



# Evaluation Form

## LAPHIA – IdEx Bordeaux



université  
de **BORDEAUX**



INSTITUT  
d'OPTIQUE   
GRADUATE SCHOOL

# CALL FOR PROJECTS

## RESEARCH & VALORIZATION

### EVALUATION FORM

#### Information

The evaluation form is divided into 5 sections covering all the evaluation criteria and selection of projects presented in the description of the LAPHIA internal research call. Each section contains a number of points in order to facilitate the analysis for the referee and to help him/her to provide a synthesis score for each section. It is requested for each section a comment (around 10 lines) supporting the assessment of the referee. *The synthesis score for each section has not to be directly the average of each intermediary score, it must be in coherence with the overall impression that emerges.*

**For each score, it is requested to use the following scale:**

- 5 = excellent
- 4 = very good
- 3 = acceptable
- 2 = imperfect
- 1 = poor
- 0 = very inadequate

Please indicate “N/A” for any intermediate category not applicable, depending on the content of the project.

At the end of the evaluation form, a summary is then used to assign an overall evaluation rating on the project, review the strengths and weaknesses of the project, and finally a recommendation on the ranking of the project (*to consider as a priority / to retain if possible / to not retain*), with comments justifying the recommendation.

If you have any question regarding the evaluation form, please contact: [manager.laphia@u-bordeaux.fr](mailto:manager.laphia@u-bordeaux.fr)

**Project Acronym:**

**Evaluation date:**

1. Relevance of the proposal to the guidelines of the LAPHIA research call (see AAP Call document)	Score
Relevance to themes of the internal research call	
Adequacy of the recommendations of the research call (Project typology)	
Relevance of the positioning of the project (research / valorization)	
<b>Global score</b> <i>The synthesis score has not to be directly the average of each intermediary score, it must be in coherence with the overall impression that emerges.</i>	<b>x / 5</b>
<b>Comments</b>	

2. Scientific and technical quality of the project - Methodology, quality of the construction of the project	Score
Innovative aspect of the project	
Scientific and technical part of the project (advance in knowledge or technology in relation to the state of the art)	
International positioning of the project	
Existence and quality of preliminary results demonstrating the feasibility of the project / technical feasibility	
Risk assessment and proposals folds	
Relevance of the timetable for the project in terms of deadlines, deliverables	
<b>Global score</b> <i>The synthesis score has not to be directly the average of each intermediary score, it must be in coherence with the overall impression that emerges.</i>	<b>x / 5</b>
<b>Comments</b>  <i>Regarding the part "International positioning of the project", relevant references can be mentioned</i>	

3. Global impact of the project	Score
Perspective to create new technological solutions or innovative scientific concepts	
Improving competitiveness or knowledge	
Return on investment: scale, time, probability	
Balance between risk / benefit of the project	
Economic, industrial and societal impacts	
<b>Global score</b> <i>The synthesis score has not to be directly the average of each intermediary score, it must be in coherence with the overall impression that emerges.</i>	x / 5
Comments	

4. Quality of the consortium	Score
Scientific quality or expertise of the team involved	
Balance between expertise and competence with the tasks assigned to each partner	
Complementarity of the partnership	
For the coordinator: involvement of the coordinator and place of the project in the overall LAPHIA program	
<b>Global score</b> <i>The synthesis score has not to be directly the average of each intermediary score, it must be in coherence with the overall impression that emerges.</i>	x / 5
Comments	

5. Balance – Support requested / Project feasibility	Score
Realism of the calendar	
Adaptation and justification of the amount requested by considering the tasks and goals	
Balance between the partnerships	
<b>Global score</b> <i>The synthesis score has not to be directly the average of each intermediary score, it must be in coherence with the overall impression that emerges.</i>	x / 5
Comments	



**Overall review synthesis**

(This small text will be used to answer to the project coordinator and to suggest constructive improvements.)

Empty box for writing the overall review synthesis.

**CONTACT**

**LAPHIA**

[manager.laphia@u-bordeaux.fr](mailto:manager.laphia@u-bordeaux.fr)