

## Feedback for a proposal not ranked among the top in the call for university-wide funding – Interdisciplinary projects focusing on Agenda 2030 and sustainable development

Title of the proposal:

Main applicant:

Co-applicants:

<b>Criterion*</b>	<b>Rated</b>
Relevance (1-7)	
Quality (1-7)	
Novelty (1-7)	
Development potential (1-7)	
External engagement (1-3)	
Feasibility (1-3)	

	<b>Justification</b>
Comments on the criterion rated highest	
Comments on the criterion with the weakest rate	

Relevance, development potential and external engagement were assessed solely on the basis of the respective section in the application. Quality, novelty and feasibility were assessed on the basis of the specific sections, but also on the basis of the application as a whole and the attached CV:s.

### **The panel's overall assessment of the project:**

<b>Overall assessment (1-7)</b> The overall assessment should not be an average of the rates for the individual criteria. Projects that have not been rated 3 on feasibility should only in exceptional circumstances receive an overall assessment of 6 or 7.	
<b>Justification of the overall assessment</b>	
<b>Ranking</b>	The proposal was not ranked among the top proposals.
<b>Justification of the ranking</b>	The proposal had several promising features, but there were proposals that were assessed to have a higher

<p>Only leave the most important criteria in the text. If the panel has time, you are free to add other justifications.</p>	<p>potential, especially with respect to: relevance/quality/novelty/development potential/external engagement/feasibility.</p>
---	--

## \* Explanations of the scales:

### Relevance

- 7 – The relevance of the project is outstanding with respect to sustainable development and the specific goals stated with negligible limitations to its relevance
- 6 – The relevance of the project is excellent with respect to sustainable development and the specific goals stated
- 5 – The relevance of the project is very good to excellent with respect to sustainable development and the specific goals stated
- 4 – The relevance of the project is very good with respect to sustainable development and the specific goals stated
- 3 – The relevance of the project is good with respect to sustainable development and the specific goals stated
- 2 – The relevance of the project is weak with respect to sustainable development and the specific goals stated
- 1 – The relevance of the project is poor with respect to sustainable development and for the specific goals stated

### Quality

- 7 – Outstanding. Exceptionally strong application with negligible weaknesses
- 6 – Excellent. Very strong application with negligible weaknesses
- 5 – Very good to excellent. Very strong application with minor weaknesses
- 4 – Very good. Strong application with minor weaknesses
- 3 – Good. Some strengths, but also moderate weaknesses
- 2 – Weak. A few strengths, but also at least one major weakness or several minor weaknesses
- 1 – Poor. Very few strengths, and numerous major weaknesses

### Novelty

- 7 – Outstanding. The issues, methods, perspectives and knowledge combinations are original and completely unique internationally.
- 6 – Excellent. The issues, methods, perspectives and knowledge combinations are original internationally and constitute the basis for a new interdisciplinary collaboration at Lund University.
- 5 – Very good to excellent. Most of the issues, methods, perspectives and knowledge combinations are original internationally and largely constitute the basis for a new interdisciplinary collaboration at Lund University.
- 4 – Very good. The issues, methods, perspectives and knowledge combinations are new internationally and constitute the basis for increased interdisciplinary collaboration at Lund University.
- 3 – Good. There is some newness with respect to the issues, methods, perspectives and knowledge combinations are original internationally and there is some potential for new interdisciplinary collaboration at Lund University.
- 2 – Weak. Similar research is to a large extent already done internationally and the collaboration include only some new features compared to what is already done at Lund University.
- 1 – Poor. Similar research is already done internationally and the collaboration is already well established at Lund University.

### Development potential

- 7 – Outstanding. The development potential of the application is exceptionally strong with negligible weaknesses
- 6 – Excellent. The development potential of the application is very strong with negligible weaknesses
- 5 – Very good to excellent. The development potential of the application is very strong with minor weaknesses

- 4 – Very good. The development potential of the application is strong with minor weaknesses
- 3 – Good. The development potential of the application has some strengths, but also moderate weaknesses
- 2 – Weak. The development potential of the application has a few strengths, but also at least one major weakness or several minor weaknesses
- 1 – Poor. The development potential of the application has very few strengths, and numerous major weaknesses

### **External engagement**

- 3 – Excellent external engagement
- 2 – Good external engagement with weaknesses
- 1 – Weak/insufficient external engagement

### **Feasibility**

- 3 – Feasible
- 2 – Partly feasible
- 1 – Not feasible