

Guidelines

for Reviewing Knowledge Transfer Projects in Research Training Groups and Interna- tional Research Training Groups



Disclaimer: The English translation of this document is provided for informational purposes. In the event of a discrepancy between the English and the German versions, the German text takes precedence.

I General Information

Transfer projects may be integrated within existing Research Training Groups (RTG). Proposals for transfer projects are reviewed on the basis of a written proposal, which may be submitted either as part of a renewal proposal for a second RTG funding period or as a supplemental proposal while the RTG is in progress.

In your review, please consider the following criteria. The explanations and questions for each criterion are illustrative.

II Review Criteria

1 Quality of the Research Training Group's prior work and assessment of further developments within a transfer project

- Please evaluate, to the extent relevant for the proposed transfer project, the scientific quality of the findings generated to date by the Research Training Group. How will this expertise be used in the transfer project?
- What is the significance of the project from a technical, economic, cultural, and/or socio-political point of view (also in relation to its cost)?
- To what extent is the transfer project an innovative transfer of the Research Training Group's findings?

2 Application partner

- Please evaluate the suitability of the application partner in relation to the proposed project.
- Is the application partner's contribution necessary and sufficient?
- For projects with commercial application partners: Is the transfer project in a pre-competitive area? Give reasons for your assessment.

3 Objectives and work programme

- Does the transfer project provide opportunities for one or more dissertations/theses?
- Are the transfer project's objectives and success criteria plausible? Can they be evaluated?

- Will the work programme be jointly supported by both the Research Training Group and the application partner?
- Please assess the extent to which the work programme is appropriate to achieve the stated objectives.

4 Working conditions and environment

Please assess whether the staff, institutional, spatial and instrumental resources are adequate to successfully undertake the project.

5 Scope of funding

- Does the work programme justify the proposed staffing requirements?
- Is the proposed instrumentation, if any, necessary for the transfer project, and will it be fully utilised by it? Can it be considered contemporary core support?
- What budget will the project need for consumables, travel and other costs? Please review the individual items in the proposal and suggest an appropriate amount, either for each item or for the total.

6 Added value for the Research Training Group

- Is the transfer project expected to have an impact on the Research Training Group? To what extent can the transfer project be linked to other projects or theses in the Research Training Group? To what extent will the other doctoral researchers also benefit from the inclusion of the transfer project?
- Does the transfer project enable the participating doctoral researchers to obtain research and professional qualifications? If so, how? Will the participating doctoral researchers be included in the qualification and supervision strategies?
- To what extent does the transfer project offer new forms of doctoral training and supervision?
- Has the role of the transfer project within the context of the Research Training Group in general been presented in a coherent and persuasive manner?
- Have adequate legal agreements been made to govern matters such as the further use and publication of the data and outcomes generated in the Research Training Group by its doctoral researchers?
- How do you rate the significance and scope of this transfer compared to other collaborations with non-university partners?
- Is a separate transfer project necessary and appropriate?

Please make a clear recommendation as to whether you believe this project should be funded.

III Additional Aspects of the Review

1 Confidentiality

Please treat the proposal documents confidentially. To ensure the confidentiality of the review process but also for reasons of data protection, only you as the reviewer may have access to the proposal documents. The contents may not be forwarded to third parties – including third parties within your department/work area.

It may, however, be appropriate to involve further individuals if you are under the impression that further expertise is required for reviewing the proposal or if you wish to introduce researchers in early career phases to the review process. Approval of such involvement must be requested at the DFG Head Office (no particular formal requirements apply): For further information on the involvement of third parties and the requirements for a proposal to this effect, see the General Guidelines for Reviews (DFG form 10.20), sections 4 to 6.

www.dfg.de/formulare/10_20

The DFG is looking closely at the potential uses of artificial intelligence (AI) in the form of generative models for text and image creation – both in research work itself and when submitting proposals to the DFG.

As the documents that are provided to you for review are confidential, they may not be used as input for generative models. The use of generative models in the preparation of reviews is inadmissible in any case due to the confidentiality of the review process. What is more, the processing of proposal content using a generative model may constitute a copyright infringement.

When submitting proposals to the DFG, the use of generative models is permissible because of the considerable opportunities and development potential they offer, but such usage must be disclosed in a scientifically appropriate manner. The use of generative models is to be assessed neutrally per se when it comes to evaluating the subject-specific quality of a funding proposal. As far as the content of a proposal is concerned, full responsibility for research integrity remains with the applicants.

2 Obligation to Observe the Principles of Good Research Practice

The principles of good research practice must also be observed during the review process. Detailed information can be found in the DFG [Code of Conduct “Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice”](#).

A violation of these principles can result in a charge of scientific misconduct in accordance with the [DFG's Rules of Procedure for Dealing with Scientific Misconduct \(Verfahrensordnung der DFG zum Umgang mit wissenschaftlichem Fehlverhalten – VerfOwF\)](#).

3 Conflicts of Interest

Please examine whether any circumstances exist that might give rise to an appearance of bias, favouritism or conflict of interest on your part. For more information, please refer to the Guidelines for Avoiding Conflicts of Interest (DFG form 10.201).

www.dfg.de/formulare/10_201

4 Assessment of Researchers' Achievements

The assessment of a researcher's achievements must be carried out in its entirety and based on substantive qualitative criteria. In addition to the publication of articles, books, data and software, other dimensions can be taken into account, such as involvement in teaching, academic self-administration, public relations or knowledge and technology transfer. Details of quantitative metrics such as impact factors and h-indices are not required and are not to be considered as part of the review.

We ask you to consider a researcher's individual career stage when evaluating the qualification of the applicant and to assess his/her achievements on this basis. In some cases, this may mean that preliminary work specific to the project cannot necessarily be expected.

Please also take into account that some researchers may have pursued individual career paths in a business or non-university context.

The review must not be based on non-scientific criteria such as age, gender, family obligations, origin or health restrictions, to the detriment of the applicant. Researchers are encouraged to declare periods of absence and periods of restricted academic activity (minimum duration: three months in a year) due to unavoidable delays in their career.

Such periods should be given appropriate consideration in the researcher's favour in order to compensate for any disadvantages experienced.

For further information on equity and diversity in research, see:

www.dfg.de/diversity/en

In order to be able to make non-discriminatory, science-led funding decisions, it is important for the evaluation process to be based solely on the above criteria and free of non-scientific factors. Regularly engaging with the topic of bias can sensitise people to their own, often unconscious prejudices, thereby counteracting any potential bias in assessment. For further information, please refer to the recommendations and background material that are available at:

www.dfg.de/bias/en

5 Important Information on Data Protection

The DFG takes the protection of your personal data very seriously. The proposal documents on which your review is based regularly contain personal data that is protected by data protection laws, particularly by the provisions of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). In order to protect this data, we therefore request that you observe the following guidelines on the confidential handling of personal data when preparing your review.

Data protection law stipulates that personal data must be protected by sufficient security measures to prevent any access by unauthorised parties as well as accidental loss. Please take the necessary measures to comply with data protection law, for example by choosing secure passwords, securing PCs, etc. We also ask that you take measures to protect the proposal documents in your home workplace against access by other persons in your household or by other third parties.

If you are working outside the DFG systems (elan), for example saving the proposal documents onto a local end device, please make sure to delete personal data immediately or to securely destroy it when it is no longer required. This should be done in a secure manner (in the case of printed documents, by not disposing of them in a wastepaper basket but by using a paper shredder).

Please help us to recognise and remedy any data privacy incidents, and report all technical difficulties or irregularities to us when using DFG systems (elan), as well as any

(potentially) unauthorised access to personal data contained in the proposal documents. Examples of such incidents include:

- Unauthorised use of your elan login data
- Cyberattacks leading to access to personal data contained in the proposal documents by unauthorised parties
- If documents containing personal data relating to the proposal are stolen or read in the event of a break-in
- If USB sticks, mobile phones or laptops containing unencrypted personal data in connection with a proposal document are lost or stolen

In such cases, please contact: E-mail: datenschutz@dfg.de

With regard to your own personal data, please take note of the DFG's data protection notice for reviewers, which can be viewed and downloaded at www.dfg.de/privacy_policy. By taking up your duties as reviewer, you hereby confirm acknowledgement of this data protection notice.

www.dfg.de/privacy_policy