

ODYSSEUS TYPE I

1. Competence of the Odysseus applicant							
D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
	<50%	>50%	>40%	>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
1.a. International recognition and scientific independence <i>Taking into account the scientific seniority of the applicant, assess the track record of the applicant: research results and scientific contributions to the field as evidenced by the quality (rather than the quantity) and impact of the publication record, as well as other scientific output (invited contributions, conferences, patents, teachings, monographs, ...), and impact beyond publications. To what extent (1) has the applicant demonstrated to be able to propose and conduct ground-breaking research, (2) is the applicant respected within the international community, (3) can the applicant rely on an international network, and (4) is the applicant an independent researcher.</i>							
<p>The applicant is not (inter)nationally recognized at all in his/her field(s) of research. His/her track record shows no signs of state-of-the-art research. He/she has no or can only rely on a very limited network, AND/OR was not able to secure project funding yet, AND/OR has no expertise in leading/training a team of researchers.</p>	<p>Although locally recognized, the applicant has no strong international reputation. His/her track record shows very limited signs of state-of-the-art research. The vast majority of the applicants' work is incremental in nature. He/she is predominantly locally networked, AND/OR was only able to secure limited national project funding, AND/OR only has occasional expertise in leading/training of a team of researchers.</p>	<p>The applicant in an expert in his/her field with a growing international reputation in his/her field of research. His/her track record shows some important signs of state-of-the-art research, however, a considerable part of it remains rather incremental in nature. He/she is rather locally networked with growing signs of international embedding, AND/OR has been able to secure some (inter)national project funding; AND/OR only recently started to gain experience in leading/training a team of researchers.</p>	<p>The applicant is a solid expert in his/her field of research with a profound international reputation. His/her scientific track record shows a significant number of clear signs of predominantly state-of-the-art research, pushing the boundaries of the field(s) in which he/she is active. This might have resulted in some awards, among other elements of recognition. The applicant is well-networked internationally, was already able to secure substantial (inter)national project funding and has considerable experience in leading/training a team of researchers.</p>	<p>The applicant is an international authority in his/her field of research, widely recognized for his/her ground-breaking contribution(s) that go far beyond the state-of-the-art in his/her domain and might have impacted other domains as well. This is reflected in the scientific track record of the applicant and has resulted in various prestigious awards, honours, invited key note lectures at main events in- and/or outside his/her domain, among other elements of recognition. The applicant has an extensive international network, is able to secure high-level project funding both at a national and international level, and demonstrated a clear ability to independently lead/train a team of researchers.</p>			
1.b. Competences and motivation <i>Assess (1) whether the applicant has the right scientific background/competences to perform the proposed research, and (2) whether the applicant shows proper motivation and commitment to pursue the proposed research (e.g. motivation statement).</i>							
<p>The applicant lacks the expertise/knowledge and necessary skills to perform the proposed research. As a result, one can expect that the scientific goals laid out in the project proposal will not be reached, not even with the help of others. The applicant does not come across as motivated/committed.</p>	<p>The applicant lacks significant expertise/knowledge and/or the necessary skills to perform most of the proposed research. Only with the help of others, some of the goals will be (partially) reached. Very limited motivation/commitment is given/shown by the applicant to pursue the proposed research.</p>	<p>The applicant lacks some of the expertise/knowledge and/or necessary skills to perform some of the proposed research. As a result, one can expect him/her not to independently reach all of the goals laid out in the project. His/her motivation/commitment to pursue the proposed research could be more convincing.</p>	<p>The applicant has the required expertise/knowledge and necessary skills to perform the proposed research. The applicant is a creative thinker allowing him/her to independently reach most of the scientific goals laid out in the project proposal. His/her motivation/commitment to pursue the proposed research is well-built.</p>	<p>The applicant's expertise/knowledge/skills go beyond those required to conduct the proposed research. He/she is an adaptive, autonomous, innovative and visionary thinker allowing him/her to independently reach all the scientific goals laid out in the project proposal. The applicant's motivation/commitment to pursue the proposed research is elaborated in an excellent way.</p>			

ODYSSEUS TYPE II

1. Competence of the Odysseus applicant							
D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
	<50%	>50%	>40%	>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
1.a. Track record of the applicant and potential to become a leading figure in the field <i>Taking into account the scientific seniority of the applicant, assess the track record of the applicant: research results and scientific contributions to the field as evidenced by the quality (rather than the quantity) and impact of the publication record, as well as other scientific output (invited contributions, conferences, patents, teachings, monographs, ...), and impact beyond publications. To what extent has the applicant (1) an emerging scientific reputation and an upward scientific trajectory, (2) the potential to become an independent researcher and establish his/her own research group.</i>							
The applicant has no demonstrated background at all in proposing and/or performing ground-breaking research.	The applicant has up to now shown very limited capabilities to propose and/or perform ground-breaking research, AND/OR despite an earlier upward trajectory, his/her scientific performance is stalling.	The applicant is a growing expert in his/her field with a limited international reputation . Although his/her track record (evaluated in relation to his/her scientific seniority) shows some signs of state-of-the-art research, a considerable part remains incremental in nature. He/she shows signs of growing international embedding. Despite limited experience in securing (inter)national project or other types of funding and/or leading/training a team of researchers, the applicant has given clear evidence of an upward trajectory and the potential to become an expert in his/her field of research.	The applicant is an expert in his/her field with a growing international reputation in his/her field of research. Taking his/her scientific seniority into account, is/her track record shows important signs of state-of-the-art research. He/she is well-networked internationally, was able to secure some (inter)national project or other types of funding and has considerable experience in leading/training a team of researchers. The applicant undoubtedly has the potential to become an international expert in his/her field of research.	The applicant is a solid expert in his/her field of research with a profound international reputation . Taking his/her scientific seniority into account, his/her scientific track record shows clear signs of predominantly state-of-the-art research, pushing the boundaries of the field(s) in which he/she is active. This has resulted in some awards, among other elements of recognition. The applicant has an extensive international network, was already able to secure competitive (inter)national project or other types of funding and has significant experience in leading/training a team of researchers. The applicant has the potential to become an international authority well-respected in his/her field of research and beyond.			
1.b. Competences and motivation <i>Assess (1) whether the applicant has the right scientific background/competences to perform the proposed research, (2) whether the applicant is acquiring the proper skills in terms of the anticipated career development, and (3) whether the applicant shows proper motivation/commitment to pursue the proposed research (e.g. motivation statement) and has a realistic vision on his/her professional future.</i>							
The applicant lacks the expertise/knowledge and necessary skills to perform the proposed research. As a result, one can expect that the scientific goals laid out in the project proposal will not be reached, not even with the help of others. The applicant does not come across as motivated/committed to pursue the proposed research and/or an academic career.	The applicant lacks significant expertise/knowledge and/or the necessary skills to perform most of the proposed research. Only with the help of others, some of the goals will be (partially) reached. Very limited motivation/commitment is given/shown by the applicant to pursue the proposed research and/or an academic career.	The applicant lacks some of the expertise/knowledge and/or necessary skills to perform the proposed research. As a result, one can expect him/her not to independently reach some of the goals laid out in the project. His/her motivation/commitment to pursue the proposed research and/or an academic career could be more convincing.	The applicant has the required expertise/knowledge and necessary skills to perform the proposed research. The applicant is a creative thinker allowing him/her to independently reach most of the scientific goals laid out in the project proposal. His/her motivation/commitment to pursue the proposed research and an academic career well-built.	The applicant's expertise/knowledge/skills go beyond those required to conduct the proposed research. He/she is a adaptive, autonomous, innovative and visionary thinker allowing him/her to independently reach all the scientific goals laid out in the project proposal. The applicant is strongly motivated/committed to pursue to proposed research and has a bright, concrete and realistic vision on his/her professional future.			

ODYSSEUS TYPE I AND II

2. Scientific quality of the research project							
D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
	<50%	>50%	>40%	>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Not competitive	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
2.a. Scientific added value, rationale, relevance and originality							
The targeted research goals of an Odysseus research proposal must contribute to the current international state-of-the-art. To what extent is the proposal original and will it generate knowledge that goes beyond the state-of-the-art (e.g. novel concepts or novel approaches)? Does the Odysseus project contain a strong rationale and robust/original hypothesis, does it propose innovative methodological approaches?							
The targeted research goals are not original at all, the project does not build upon the international state-of-the-art and will not offer an added value to the state-of-the-art in its domain, AND/OR The proposed research has been studied before (duplicate of previous studies). AND/OR The rationale and hypothesis are completely lacking.	The targeted research goals are not very original and their innovative character is limited. The planned research activities will not result in much added value for the domain, but are rather a catching up with respect to the international state-of-the-art AND/OR The rationale and hypothesis are somehow lacking and/or rather weak.	The project is moderately original and/or the targeted research goals are primarily incremental in terms of contribution to the current state-of-the-art. The rationale and hypothesis are present, however, not sufficiently elaborated.		The targeted research goals are timely, innovative and original. The research results will contribute clearly to the current international state-of-the-art in the scientific domain. The rationale is strong and hypothesis is clear.			The project is timely and addresses important challenges. It is unique, extremely original, and it distinguishes itself in an outstanding manner from ongoing research efforts at the international level. It is a pioneering project based on a ground-breaking rationale and challenging objectives, concepts and research strategies that go beyond the state-of-the-art with a very high potential for impact.
2.b. Research approach and feasibility							
An Odysseus research proposal must be scientifically challenging and nonetheless feasible. To what extent is the outlined scientific approach challenging, feasible and focussed, bearing in mind the project, the requested budget and a project duration of five years? Is the proposed research approach/methodology sufficiently detailed and in line with the state-of-the-art?							
The research methodology is inappropriate/not suited to reach the scientific goals, is overall vaguely described/lacking or irrevocably outdated compared to the state-of-the-art. AND/OR The project is not feasible and/or not focussed at all, because e.g. it involves too many planned activities (too broad). AND/OR The project is not ambitious at all and does not require the budgets made available by the Odysseus program at all or could be finished in much less than five years' time.	The research approach shows significant weaknesses/shortcomings or is poorly described. Significant improvement is needed to meet the state-of-the-art. AND/OR The feasibility and/or focus of the scientific project objectives are doubtful. AND/OR Overall the project is not ambitious enough given the requested budget and/or timeframe.	The research approach is appropriate, but lacks some elements (could have been more detailed) and/or contains some shortcomings. The methodology is reasonably innovative. AND/OR The project is feasible, but could've been more focussed. As a result, it is likely that the scientific goals will only be partially reached. AND/OR Despite some ambitious aspects, the project could have been somewhat more challenging given the requested budget and/or timeframe.		The proposed methodology is (very) well elaborated, state-of-the-art, relevant and suitable to reach the targeted scientific objectives. There are some minor gaps and/or shortcomings, however, not significant in nature. AND The balance between the challenging nature and feasibility of the scientific project objectives is (very) good. The work plan proposes an efficient use of the budget and the five-year time frame. Risk mitigation strategy is present.			The proposed methodology is the most relevant, efficient and effective approach to reach the scientific goals and is considered as international state-of-the-art or beyond in the domain. Each step in the methodology is described in detail making it perfectly clear. AND Excellent focus, optimal balance between high-level scientific challenges and intrinsic feasibility of the scientific project objectives. The work plan fits perfectly the five-year timeframe and requested budget. In addition, the proposal clearly identifies potential risks and proposes carefully designed alternative research strategies and 'fall back' options.