



EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS: ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP SCHEME 2019

- The Irish Research Council maintains the principles of impartiality, integrity and excellence in its assessment process. All applications are assessed competitively by international peer reviewers solely on the basis of excellence. Please see below for a flowchart of the assessment process.
- Applications are first reviewed by the Council for eligibility and adherence to the Terms and Conditions.
- Applications are then sent for remote evaluation to an Outer International Assessment Board (IAB). Each application is assessed by at least two remote independent, international reviewers. Each assessor submits their evaluation and the applications are ranked from the highest score to the lowest.
- The top ranked applications are then referred on to an Inner IAB where they are assessed by at least two independent, international reviewers before being discussed at an Inner IAB panel meeting.
- The primary responsibility of the Inner IAB is to determine a quantitative ranking of the applications presented to it, arrive at an overall judgement of standard and make final recommendations to Council.
- Applications are assessed under the headings: (1) track record and research potential of the applicant; (2) training and career development and impact; (3) quality of the research project (4) quality of the host organisation(s)/implementation. Assessors consider all headings and allocate scores as per the evaluation criteria detailed below. Applicants are advised to familiarise themselves fully with the eligibility criteria in the Terms and Conditions and the evaluation criteria **prior to making an application** to the scheme.

Notification and feedback

- The Council is precluded from discussing results of the competition or the outcome of individual applications over the telephone or in writing. Feedback to unsuccessful candidates will consist of the quantitative score assigned by the IAB and qualitative feedback under each of the corresponding marking criteria.
- Under no circumstance will feedback provided by the Council compromise the confidentiality of a participant form submitted to Council.
- Additional qualitative feedback beyond what is detailed in the feedback letter will not be provided. Under no circumstance will feedback provided by the Council compromise the confidentiality of a participant form submitted to the Council.

EVALUATION MATRIX

Postdoctoral Evaluation Criteria & Detail	Evaluation Marks
<p>1. Track Record / Research Potential of the Applicant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research experience (based on their academic CV), including trans-national mobility, inter-sectoral mobility, scientific/practical/management experience. • Research results (publications record, invited contributions, patents, teaching, monographs, data sets etc.) in relation to the level of research experience. • Evidence of independent thinking and leadership qualities. • Match between the researcher's profile and the project. 	30% (0-30)
<p>2. Training and Career Development Aspects and Impact of the Fellowship:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity and quality of objectives in the applicant's career development and training plan, including the extent to which specific training activities have been scheduled. • Potential acquisition of new research related and transferable skills. Particular attention will be paid to aspects of the proposed fellowship which allow the fellow to gain skills relevant to employment outside the traditional academic sector. • Potential to acquire new knowledge. • Impact of the proposed fellowship on the applicant's career path: potential to acquire competencies that improve the prospects of reaching and/or reinforcing a position of professional maturity, diversity and independence. 	25% (0-25)
<p>3. Quality of the Research Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research quality, including consideration of ethical and sex/gender issues and any interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary aspects of the proposal. • Potential of the research to advance fundamental understanding of the topic and/or potential for research impact and the degree to which the proposal addresses present or future socio-economic needs. • Originality (relationship to the 'state-of -the-art') and innovative nature of the project. • Suitability of the proposed methodology and approach for the project, including the clarity of short and long-term research objectives. • Feasibility of the project. 	25% (0-25)
<p>4. Quality of the Host Organisation(s) / Implementation of the Fellowship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitability and Quality of the Host Organisation(s): research reputation of the Mentor (including research output record); support provided (e.g. equipment and facilities); (inter) national linkages with appropriate partners. • Host expertise in developing experienced researchers in the field; capacity to provide mentoring, and their ability to facilitate the activities specified in the applicant's career development and training plan. • Ability of Host Organisation(s) to allow full implementation of all aspects of the fellowship, such as the provision of all necessary facilities for the fellow to carry out the project. • Ability of Host Organisation(s) to assist the fellow in integrating in their new research environment (e.g. assistance with tax and social security arrangements, etc.). 	20% (0-20)

ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP SCHEME 2019– APPLICATION & ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Applicant deadline
5 September 2018

Academic/Enterprise Mentor
& Referee deadline
12 September 2018

Research Office deadline
19 September 2018

