

Grading rubric for Explore – Formas’ open call for research projects 2024

The grading rubric is developed to support reviewers in applying the grading criteria consistently. The grading rubric describes what is required to meet a certain grade for each of the grading criteria. The rubric describes four grades. However, reviewers can use the entire seven-point scale in their assessments, through selecting also grades that fall between the four described grades when relevant. For, example, the grade Exceptional (6) is defined as being between Very good (5) and Outstanding (7).

The grading rubric is also intended to provide guidance to those preparing an application to Explore, through articulating expectations in relation to different grades. The rubric is only available in English.

Novelty and originality				
Guiding question	Insufficient (1)	Acceptable (3)	Very good (5)	Outstanding (7)
What is the potential of the project to advance or challenge the state of knowledge and state of the art?	Shows no or only incremental potential of advancing or challenging the state of knowledge or state of the art. <i>And/or</i> Cannot be expected to make any scientific contribution or only to a limited extent.	Shows potential for limited advancements (e.g. “the logical next step”) in the state of knowledge or state of the art.	Shows some potential for significant advancements in the state of knowledge or state of the art.	Shows clear potential for significant advancements in the state of knowledge or state of the art.

Scientific approach				
Guiding question	Insufficient (1)	Acceptable (3)	Very good (5)	Outstanding (7)
To what extent are theory, method, empirical material and/or context appropriate in relation to each other and in relation to the project objectives?	<p>Theory, method, empirical material, and/or context are not aligned in relation to each other or to project and objectives.</p> <p><i>And/or</i></p> <p>Theory, method, empirical material, and/or context are poorly described.</p>	<p>Theory, method, empirical material, and/or context are properly described but not motivated, or they are weakly aligned to each other or to project objectives.</p>	<p>Theory, method, empirical material, and/or context are properly described and motivated, and they are sufficiently aligned to each other and to project objectives.</p>	<p>Theory, method, empirical material, and/or context are properly described and motivated, and they are well aligned to each other and to project objectives.</p>
To what extent are ethical aspects and considerations in research addressed in a satisfactory way?	<p>The applicant has stated that there are no ethical aspects or considerations relevant to address, but there is one or more ethical aspects or considerations that should have been brought up.</p>	<p>Ethical aspects and considerations are described and reflected on, but the most relevant ones are missing. The description of how ethical aspects or considerations are addressed in the project is missing or is weak.</p> <p><i>Or</i></p> <p>The motivation to why there are no ethical aspects or considerations is weak.</p>	<p>The most relevant ethical aspects and considerations are described and reflected on, and there is a satisfactory description of how these are addressed in the project.</p> <p><i>Or</i></p> <p>The motivation to why there are no ethical aspects or considerations is satisfactory.</p>	<p>The most relevant ethical aspects and considerations are thoroughly examined and reflected upon, with a detailed and convincing description of how these issues addressed in the project.</p> <p><i>Or</i></p> <p>The motivation to why there are no ethical aspects or considerations is detailed and convincing.</p>

Societal relevance and open science				
Guiding question	Insufficient (1)	Acceptable (3)	Very good (5)	Outstanding (7)
What is the potential of the project to contribute to addressing issues of relevance to society?	<p>The project has no or a very limited potential in contributing to an issue of relevance to society.</p> <p><i>And/or</i></p> <p>The proposal does not adequately explain what societal benefits the outcomes of the project could lead to.</p>	<p>The project has potential to make an incremental contribution to an issue of relevance to society.</p> <p>This could include, for example, projects that benefit only a very limited part of society, or where the potential contribution to sustainable development is incremental.</p>	<p>The project has potential make a significant contribution to an issue of relevance to society.</p> <p>This could include, for example, projects that could benefit a large part of society, or has potential to make a significant contribution to sustainable development.</p>	<p>The project has potential to make a substantial contribution to an issue of relevance to society.</p> <p>This could include, for example, projects could benefit a major part of society, or has potential to make a substantial contribution to sustainable development.</p>
To what extent does the project contribute to open science and science communication, during the project process and/or through disseminating methods and results?	<p>Planned efforts to contribute to open science and science communication are missing or are insufficiently described.</p> <p><i>And/or</i></p> <p>Relevant stakeholders and target audiences for such efforts are not identified.</p>	<p>Planned efforts to contribute to open science are described but lack in detail.</p> <p><i>And/or</i></p> <p>Stakeholders and target audiences are identified, but the most relevant ones are missing.</p>	<p>Planned efforts to open science and science communication are comprehensively described.</p> <p><i>And</i></p> <p>Planned efforts are fit for purpose and likely to be mostly achievable.</p> <p><i>And</i></p> <p>The most relevant stakeholders and target audiences are identified.</p>	<p>Planned efforts to open science and science communication are comprehensively described and argued for.</p> <p><i>And</i></p> <p>Planned efforts are fit for purpose and likely to be fully achievable.</p> <p><i>And</i></p> <p>All key stakeholders and target audiences are identified.</p>

Work plan and competence				
Guiding question	Insufficient (1)	Acceptable (3)	Very good (5)	Outstanding (7)
To what extent is the work plan for the project, including activity levels and budget, realistic and fit for purpose in relation to the project objectives?	<p>It is unlikely that the project objectives will be met within the proposed time frame, activity levels and budget.</p> <p><i>And/or</i></p> <p>There are relevant risks, but these are not identified.</p> <p><i>And/or</i></p> <p>The work plan is not fit for purpose or is missing.</p>	<p>The project objectives might be met within the proposed time frame, activity levels and budget.</p> <p><i>And/or</i></p> <p>Relevant risks are identified to some extent.</p> <p><i>And/or</i></p> <p>The workplan is fit for purpose with a few exceptions or is lacking in relevant details.</p>	<p>The work plan is fit for purpose and is likely to be mostly achievable within the proposed time frame, activity levels and budget.</p> <p><i>And</i></p> <p>Relevant risks are identified and ideas on how to address these are presented.</p>	<p>The work plan is fit for purpose and is likely to be fully achievable within the proposed time frame, activity levels and budget.</p> <p><i>And</i></p> <p>Relevant risks are identified and ideas on how to address these are presented and argued for.</p>
To what extent do project participants have the competences and experiences needed to carry out the project successfully?	<p>The competence and experience of project participants, individually and as a team, are poorly described.</p> <p><i>And/or</i></p> <p>Competences and experiences are not backed up by information provided in the project participants' academic profiles.</p> <p><i>And/or</i></p> <p>Academic profiles are missing or are not provided using the required template.</p>	<p>Competences and experiences are adequate to carry out the project successfully, with a few exceptions.</p> <p><i>And/or</i></p> <p>Competences and experiences are in most parts backed up by information provided in the project participants' academic profiles.</p> <p><i>And/or</i></p> <p>Competences and experiences are sufficiently described but not motivated.</p>	<p>Competences and experiences are sufficiently described and motivated.</p> <p><i>And</i></p> <p>Competences and experiences are adequate to carry out the project successfully.</p> <p><i>And</i></p> <p>Competences and experiences are backed up by the information provided in the project participants' academic profiles.</p>	<p>The competence and experience of project participants, individually and as a team, are well described and motivated.</p> <p><i>And</i></p> <p>The competence and experience are what is needed for carrying out the project successfully.</p> <p><i>And</i></p> <p>Competences and experiences are backed up by the information provided in the project participants' academic profiles.</p>