datasets, software, prototypes, etc., when applicable). In this context the **scientific quality and relevance of a paper is deemed much more important than publication metrics or the name of the journal in which it was published.**

Furthermore, **the evaluation should be done against the background of the scientific discipline, academic age, personal situation of each applicant** (e.g. child care duties, career breaks, etc.). Comments should refer neither to the applicant's age, gender, nationality or any other personal matters, nor to other proposals and other assessments.

### Overall assessment

Please provide a rating on the following scale for your overall assessment of the proposal, considering the strengths and weaknesses in the criteria-based assessment. Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.


| Rating *              |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> | 9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.               |
| <input type="radio"/> | 8  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.        |
| <input type="radio"/> | 6  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.    |
| <input type="radio"/> | 4  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses. |
| <input type="radio"/> | 2  |
| <input type="radio"/> | 1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.          |

Please summarise the main reasons for your overall assessment by listing the **strengths** and **weaknesses** of the proposal.

This statement is the most important part of your recommendation, as it makes the reasoning behind your assessment transparent, it prepares the panel for the decision-making, and it provides the administrative office with the necessary information for the further processing of the proposal. A summary of your statement will be forwarded to the applicant(s), especially in the case of negative funding decisions.

Main reasons for your overall assessment \*

(8000 characters (max.))



A rich text editor interface with a toolbar containing icons for bold, italic, underline, bulleted list, numbered list, undo, redo, link, unlink, print, font color, background color, and insert image. The main editing area is currently empty.