



Application review form

Joint mobility programmes with foreign funding agencies

25 May 2020

Joint mobility programmes with foreign funding agencies

This form is used in the Academy of Finland's collaboration with China/NSFC, China/CAS, China/CASS and Germany/DAAD.

Research council: _____

Proposal number: _____

Project coordinator: _____

Target country: _____

- New project
- Third-year extension
- Previous funding with the same partner

Please provide both written feedback and numerical ratings.

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and final rating is made with a rating scale ranging from 10 to 1:

- 10–8 = eligible for funding
- 7–4 = to be discussed
- 3–1 = not eligible for funding.

If one of the ratings (A, B, C) falls below 4, the whole proposal must be rejected as it is not eligible for funding.

A bonus of 0.1 to 0.3 points can be awarded for proposals from which particular additional outcomes can be expected from working together with the partner.

Rating

A) Project Quality (rating A __)

1. Presentation of project (sub-rating __)
 - Clarity of project goals
 - Preliminary work
 - Work and time schedule

2. Scientific quality of project (sub-rating __)
 - Topicality and degree of innovation
 - Methodology
 - Appropriateness of question within the work and time schedule


B) Qualifications of research teams (rating B __)

1. Project-relevant competence of Finnish team (sub-rating __)
 - Publications
 - Thematic relevance of project coordinators and participants
 - Project-relevant research infrastructure

2. Project-relevant competence of foreign team (sub-rating __)
 - Publications
 - Thematic relevance of project coordinators and participants
 - Project-relevant research infrastructure

3. How do the two teams complement each other? (sub-rating __)
 - In terms of content, methodology and equipment
 - Previous joint scientific/research activities or publications
 - How meaningful is this cooperation for achieving the aspired goals?

C) Participation of young scientists and researchers (if relevant) or other relevant added value of cooperation (rating C __)





1. Scientific importance of project for young scientists and researchers
(sub-rating__)
2. Project-appropriate ratio between number of participating young scientists and number of visits
(sub-rating__)

D) Aspired additional outcomes of cooperation (bonus points D __)

1. Particular exploitability of results (IPRs) (scientific, industrial, societal)
 Bonus 0.1 points
2. Particular knowledge transfer (e.g. junior-senior partnerships)
 Bonus 0.1 points
3. Particular sustainability and wide-ranging impact of cooperation
 Bonus 0.1 points

Overall assessment and rating**Main strengths and weaknesses of project, additional comments and suggestions**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

Overall rating: Mean rating A–C + bonus points D = _____

