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**NOTE TO THE EVALUATOR**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. Underlying evaluation form is designed to evaluate the results of the research projects of the seventh phase of the IAP programme 2012-2017 for the period from the start of the project (01/04/2012 or 01/10/2012) till 01/06/2016.

The evaluation of each project will be carried out by **four international and independent evaluators**by means of a written procedure.

1. As one of the evaluators, you are expected to assess not only the **quality of the scientific achievements of the project** but also **the quality of the partnership**. The evaluation form subsequently deals with the following topics :

- Quality of the information provided by the network

- Quality of the scientific achievements

- Quality of the partnership

- Position of the IAP-network (cutting-edge, critical mass, international role)

- Output (publications, PhD and post-doc training, young emerging teams)

- General appreciation of the network and recommendations

1. The evaluators are asked to **carefully** answerthe different questions and assign marks, where appropriate, a YES or NO, or a number from 0 - 5 indicating:

5 **Excellent.** The project successfully meets all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

4 **Very good.** The project meets the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present

3 **Good.** The project meets the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present

2 **Average.** The project broadly meets the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.

1 **Poor.** The criterion is inadequately met, or there are serious inherent weaknesses

0 The project fails to meet the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.

NA Not Applicable

Your marks as well as your written comments will be used in the evaluation process and will provide the IAP-network with important feedback. So, please, comment clearly your marks (to write your comments, put your cursor in the grey area of the form; the foreseen comment boxes will expand automatically).

Moreover you are asked to provide your final rating and overall assessment of the project thereby indicating and considering the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. Please note that the final rating doesn’t need to be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings (but, nevertheless, has to be consistent with these ratings).

1. All answers will be treated **confidentially**. We guarantee anonymity when transferring the evaluation reports to the IAP-promoters and their institutions, the members of the evaluation panels and the IAP-steering committee.
2. Upon receipt of the evaluation report, the Belgian Science Policy Office (BELSPO) will send it to the IAP coordinator. **In case of factual errors,** the coordinator and his/her IAP network partners have two weeks to send their comments on this report to BELSPO.

**II. ASSESSMENT**

1. INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE NETWORK

* Your evaluation of the quality (i.e. accuracy, richness of information, etc.) of the information provided by the network:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Review report and annual reports |  |
| IAP-network’s website |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

1. SCIENTIFIC ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE NETWORK

* Your evaluation of…

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The achievements in relation to the initial objectives (see description of the project) |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please provide here a global comment + short comment per WP: |

* Your evaluation of…

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The scientific contribution of each partner to the project (taking into account the budget shares of the partners) |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please provide here a global comment + short comment per partner: |

1. NETWORKING

* Your appreciation of the specific network activities:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Occurrence of joint experiments |  |
| Transfer/exchange of tools, materials and knowledge |
| Common use of equipment and/or databases |
| Exchanges of researchers |
| Annual meetings |
| Organization of WP meetings |
| Organization of international workshops |
| Organisation of network-driven training activities |
| Newsletter |
| Involvement of an advisory committee |
| Other : |

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

* Your appreciation of the organization and management of the network:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Coordination process and planning control |  |
| Internal information dissemination/flows |

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

* Your appreciation of the cooperation/collaboration between the different partners and the degree of networking:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The effective cooperation/collaboration |  |
| The degree of networking |

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

1. POSITION OF THE IAP-NETWORK

A. Cutting edge / or novelty of research carried out

* Are there any scientific achievements so far that can be characterized as “breakthroughs” (new compared to the “state of the art”)?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

* Compared to other internationally recognized research networks/groups in the same discipline how do you evaluate….

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The scientific position of the network in the research domain |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

* How do you evaluate…

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The future opportunities (5 to 10 year outlook) of the research topics dealt with by the network |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

B. Critical mass

* A major objective of BELSPO is to build a scientific critical mass in Belgium which is recognized internationally. How do you appreciate this for the network under consideration?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Internationally recognized scientific critical mass |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

C. International role

* Please assess the integration of the international partner(s) in the network

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Integration of the international partners in the network |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

* Please review the recognition and visibility of the IAP-network and its partners on the international scene.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| International visibility of the IAP-network and partners |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

1. OUTPUT

A. Publications

Please comment (about visibility, quality, relevance, impact, etc.) on the 10 most relevant publications selected by the network (see review report 2012-mid 2016) provided by the network).

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

B. Outreach, dissemination and impact to society

Please comment on the outreach, dissemination activities and the impact to society provided by the network, bearing in mind that such activities were not compulsory.

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

C. PhD and postdoc training

Your evaluation of the training of PhD and postdocs in the network…

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Training of PhD and postdocs |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

D. Young emerging teams (if applicable)

One of the recommendations of BELSPO is to integrate young emerging teams in the network. Please assess the integration of these teams in the network under consideration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Integration of emerging teams |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |

**III. GENERAL APPRECIATION OF THE IAP NETWORK AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE**

1. GENERAL APPRECIATION OF THE NETWORK

We ask you to provide your overall appreciation of the functioning of the network. The two final ratings (one for scientific achievements and one for quality of partnership) need not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings but consistent and in line with the previously given marks.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Quality of the scientific achievements** |  |
| **Quality of the partnership** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please provide here a summary of approximately 10 lines on the quality of the scientific achievements : |

|  |
| --- |
| Please provide here a summary of approximately 10 lines on the quality of the partnership: |

1. SWOT ANALYSIS OF THE NETWORK

Please fill out (summarize) with a few key words the network’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. Please also consider the previously given evaluation/appreciation of the various aspects/achievements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Network strengths** | **Network weaknesses** |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Network opportunities** | **Network threats** |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |
| - | - |

1. CONTINUATION OF THE NETWORK

The phase VII networks that wish to introduce a proposal for the next phase will be required to take into consideration the results and recommendations from the ex-post evaluation. Also, all proposals for the next phase will be submitted to an ex-ante evaluation process by peer review.

- Should the network be prolonged in the next phase and under which conditions, if any?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| If no, please comment here: |

- If yes, what are your recommendations for improvement (research themes, partners, management, …)?

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment here: |