

## Project evaluation of grant applications to the PhD Council 2017

<b>Name of the reviewer</b>	
<b>Name of the applicant</b>	
<b>Project title</b>	

### **Scale:**

**Please give your score with the numbers from 1 to 4 where 4 is the highest and 1 is the lowest score.**

Please provide each application with a single score for each of the four categories using the numeric score and definitions in the scheme below:

4	Excellent	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.
3	Good	The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements are still possible.
2	Fair	While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, improvements would be necessary.
1	Poor	The proposal is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are significant weaknesses.

Please write your comments on the following evaluation sections. Additionally, please give your score in the corresponding boxes. Please state your scores in whole numbers with **4 being the best possible score**. Other scores such as 1-2 or 1,5 will not be accepted. Please, do not summarize the project but make an assessment of each criterion.

Please make sure that the written comments must be aligned with the score. Total score is a weighted average of the four scores (calculated by the PhD Council).

The comments can be written in English, Danish, Norwegian or Swedish.

Please notice that the review is NOT blind and will be sent to the applicant.

Your evaluation should be returned **no later than 25 August 2017** to the email address:

**jchor@au.dk**

By sending the evaluation from your personal email account, you certify to be free of any conflict of interest concerning the project proposal.

<b>A. Scientific quality – 40%</b>	<b>Score:</b>
------------------------------------	---------------

Does the project

- have potential for scientific progress and development of new knowledge, theoretically as well as methodologically?
- address a clear and well-defined problem?
- describe the status of existing research and the project's potential contribution?
- include an appropriate and well-argued choice of theory?
- include a detailed and well-described methodology?
- include ethical reflections relevant to the specific research project

Please write your comments on the scientific quality of the project (min. 200 keystrokes - max. 500 keystrokes):

<b>B. Relevance – 15%</b>	<b>Score:</b>
---------------------------	---------------

Does the project

- correspond to the objectives of the call?
- have potential for the production of new knowledge of significance for professional development in the educational field?
- meet the objective of the call concerning collaboration between the university and the university college?

Please write your comments on the relevance of the project (min. 200 keystrokes - max. 500 keystrokes):

<b>C. Feasibility – 25%</b>	<b>Score:</b>
-----------------------------	---------------

- Is the project realistic and feasible, scientifically and organisationally?
- Does the project description include clear milestones, a realistic timetable for the project activities and relevant success criteria?
- Are the qualifications of the candidate appropriate for the feasibility of the project?

Please write your comments on the feasibility of the project (min. 200 keystrokes - max. 500 keystrokes):

<b>D. Dissemination – 20%</b>	<b>Score:</b>
-------------------------------	---------------

Is there an appropriate plan for dissemination to the relevant users and target groups?

Please write your comments on the dissemination of the project (min. 200 keystrokes - max. 500 keystrokes):

<b>E. Overall evaluation</b>	<b>Overall score calculated by the PhD Council</b>
------------------------------	--

Please write your overall evaluation of the project explaining both the strengths and weaknesses taking into account that scientific quality is the most important criterion.

(min. 200 keystrokes - max. 1000 keystrokes):