



**FFG**  
Forschung wirkt.

FFG  
3 MAY 2018  
VERSION 1

---

**NURTURING TALENTS PRIZE  
GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION**

## 1 GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION

For the Nurturing Talents Prize (“Helga Nowotny Prize”)

**Note:** The terms “measures” and “concept” always mean both, planned/ designed and/or implemented measures.

### Criterion 1: Mentoring concepts – Quality of content and appropriateness of approach

- How do you rate the quality of the concept’s content?
- Is the approach appropriate to reach the objectives of the described concept?

Within this subcriterion, please **also** assess the following aspect:

- To which extent do the measures comprehensively address potential ERC applicants/ERC grantees of the institution?
- Are there any measures specifically designed to address women as potential applicants for ERC grants?

*Explanation for “quality” and “appropriateness”:* Mentoring concepts of high quality and reasonable appropriateness represent a set of well thought-through, sound and realistic measures that are adequate to the type and scale of the applying institution.

*Explanation for “comprehensiveness”:* If there are “institutional” measures, i.e. one or more measures implemented for the benefit of potential ERC applicants/grantees of all departments of the institution, this would be a highly comprehensive approach. Measures addressing a subset of those would in principle represent a lower degree of comprehensiveness. Since there might be good reasons for such an approach, a brief explanation on the reasons for priority setting should be provided.

*Embedding of such measures within a (career) development plan of the institution would further add to the level of comprehensiveness.*

## **Criterion 2: Mentoring concepts – Level of sustainability**

- To which extent are the measures planned/implemented in a sustainable manner with a view to achieving the best possible impact for the institution?

*Explanation for “sustainability”:* The term “sustainability” used here refers to both, the nature and frequency of measures (e.g. events) as well as the time frame envisaged for implementing them. Therefore, several small or less resource-intensive measures organised on a rather frequent basis may be valued equally sustainable as more complex measures taking place less frequently. Also, a longer-term strategy, e.g. encompassing a time frame of up to 3 years (or more) for carrying out the planned measures would add to the level of sustainability.

Integration of **gender-specific measures** may, if applicable, further add to the sustainability of mentoring measures.

Again, evaluators are kindly requested to take the scale and type of the institution into account when assessing the appropriateness of measures and their (planned) frequencies.

### **Examples:**

*Less resource-intensive:* An informal “lunch meeting” dedicated to the exchange of experiences among potential applicants and ERC grantees, taking place more than once a year.

*More complex:* A more elaborate measure requiring a higher degree of organisation and/or including follow-up measures, e.g. a workshop where concrete project ideas are presented and discussed.

## **Criterion 3: Evaluation of mentoring concepts**

- How does the institution evaluate its mentoring measures in order to ensure their quality and enable their further development?

*Explanation:* Does the institution evaluate its mentoring measures at all? (Yes/no)  
If Yes: How is the evaluation of mentoring measures carried out? How do the results of such an evaluation feed into further improvement of measures?

*Examples:* Gathering oral feedback at the end of the event/measure; feedback questionnaires; targeted discussions to further improve the impact of these measures, e.g. with the highest management level of the institution.

#### **Criterion 4: Concepts to attract and hold ERC grantees**

- What are the institution's concepts to attract incoming grantees and to retain them over the long term?

Within this criterion, please **also** assess the following aspect:

- Are there any measures specifically designed to address female ERC grantees?

***Explanation:** Are there any measures planned/in place to offer attractive framework conditions for incoming ERC grantees and to hold already present grantees? (Yes/no) If Yes: a brief description of such measures should be provided.*

***Examples:** Acquisition strategies to actively attract ERC grant holders such as recruiting activities at scientific conferences; promotional material specifically developed for this purpose; "welcome packages" containing specific benefits; clear career perspectives e.g. tenure track; embedment of such measures within the (career) development plan of the institution.*

## Scoring system

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Maximum Score</b> (Subcriterion max. score)
<b>1 – Quality of content and appropriateness of approach</b>	<b>35</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do you rate the quality of the concept's content? (15)</li> <li>• Is the approach appropriate to reach the objectives of the described concept? (15)</li> <li>• Are there any measures specifically designed to address women as potential applicants for ERC grants? (5)</li> </ul>	
<b>2 – Sustainability of concepts</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>3 – Evaluation of mentoring concepts</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4 – Concepts to attract and hold ERC grantees</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Threshold</b>	<b>60%</b>