

## Concept workshop „Review Processes“

This workshop addresses young researchers, ideally a group from a similar field, who want to understand the logic of peer review processes. The workshop presents different review strategies and background information from the perspective of research funders. The participants need to prepare short [mock] applications and act as reviewers in two panel meetings. By “playing” the process of a peer review meeting (and making all the mistakes) the participants learn on the example how peer review works, about its strength and shortcomings. They profit twice: as future applicants they will be able to address their specific review audience in a much more specific way, and in their role as future reviewers they collect insights that will help them to make peer review work better.

### **Preparation for workshop**

#### **Until November 5th**

- 1) One page (max.) application for fictional project (pdf)
- 2) Short presentation for this project

#### **Approx. 1-2 weeks before the workshop**

- 1) Receive and read the applications of your fellow participants
- 2) Prepare for panel meeting (select best two applications)

<p style="text-align: center;">Workshop</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>"How to improve your grant application – the reviewer’s perspective"</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Digital: BigBlueButton</p> <p style="text-align: center;">17.11.2023, 9.00 – 17.00 h</p>	
09:00 am	<p>Welcome session</p> <p>Expectation</p> <p>General information</p>
09:30 am	<p>Group discussion</p> <p>How did you prepare the review?</p> <p>How useful was the information provided by the applications?</p> <p>Describe your feelings regarding process and group situation.</p>
10:00 am	<p>Information</p> <p>The logic of the review process</p>
10:30 am	<p>Group discussion</p> <p>Perspectives - Frustrations &amp; reasons of applicant, reviewers and funder</p>
11:00 am	<p>Practical exercise</p> <p>Panel Meeting I – selection for presentation</p>
12:30 am	<p>Group discussion</p> <p>How did you feel during discussion?</p> <p>What do you think about the result?</p> <p>Did you feel being biased / unfair at any point?</p>
01:00 pm	<p>Lunch break</p>
02:00 pm	<p>Information</p> <p>How are reviewers found and selected?</p> <p>Observations from review processes.</p>
02:30 pm	<p>Practical exercise</p> <p>Panel Meeting II – Personal presentations</p>
04:00 pm	<p>Information and Group discussion</p> <p>Preparing for being a reviewer yourself</p>
04:30 pm	<p>Summing up the day and feedback</p>
05:15 pm	<p>End of workshop</p>

[Fictitious] Call for Funding Program „Science-Starters“ University of Gießen

The University of Gießen wants to give young postdoctoral researchers up to five years after PhD the opportunity to optimize their chances for winning a professorship at their favourite institution with a small and innovative “kick-off project”. Applicants can submit proposals for projects that demonstrate their unconventional, yet strategic thinking and gives an outlook on what would be their research agenda as a professor.

Criteria of the program

- Personal qualification of the applicant
- Excellence of research idea
- Originality and innovation of the kick-off project
- Match between planned research agenda and strategy of institution

The proposed kick-off project should have a duration of up to 18 months and a flexible budget of up to 150.000 Euro. For the first step of the review process the University of Gießen asks for a 1-page summary of the project, containing the most relevant information. There are no specific guidelines, structuring and layout of this application lies in the hands of the applicant.

The two-step review process consists of 1) a panel meeting of 14 international and interdisciplinary experts from various fields of the life sciences and 2) a personal presentation of up to three selected projects.

Documents to be submitted

- 1-page Application (in English)
- Curriculum Vitae
- List of max. five most relevant publications

The presentations will be 5 min. followed by 10 min. of discussion with the panel.

Deadline **05.11.2023**

Send your application (PDF) to:

**Marco Russo, University of Gießen**

**MAIL:** [postdocs@ggl.uni-giessen.de](mailto:postdocs@ggl.uni-giessen.de)

### **Comment to participants of the workshop:**

Please prepare a 1-page application according to this [virtual/non-real] call until **05.11.2023**. If you do not feel comfortable with sharing any real information, feel free to provide fictitious information. All documents are exclusively used to create a realistic review situation during the workshop.

Please treat all information you receive as a “reviewer” confidential and destroy/delete the documents immediately after the workshop.

The call is deliberately unusual and difficult to prepare for. If in doubt, get creative. The more “mistakes” the participants make, the more opportunities we will have for learning during the workshop. Please treat other participants with respect and contribute to an inspiring and fun atmosphere. Feel as relaxed as possible towards “mistakes” you made in your application, but stay self-caring and indicate possible disrespectful comments of others.

While review processes are always planned to be rational and reasonable, we will also discover the influences of emotions and personal attitudes and opinions.

### **Instructions for your role as a reviewer**

Consider the following criteria

- Scientific quality and potential of the application
  - Quality of the long-term strategy for research agenda as a professor
- Academic potential of the applicant
- Originality and innovation
- Match of applicant and (strategy of) institution
- Clarity of application

Be prepared to indicate 2-3 favourite applications at the beginning of review panel I and give a short statement with your main arguments.

Considerations to prepare for workshop (please take notes!)

- Observe your workload, time-management, and organization of your pre-review.
- Observe your feelings towards the individual application.
  - What causes these feelings?
  - How much do they influence your opinion?
- Observe potential biases.