

The following is a translation from Estonian. In case of disputes, the Estonian text shall prevail.

Guidelines for Evaluating Outgoing Postdoctoral Grant Applications

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This directive establishes the evaluation criteria and the principles for evaluating and compiling the ranking lists of the applications submitted according to the “Conditions and Procedure for Postdoctoral Grants”.
- 1.2. The Estonian Research Council (hereinafter *Council*) is entitled to make well-considered decisions and consult experts where necessary in relation to matters not covered by this directive.

2. Evaluation of Grant Applications

- 2.1. The evaluation of the applications takes place in the Estonian Research Information System (hereinafter *ETIS*).
- 2.2. All applications are to be evaluated according to the same criteria and procedures in order to ensure equal treatment of all applications.
- 2.3. The final funding list of the applications is formed by taking into consideration all relevant information and by comparing the applications in the (sub-)field-specific ranking lists. The Expert Panel and the Evaluation Committee may use the overview of the bibliometric indicators of the supervisor of the postdoctoral fellow as an additional material for evaluating the applications.
- 2.4. The evaluation process is as follows:
 - 2.4.1. Processing the applications in the Expert Panel
 - 2.4.1.1. Each application will be reviewed by at least three independent experts, one of whom shall act as a rapporteur. At least two experts, incl. the rapporteur, have to be the members of the Expert Panel. In cooperation with and based on the evaluations given by the experts, the rapporteur will prepare the preliminary final evaluation for each application.
 - 2.4.1.2. The Expert Panel will confirm the preliminary final evaluation and the preliminary funding list of the applications.
 - 2.4.1.3. During the hearing, the preliminary final evaluation will be made available to the applicant and to the institution.
 - 2.4.2. Processing the applications in the Evaluation Committee
 - 2.4.2.1. The Evaluation Committee will consider the results of the hearing, approve the final evaluation of each application, compile the funding list of the applications, and forwards the applications to the Expert Panel on Research Ethics and Data Management.
 - 2.4.2.2. The applications that have received the funding proposal and at least the next three applications in the ranking list shall be forwarded to be evaluated by the Expert Panel on Research Ethics and Data Management.
 - 2.4.2.3. The Evaluation Committee will submit a proposal to the Management of the Council not to approve the rest of the applications.

2.4.3. Processing the applications in the Panel on Research Ethics and Data Management

2.4.3.1. This Panel will give an evaluation on the criteria of research ethics and research data management.

2.4.3.2. During the evaluation process, the Panel is entitled to request explanations and additional information from the applicant.

2.4.3.3. The Panel on Research Ethics may make suggestions or proposals for organising the activities of the project which are related to research ethics and/or data management more effectively, or submit a proposal to the Evaluation Committee to prescribe certain conditions that the PI and the institution are required to fulfil upon receiving the grant.

3. Evaluation Criteria and Rating Scale

3.1. Evaluation criteria

When evaluating the applications, the following evaluation criteria are to be used and the scores have to be justified. The justification has to be based on the sub-criteria. It is also possible to add other noteworthy observations for each evaluation criterion.

Evaluation criterion	Sub-criteria	Rating scale
1. Scientific justification for and feasibility of the research project	<p>In this criterion, the scientific justification for and the feasibility of the research project, the clarity of the objectives, the justification for the research plan and risk reduction measures, proposed methods, and resources are to be evaluated, based on the following questions:</p> <p>1.1. How clear and justified is the objective of the project?</p> <p>1.2. How good and how clear is the scientific justification, incl. how precisely are the research questions and/or (excl. justified exceptional cases) hypotheses defined?</p> <p>1.3. How suitable and justified are the proposed research methods?</p> <p>1.4. How reasonable and purpose-driven is the research plan, incl. how justified and how suitable is the place where the postdoctoral project is going to be implemented (will the project be carried out entirely at the collaborating institution or partially in Estonia)?</p> <p>1.5. How well are the potential scientific or methodological problem areas acknowledged and how well are the risk reduction measures and the back-up plan described?</p> <p>1.6. How specifically and appropriately are the feasibility of the project explained and the necessary resources justified?</p>	From 1 to 5
2. Qualification of the applicant	<p>In this criterion, the qualification of the applicant is to be evaluated, based on the following questions:</p> <p>2.1. What are the research experiences and the quality of the results of the applicant's previous research activities, incl. participation in (international) cooperation and/or in research projects, number and quality of publications, conference</p>	From 1 to 5

	<p>attendance, skills obtained, and other research-related activities?</p> <p>2.2. How suitable are the scientific competences and the previous experiences of the applicant for successfully carrying out the proposed project?</p>	
<p>3. Qualification of the supervisor</p>	<p>In this criterion, the qualification of the supervisor is to be evaluated, based on the following questions:</p> <p>3.1. What is the focus and quality of the research and of the results of the research conducted by the supervisor during the past 10 years, incl. the number and quality of publications, the experience in supervising doctoral students and postdoctoral fellows; leadership of and/or participation in domestic and/or international R&D projects, and other research-related activities?</p> <p>3.2. How suitable is the supervisor's scientific qualification and experience in supervising postdoctoral fellows and doctoral students for supporting this project?</p>	<p>From 1 to 5</p>
<p>4. Importance of the research project, incl. importance for Estonia</p>	<p>In this criterion, the the importance of the research project, incl. the importance for Estonia, is to be evaluated, based on the following questions:</p> <p>4.1. How specifically and appropriately is the scientific importance and the potential impact of the project described, considering the specifics of the research field and topic?</p> <p>4.2. How clearly has it been defined where and how the new skills and knowledge acquired as a result of the project could be used, incl. in future research?</p> <p>4.3. How specifically and appropriately is the importance of the project outside academia, incl. the importance for Estonia, described, considering the specifics of the research field and topic?</p> <p>4.4. How well has the applicant planned the activities of the project for the development of his/her future research career (development of professional and transferable competences, training, supervision, etc.)?</p> <p>4.5. How well are the plans for public outreach (dissemination of the results among the wider public outside academia) considered?</p>	<p>From 1 to 5</p>
<p>5. Research ethics, incl. the potential ethical risks accompanying the implementation of the project</p> <p><i>This criterion will be evaluated only by the Panel on Research Ethics and Data Management</i></p>	<p>5.1. Has the applicant sufficiently, carefully, and properly assessed the potential ethical risks concerning research which may arise during research (e.g., questions related to human participation or involvement of animals; gender, age, cultural, etc. diversity issues; political, religious, societal, historical, and other sensitive topics; maintenance of biodiversity, environmental intervention, etc.)?</p>	<p>Appropriate, conditionally appropriate</p>

	<p>5.2. Has the applicant sufficiently, carefully, and properly described the measures and activities with which the risks concerning research ethics are mitigated?</p> <p>5.3. Has the applicant sufficiently, carefully, and properly addressed the ethical and legal requirements applicable to the research (e.g., requirements related to the processing of personal data or ethics committee approvals) and how the requirements are to be met during the course of the project?</p>	
<p>6. Research data management</p> <p><i>This criterion will be evaluated only by the Panel on Research Ethics and Data Management</i></p>	<p>6.1. Has the applicant sufficiently, carefully, and properly described issues related to the management of research data and other research results throughout their life cycle?</p> <p>6.2. Has the applicant sufficiently, carefully, and properly addressed the ethical and legal requirements regarding the storage or use of research results and research data (e.g., issues related to open science or intellectual property), and explained the fulfilment of the requirements?</p>	<p>Appropriate, conditionally appropriate</p>

3.2. Rating scales and the formation of the final score

3.2.1. For criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4 a nine-point differentiated rating scale is used:

- Outstanding (5);
- Very good-Outstanding (4.5);
- Very good (4);
- Good-Very good (3.5);
- Good (3);
- Satisfactory-Good (2.5);
- Satisfactory (2);
- Unsatisfactory-Satisfactory (1.5);
- Unsatisfactory (1).

3.2.2. For criteria 5 and 6 a two-point differentiated rating scale is used:

- Appropriate;
- Conditionally appropriate.

3.2.3. Interpretation of ratings for criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4:

- Unsatisfactory (1) – the application addresses many of the aspects of the evaluation criteria inadequately and/or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- Satisfactory (2) – the application addresses most of the aspects of the evaluation criteria in very general terms and there are significant weaknesses. Major revision and clarification would be needed to improve the application.
- Good (3) – the application addresses most of the relevant aspects of the evaluation criteria well, but a number of shortcomings are present. Some questions could be elaborated on more thoroughly and more clearly. A sound research project with some issues to be considered.

- Very good (4) – the application addresses most of the relevant aspects of the evaluation criteria very well and only a small number of shortcomings or issues to be considered are present. Minor revision and clarification would be suggested.
- Outstanding (5) – the application is remarkably well elaborated and all sub-criteria of the evaluation criteria have been met at an excellent level. An exceptionally strong application in all respects. The score “outstanding” is exceptional and it will be necessary to provide an additional justification for this score.

3.2.4. Interpretation of ratings for criteria 5 and 6:

- Appropriate – there are no shortcomings; there are some shortcomings or issues to be considered; the Panel may make suggestions or proposals for organising the activities of the project which are related to research ethics and/or data management more effectively.
- Conditionally appropriate – there are significant shortcomings related to research ethics and/or data management and in order to ensure that the project will be implemented in compliance with the requirements of research ethics and/or data management, the Panel will prescribe certain conditions that the PI and the institution are required to fulfil upon receiving the grant.

3.2.5. The final score will be formed by summing up the scores given to the evaluation criteria. For criterion 3 (Qualification of the supervisor), the coefficient 0.8 is applied. The final score can range from 3.8 to 19 points.

3.3. Threshold

3.3.1. The qualification threshold for criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4 is 3 points (*good*) before applying the coefficient. If the application does not pass the qualification threshold, then it does not qualify for funding and limitations could be placed upon the applicant in the next call.

3.3.2. The application will not be approved if it receives less than 80% of the maximum possible final score, i.e., if the application receives less than 15.2 points.

4. Basis for the formation of the ranking and funding list

4.1. The applications will initially be placed into field-specific ranking lists based on the final score given to each application. The applications which have not passed the quality threshold or which have received less than 15.2 points as the final score will not be included in the ranking list.

4.2. For ranking the applications with the same final score, the criteria to be used is as follows:

- 4.2.1. the applications of equal standing will be ranked according to the scores received during the evaluation process in the following order of the evaluation criteria: 1, 2, 3, and 4;
- 4.2.2. the applications which sustain equal standing after the ranking procedure described in 4.2.1 will be prioritised according to the underrepresented gender among the applicants whose applications rank above the applications of equal standing;
- 4.2.3. the applications which sustain equal standing after the ranking procedures described in 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 will be prioritised according to the

underrepresented (sub-)field of research among the applications which rank above the applications of equal standing.

4.3. After the activities mentioned in points 4.1 and 4.2, applications are prioritized in a non-field-specific funding list based on the following principles:

4.3.1. the applications which have been ranked first in each of the field-specific ranking list will sustain the equal standing;

4.3.2. when ranking the following applications, the principles outlined in points 4.1 and 4.2 are followed..