

Swiss National ORD Prize

Evaluation Guidelines

1. Reviewers
2. Evaluation and selection process

1. Reviewers

Evaluation of the proposal will be carried out by the members of the ORD Sounding Board Researchers, acting as ORD Prize Jury.

Conflict of Interest

An interest may be defined as where a person may benefit either financially, professionally or personally by the success or failure of a proposal, or if the impression is given that this could be the case.

In that sense, each reviewer will be requested to check whether a circumstance exists that could be interpreted as a conflict of interest.

The following reasons are considered as conflicts for reviewers:

- Relatives, personal ties or conflicts
- Close scientific collaboration, e.g., implementation of joint projects or joint publications within the past 5 years
- Close proximity, e.g., member of the same scientific unit or impending transfer of the evaluator to the institution of the applicant or vice versa
- Teacher/student relationship, unless independent scientific activity of more than 5 years exists
- Dependent relationship in employment during the past 3 years
- Participation in on-going or recently concluded professorial appointment proceedings
- Personal economic interests in the funding decision
- Competitive relationship or common economic interests, e.g., common business management

Handling Conflict of Interests

The call coordinator (ORD Office) will do their best to avoid possible conflicts of interest among the reviewers. In addition to that, reviewers are obliged to thoroughly and conscientiously reflect upon their own situations and biases regarding a submission and, when in doubt, decline to review. As a guidance, bias criteria for declining review are specified in the declaration form.

Jury members should inform the ORD Office immediately of any possible reservations so that the coordinator of the call can determine whether participation in the evaluation process is appropriate.

2. Evaluation and selection process

All applications will be assessed by the ORD Prize Jury. Each submission will be reviewed by two jury members who will provide scoring and written statements of each application.

The evaluation process consists of the following stages:

- Formal eligibility check (by the ORD office)
- Pre-assessment & Panel discussion (Phase 1)
- Review of shortlist (Phase 2)
- Final selection of winners (Phase 3)

2.1 Reviewer assignment

After the call coordinator (ORD office) has checked the eligibility of all proposals received through the submission form, the eligible proposals will be forwarded to the reviewers. Assignment of proposals to reviewers is done by the ORD office together with the chair of the jury based on ruling Conflict of Interest and in accordance with the areas of member expertise. Each submission will be reviewed by two jury members.

2.2 Pre-assessment & Panel discussion (Phase 1)

During the pre-assessment phase, reviewers fill in their scoring sheets and send them back to the ORD office to ensure blind voting. Scoring is complemented by comments from jury members. The ORD office compiles the scoring results and discusses them with the chair of the jury.

In a panel discussion, each application will be presented by the assigned jury members and discussed to select a shortlist, respecting the total score and selected criteria by the applicant. In case of significant deviations between two jury members, a balancer will be activated.

2.3 Review of shortlist (Phase 2)

The remaining proposals will be reviewed by all jury members. Each jury member will select their top 5 proposals and rank them from 1-5, with 1 being the best. Each jury member's ranking will be conducted in a blind voting mode.

2.4 Final selection of winners (Phase 3)

In a final discussion, the jury will decide on the winners based on the rankings. The jury members will strive for a balanced portfolio of selected winners in terms of diversity (disciplines, career levels, gender, institutions, etc.).

2.5 Communicating results to applicants

The ORD office will communicate the results to the winners in advance of the award ceremony, and every applicant will receive an email with the decision of the jury.

2.6 Confidentiality

The reviewers declare by signing the conflict of interest form their confidentiality concerning the contents of the proposals they read.

3. Evaluation criteria

Reviewers will evaluate the proposals considering three criteria.

INNOVATION

Score	Definition
0	Absent - No meaningful use of ORD practices
1	Limited - ORD use is minimal or unclear
2	Basic - ORD use is present but not distinctive
3	Effective - Solid and appropriate use of ORD practices
4	Highly Innovative - Original and well-integrated use of ORD
5	Pioneering - Exceptionally creative use of ORD and set a strong example

IMPACT

Score	Definition
0	None - No evident impact
1	Minor - Impact is weak or not well demonstrated
2	Modest - Some positive effects, but limited reach
3	Relevant - Noticeable impact within a specific scope
4	Significant - Clear benefits for a defined community or field
5	Transformative - Broad, lasting impact on research or society

COMMUNITY-BASED

Score	Definition
0	None - No community involvement
1	Minimal - Engagement is superficial or unclear
2	Consulted - Some input from community, but limited
3	Engaged - Community involved / active at key stages
4	Well Integrated - Community actively contributes to the project (e.g. reuse)
5	Deeply Embedded - Strong co-creation and ongoing collaboration

Scoring guide

Reviewers express their evaluation in terms of scores for the three evaluation criteria, as well as an overall score, including short written comments. The ranking scale (0-5) should be used to make a clear distinction between high-quality, average and low-quality proposals. The role of reviewers is

important to keep the standard of the selection high. This includes sharing their remarks in a constructive manner and being aware of possible cultural, disciplinary, etc. biases.

Overall score

Reviewers will provide an overall score based on the following score system.

Score	Definition
0	Proposal does not meet the criteria at all or cannot be evaluated
1	Fail
2	Adequate
3	Good
4	Very Good
5	Excellent

Calculation

Each application is assigned an overall score and individual criterion scores (innovative, impactful and community-based).

If the average value of the three criteria scores reaches 4 or 5, an additional point is added to the overall score, which defines the total score. The total score can be a maximum of 6 points.

Examples

a) 1 point is added

Overall Score	Innovative	Impactful	Community-based	Total Score
5	3	4	5	6

b) No point is added

Overall Score	Innovative	Impactful	Community-based	Total Score
4	5	2	3	4