

DAHLEM POSTDOC FELLOWSHIPS 2017

Peer Review Guidelines

DAHLEM POSTDOC FELLOWSHIPS provide funding for highly qualified postdoctoral fellows to conduct their own research within one of Freie Universität Berlin's outstanding collaborative research projects. Fellows are given the opportunity to expand their academic profile by experiencing early independence combined with professional guidance. During their stay they are integrated into research groups and assigned a professor as scientific advisor.

Fellows are selected in a four-step procedure: Eligibility check, International peer review, Structured interviews, Approval by the university's Executive Board. For further information on the program please visit www.fu-berlin.de/en/drs/drs_fellowships/DAHLEM-POSTDOC-FELLOWSHIPS.

Thank you for taking part in the selection process as an independent reviewer!

Your review will be treated confidentially and we ask you to please maintain confidentiality with respect to all those involved. Please note that, in order to provide feedback to unsuccessful applicants, we may forward anonymized sections of your assessment to them.

We will, of course, notify you of the outcome of the selection procedure when it has been completed. To ensure a timely selection procedure we would like to ask you use the online application and selection platform to complete your independent review(s) and to do this within in two weeks.

Before preparing your review, please check that you are not affected by impartiality issues (see guidelines overleaf). Should you not consider yourself sufficiently impartial or appropriately qualified to provide an expert opinion or not be able to submit your statement in the time foreseen, we should be very grateful if you would provide us with the name and address of a competent colleague and return the application documents to us immediately.

Schedule from Call for Applications to Project Start

January 2017	Call for Applications
March 2017	Deadline 15 March 2017
March 2017	Eligibility Check
April-May 2017	International Peer Review
June 2017	Structured Interviews
July-August 2017	Final Decision and Notification of successful candidates
September-October	Contracting of Fellows
1 November 2017	Project Start

Guidelines on impartiality issues

You must decline the peer review if you have a conflict of interest or may be perceived to have a conflict of interest in the eyes of a third party. If you have any doubts, you should clarify the matter with the DRS Fellowship Team.

Impartiality issues arise when there is a danger that unrelated considerations could influence the outcome of your peer review. Please note that impartiality issues may exist in relation to:

- the research project
- the applicant or his/her institution

Circumstances leading to impartiality issues may include:

- a family relationship, close personal ties or personal conflicts
- existing, planned or recently concluded close academic cooperation, such as undertaking a joint project or a joint publication within the last 3 years
- direct academic competition with your own projects or plans
- employment related dependency or supervisory relationships (e.g. teacher / pupil relationship) within the last 6 years
- involvement in ongoing or very recently concluded appointment procedures (professorial or other) relating to the applicant (e.g. as applicant or member of an appointment panel)
- personal financial or commercial interests in the funding decision

Should we not receive any indication from you that there are impartiality issues, we will assume that it is your belief that no such impartiality issues exist. In any event, please declare your connections to the institutions and individuals concerned in your review.

Scoring guidelines

Scores must be in the range 0-5. Marks for each criterion are given to one decimal point.

Interpretation of the scores:

0- The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.

1- Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2- Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.

3- Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.

4- Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.

5- Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

Please use the following structure in your comments:

- Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format)
- Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format)
- Overall comments

Should you have any questions, please contact the DRS Fellowship Team:

Andrea Dünschede | Tel: 0049 30 838 50543 | E-Mail: andrea.duenschede@fu-berlin.de

Anja Müller | Tel: 0049 30 838 62061 | E-Mail: anja.mueller@fu-berlin.de

Dr. Astrid Bergmann | Tel: 0049 30 838 59168 | E-Mail: astrid.bergmann@fu-berlin.de