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Chapter 1: Introduction / Research Talent

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

This brochure provides information on submitting a proposal for Research Talent of the NWO Domain of Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH). Research Talent is a responsive mode funding scheme for high-level PhD research for young talented upcoming researchers with a demonstrable ambition to pursue a career as scientist, hereafter the “candidate (PhD student)”.

1.2 Available budget

The total budget for 2018 is approximately 6.25 million euro.

1.3 Validity of the call for proposals

This call for proposals is valid until the closing date March 6, 2018, 14:00 hours (2 PM) CE(S)T.
2 Aim

Research Talent offers excellent students within the social and behavioural sciences the opportunity to fulfil their ambition of pursuing a scientific career. This ambition is reflected in, amongst other things, their choice of study, the courses followed, and the academic activities that the student has engaged in.

To this aim, full professors (or associate professors with the *ius promovendi*) within the social and behavioural sciences can submit a pre-proposal for these candidates.

**Transition NWO and new instrument**

On January 1st, 2017, the NWO divisions for Social Sciences and for the Humanities merged into the new Domain for the Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH). 2017 will be a transition year, and consequently this round of Research Talent will only be open for applications that fall within the scientific domain of the Social Sciences. This scientific domain corresponds to the remit of the former NWO Division for the Social Sciences. In paragraph 6.1 you can find a list of the disciplines that fall within the scientific domain of the Social Sciences. The scientific domain for the Humanities has its own program for PhD research proposals: PhDs in the Humanities. For contact details see paragraph 5.1.1.

Research Talent in its current form will disappear and merge into a new instrument for curiosity-driven research of the Domain SSH. The current round will thus be the last round of the Research Talent instrument in its current form.


3 Guidelines for applicants

3.1 Who can apply

Researchers from the following knowledge institutions can submit proposals:
- Dutch universities;
- NWO and KNAW institutes;
- the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen;

Pre-proposals
The candidate cannot submit a proposal by her/himself. On behalf of the candidate the promoter submits a pre-proposal. When submitting a pre-proposal, the promoter holds the right to promote (ius promovendi). A promoter can submit a pre-proposal for more than one candidate. There are no co-applicants for the pre-proposal.

In order to be eligible for the Research Talent program, the candidate must meet the minimal requirements\(^1\) with respect to average grades:

Candidates following or having concluded their academic education in The Netherlands:
The overall weighted average grade of the completed bachelor study is at least the Dutch grade 7.5 and the overall weighted average grade of the completed first year\(^2\) of the master study is at least the Dutch grade 8.0. Dutch grades are not to be converted to a GPA on a 4 point scale.

Candidates following or having concluded their academic education outside of The Netherlands:
The candidate’s grades must be converted to a grade according to the United States Grade Point Average (GPA) on a 4 point scale. The overall weighted average GPA of the completed bachelor study is at least 3.37 and the overall weighted average GPA of the completed first year of the master study (see also footnote 2) is at least 3.95.

When submitting a proposal, the candidate has successfully concluded the first year of the master’s and the grades are final\(^3\). For more information on average grades and GPA see paragraph 6.4 of this call for proposals. The candidate’s master that meets the requirements with respect to the average grades/GPA must fall within the

---

\(^1\) For candidates having concluded an old style study at a Dutch university: the bachelor equals the ‘propedeuse’ and the master the ‘doctoraal’.

\(^2\) In case the candidate has successfully concluded a master’s of two (or more) years, the weighted average is calculated over the entire study, and is at least 8.0 or a GPA of 3.95.

\(^3\) In case the master’s has been successfully concluded, but due to administrative reasons, the candidate’s grades have not been finalised when submitting the pre-proposal, it is possible to submit a pre-proposal. In that case the date on which the grades will be finalised must be mentioned in the pre-proposal. The final grades (and the recalculated average/GPA) must be sent to the Research Talent co-ordinator no later than December 11th, 2017. If this date is not met, or if the final grades/GPA do not meet the set requirements, the pre-proposal will be declared not eligible and will be immediately removed from the procedure.
remit of scientific domain of the Social Sciences (see paragraph 6.1 of this call for proposals).

**Full proposals**

On the basis of the pre-proposal the promoter can be invited to submit a full proposal. This full proposal can be submitted on behalf of the candidate by a main applicant and one co-applicant, as long as one of the two is the promoter who has been invited by the SSH Domain Board to submit a full proposal. No more than two applicants can be involved in the full proposal. In case an additional applicant, together with the promoter, will be involved in the full proposal, her/his name must have been mentioned in the pre-proposal. A researcher can only be involved as an additional applicant in one proposal.

Main and co-applicants may only submit an application if they are employed by one of the aforementioned institutions and will be employed at said university or institute for at least the duration of the application process and the research for which funding is being applied for. This in order to not jeopardize the progress of the PhD research for which funding is requested.

When submitting a proposal to Research Talent, the following conditions apply:

- The application must fall within the remit of the scientific domain of the Social Sciences;
- The application form must be completed entirely;
- The candidate meets the requirements set for average grades: completed bachelor study: (weighted) average grade of minimal 7,5 (or in case of non-Dutch grades a GPA of minimal 3.37), completed first year of master study: (weighted) average grade of minimal 8,0 (or in case of non-Dutch grades a GPA of minimal 3.95);
- The candidate’s master that meets the requirements with respect to the average grades or GPA must fall within the remit of the scientific domain of the Social Sciences;
- Applicants whose proposal (pre-proposal or full proposal) was rejected in a previous round may not resubmit that proposal;
- For the concerning candidate an application can be submitted only once to Research Talent;
- The candidates does not already hold a position as a PhD student in the Netherlands or abroad;
- A full proposal can only be submitted when a pre-proposal has been submitted earlier;
- A full proposal can only be submitted upon invitation by the SSH Domain Board;
- The applicant and/or co-applicant of a full proposal for Research Talent may not concurrently submit another application or have an application under consideration at any SSH funding instrument that falls within the remit of the scientific domain of the Social Sciences;^4^;
- Once the application for the Research Talent full proposal has been admitted, the applicant and/or co-applicant may not submit another application to other funding instruments of SSH that fall within the remit of the scientific domain of the Social Sciences, for as long as the Research Talent application is under consideration;
- Applications submitted via ISAAC after the closing dates will not be taken into consideration.

---

^4^ This does not apply to Research Talent in case a promoter has been invited to submit a full proposal for more than one candidate.
3.2 What can be applied for

Applicants may only apply for a grant covering:
- Staff costs: four years fulltime for a PhD student;
- Material costs up to a maximum of €10,000, including costs for knowledge utilization and data management.

Personnel

The personnel budget requested for Research Talent may be spent on a four-year, fulltime position at a Dutch university for a candidate PhD student that is used fully for conducting the PhD research. The research must be carried out at a Dutch university.

Candidates who already hold a position as PhD student in the Netherlands or abroad are not eligible, nor are external PhD candidates.

Salary costs may be financed in accordance with the most recent version of the “akkoord overlaten werkgeverschap NWO-VSNU”.

Research costs

At the start of the research, the applicant will be awarded a bench fee of €5,000 for the PhD student. The bench fee is intended for expenses such as conference visits by the PhD student and costs related to the production of the PhD thesis.

In addition, the applicant can apply for a budget of €10,000 in total to be used for non-staffing research costs such as material provisions (equipment, data collection, and consumable goods), fieldwork, travel and publication costs and costs related to knowledge exchange and impact, as well as the costs for data management. These costs should be specified and substantiated in the proposal. Infrastructural expenses (housing, standard office computers), commuter traffic and other costs relating to overhead are not eligible for funding, nor are expenses covered by the bench fee.

3.3 When can applications be submitted

The deadline for the submission of preproposals is September 26, 2017, 14:00 hours (2 PM) CE(S)T.

The deadline for the submission of proposals is March 6, 2018, 14:00 hours (2 PM) CE(S)T.

When you submit your application to ISAAC you will also need to enter additional details online. You should therefore start submitting your application at least one day before the deadline of this call for proposals. Applications submitted after the deadline will not be taken into consideration.

The application form can be downloaded from https://www.nwo.nl/en/funding/our-funding-instruments/magw/research-talent/research-talent.html.
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3.4 Preparing an application

- Download the application form from the electronic application system ISAAC or from NWO’s website (on the grant page for this programme).
- Complete the application form.
- Save the application form as a pdf file and upload it in ISAAC.

Applications must be drafted in English. The intrinsic section of the pre-proposal application may not exceed 700 words, including literature references (no more than five, weblinks to publications or publication lists are not permitted) and an indication of the institutional environment, and not exceed one page (A4 format). Footnotes are not permitted. The pre-proposal form does not require a summary. However, the ISAAC system does in order to be able to submit a proposal. When asked, you can copy and paste the intrinsic section or the title of the proposal. If you choose to write a summary, this summary should not exceed 100 words and cannot contain new information. Please note that the summary is not included in the assessment of the pre-proposal. In the full proposal, the description of the proposed research may not exceed 2,000 words, excluding literature references (no more than 35) but including footnotes and text in figures. The application must also include a summary of recent, relevant scientific publications by the main applicant and if applicable, by the co-applicant – no more than 25 publications in total. References to the applicants’ online publication lists are not permitted. The full proposal contains a paragraph on data management and a summary for the public (preferably in Dutch) to be used for publicity purposes in case the proposal is awarded a grant. Applications should not include appendices.

3.5 Conditions on granting

The NWO Grant Rules 2017 and the Agreement on the Payment of Costs for Scientific Research apply to all applications.

Open Access

All scientific publications resulting from research that is funded by grants derived from this call for proposals are to be immediately (at the time of publication) freely accessible worldwide (Open Access). There are several ways for researchers to publish Open Access. A detailed explanation regarding Open Access can be found on www.nwo.nl/openscience-en.

Data management

Responsible data management is part of good research. NWO wants research data that emerge from publicly funded research to become freely and sustainably available, as much as possible, for reuse by other researchers. Furthermore NWO wants to raise awareness among researchers about the importance of responsible data management. Full proposals should therefore satisfy the data management protocol of NWO. This protocol consists of two steps:

1. Data management section (applicable to full proposals only)

The data management section is part of the research proposal. Researchers should answer four questions about data management within their intended research project. Therefore before the research starts the researcher will be asked to think about how the data collected must be ordered and categorised so that it can be made freely available. Measures will often need to be taken during the production and analysis of the data to make their later storage and dissemination possible. Researchers can state which research data they consider to be relevant for storage and reuse.
2. Data management plan (only for proposals awarded funding)

After a proposal has been awarded funding the researcher should elaborate the data management section into a data management plan. The data management plan is a concrete elaboration of the data management section. In the plan the researcher describes whether use will be made of existing data or a new data collection and how the data collection will be made FAIR: Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable. The plan should be submitted to NWO via ISAAC within a maximum of 4 months after the proposal has been awarded funding. NWO will approve the plan as quickly as possible. Approval of the data management plan by NWO is a condition for disbursement of the funding. The plan can be adjusted during the research.

Further information about the data management protocol of NWO can be found at www.nwo.nl/datamanagement.

Nagoya Protocol

The Nagoya Protocol became effective on 12 October 2014 and ensures an honest and reasonable distribution of benefits emerging from the use of genetic resources (Access and Benefit Sharing; ABS). Researchers who make use of genetic sources from the Netherlands or abroad for their research should familiarise themselves with the Nagoya Protocol (www.absfocalpoint.nl). NWO assumes that researchers will take all necessary actions with respect to the Nagoya Protocol.

After receiving a grant

The to be conducted research is subject to the conditions listed in (section 3 and 4 of) the NWO Grant Rules 2017. Main applicants are sent these conditions upon being awarded a grant. The research must start within six months after being awarded a grant. Should this not occur, NWO will retract the awarded grant. NWO will monitor the progress and evaluates the results of the funded research, using the project’s planning and expected output as listed in the application.

3.6 Submitting an application

An application can only be submitted to NWO via the online application system ISAAC. Applications not submitted via ISAAC will not be taken into consideration.

A principal applicant must submit his/her application via his/her own ISAAC account. If the principal applicant does not have an ISAAC account yet, then this should be created at least one day before the application is submitted to ensure that any registration problems can be resolved on time. If the principal applicant already has an NWO-account, then he/she does not need to create a new account to submit an application.

When you submit your application to ISAAC you will also need to enter additional details online. You should therefore start submitting your application at least one day before the deadline of this call for proposals. Applications submitted after the deadline will not be taken into consideration. For technical questions please contact the ISAAC helpdesk, see Section 5.2.1.

In concurrence with the agreement between NWO and the VSNU, applicants must inform their institution regarding their application. For this reason, NWO asks explicitly for confirmation on the application form that the institution has been informed and that it agrees to make available all the infrastructure required for the research, including its associated costs in so far as these have not been applied for from NWO.
4 Assessment procedure

4.1 Procedure

The first step in the assessment procedure is to determine the admissibility of the application. This is done using the conditions stated in Chapter 3 of this call for proposals.

The NWO Code of Conduct on Conflicts of Interest applies to all persons and NWO staff involved in the assessment and/or decision-making process.

The assessment procedure consists of two phases: a pre-proposal phase and a full proposal phase. A full proposal can only be submitted if the applicant of a pre-proposal has been invited by the SSH Domain Board to do so. The Board will invite no more applicants than three times the number of proposals it can grant funding.

The various steps in the assessment process are described in the following sections. Applicants can follow the progress of the application procedure via their ISAAC account. No rights can be derived from this.

Administrative-technical check

The secretariat will check whether the submitted applications (both pre-proposals and full proposals) meet the conditions mentioned in chapter 3. Should it be deemed necessary, the applicant will be contacted. Applications that fail to meet these conditions are not-eligible and will not be admitted to the assessment procedure. If after the application has been admitted to the assessment procedure it becomes clear that (one of) the applicant(s) submitted an application to another SSH instrument within the remit of the scientific domain of the Social Sciences, the Research Talent application will be rejected if the application submitted elsewhere is not swiftly retracted.

Assessment pre-proposals

Four committees, one for each of the four discipline groups within the scientific domain of the Social Sciences (see Chapter 6) will assess the pre-proposals comparatively without making use of external reviewers. The pre-proposal consists of the candidate’s CV and a concise description of the envisaged research. For more detail on the assessment procedure for pre-proposals see paragraph 6.3. The assessment will result in an advice to the SSH Domain Board, who will decide whether or not to invite applicants to submit a full proposal.

Assessment full proposals

The full proposals will not be presented to external reviewers. The committee of the appropriate discipline group will invite the candidate for an interview. Prior to the interview, the candidate will receive questions from the committee so she/he can prepare her/himself. The CV presented in the pre-proposal can be included in the interview. The duration of the interview is 28 minutes maximum, eight of which are reserved for a short presentation (pitch) of the research by the candidate. The assessment of the full proposals, based on the candidate’s presentation and the interview, will result in one of the following qualifications: ‘excellent’, ‘very good’, ‘good’ or ‘unsatisfactory’.

Subsequently the committees will, if necessary, rank the proposals that are eligible for funding based on the mutual variation in quality. The criterion Knowledge
exchange and impact can play an explicit role in ranking. Ranking is based on the assessment criteria for full proposals published in this brochure. The committees will advise the competent Board and will determine the ranking of the research proposals assessed by them. The Board will make a decision regarding allocation or rejection of funding, based on the committees’ advice, and where necessary, based on the policy considerations mentioned in the following section as well as available resources.

NWO gives all full proposals a qualification. The applicant is informed of this qualification when the decision about whether or not to award funding is announced. Only full proposals that receive at least the qualification excellent/very good/good will be eligible for funding. For further information about the qualifications see www.nwo.nl/kwalificaties.

The data management section in the application is not evaluated and hence not included in the decision about whether or not to award funding. However both the referees and the committee can issue advice with respect to the data management section. After a proposal has been awarded funding the applicant should elaborate the data management section into a data management plan. Applicants can make use of the advice from the referees and committee when they write the data management plan. The project can start as soon as the data management plan has been approved by NWO.

**Assessment committees**

Four committees, one for each discipline group within the scientific domain of the Social Sciences (see chapter 6), will assess the proposals. The discipline code provided in the application determines the committee that will assess the proposal.

The assessment by the committees is based on the criteria as published in this brochure. For each phase, different assessment criteria apply (see paragraph 4.2.1).

In making this decision, the Board is entitled to use the following policy considerations:
- The promotion of the participation of female researchers;
- The optimisation of the grant distribution.

**Composition of the committees**

Assessment committees are put together under the responsibility of the SSH Domain Board. The members of the assessment committees will be selected based on their research experience, their experience in assessing applications, and their non-involvement in the applications being assessed by the committees in question. Since it is only possible to put together the assessment committees once it is known who has submitted proposals, the composition of the committees cannot be announced beforehand. Each committee is chaired by a technical chairperson. After the subsidy round has been concluded, the names of the committee members will be published in alphabetical order on the Research Talent website (www.nwo.nl/magwot).
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### Time schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 September 2017</td>
<td>Deadline submission pre-proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid December 2017</td>
<td>Announcement of results to applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 March 2018</td>
<td>Deadline submission full proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April-May 2018</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of June 2018</td>
<td>Decision regarding awards by the accredited Board within NWO and announcement of the results to applicants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 Criteria

#### Assessment criteria

Different criteria, mentioned in the following sections, apply for pre-proposals and for full proposals. A number of relevant points of attention have been summarised per criterion. The criteria, and in some case specific elements within these criteria, have been allocated different weights. For more details, see paragraph 6.4.

#### 4.2.1 Assessment criteria pre-proposal

1. **Academic education**
   
The candidate has completed at least one bachelor study as well as the first year of the master study. The candidate meets the set requirements regarding average grades. Both studies carry different weights and will be assessed separately. In the assessment the following points may play a role: Has the candidate completed one or more bachelor studies? Has the candidate completed the first year of one or more master studies? Has the candidate completed a research master’s study or is she/he in the process of doing so? Which subjects have been followed and concluded during the bachelor’s and master’s studies? Did the candidate follow a talent (or similar) program? Did the candidate follow any additional subsidiary subjects? Did the candidate attend classes at another university or a renowned foreign university? Has the candidate been awarded any academic prizes for papers or theses? Has the candidate acquired a distinction in addition to the grade, and if so, which? Did the candidate conclude his/her studies on time?

   The candidate’s master that meets the requirements with respect to grades or GPA must fall within the scientific domain of Social Sciences. Bachelor’s programme(s) do not necessarily need to fall within this remit; neither do any potential additional master’s programme(s) the candidate has followed. However, in these cases the committee will consider their relevance for the proposed research.

2. **Extracurricular activities**
   
   Extracurricular activities are activities the candidate engaged in during his/her study. These activities may provide insight in the candidate’s academic interests or in the candidate’s characteristics, such as commitment and perseverance, i.e.
characteristics that matter when engaging in research. Extracurricular activities can either be academic or non-academic in nature. Academic activities may include student assistantships (e.g. research and/or teaching activities), or research activities that are independently undertaken. Possible questions in the assessment are: what was the nature of these activities and what is their relevance for (carrying out) the envisaged research? Has the candidate published in academic journals (as first and/or co-author)? Non-academic activities may include a position on the board of a student association or work experience. Possible questions in the assessment are: what was the nature of these activities? What is the relevance of these activities for the candidate’s CV and for carrying out the envisaged research?

3. Motivation
The motivation is an explanation to the CV. In this section the candidate explains why she/he desires to carry out PhD research, in particular the proposed research, and why her/his CV is fitting for the envisaged research, using no more than 350 words. The motivation also provides an opportunity to explain particular situations, e.g. delay in the study. The central question is: does the motivation convince the assessor(s) of the candidate’s drive to conduct the proposed research?

4. Research idea
The research idea is a concise description of the envisaged research. The description makes clear what the problem to be researched is, why this problem should be researched and in what way. The focus of the description lies, in this phase, on the originality of the formulated problem and the relevance of the envisaged research. However, everything mentioned by the applicant under this header is subject to assessment, including items referring to the assessment criteria of full proposals. No more than five literature references may be included. Footnotes are not allowed. If applicable, the institutional environment in which the research will be carried out can be described here. Central question is: to what degree does the description arouse the interest of the assessor(s) to read a full proposal?

4.2.2 Assessment criteria full proposal

1. Originality and potential contribution to science
Important questions in assessing the proposal are: Does the proposed research make an original and significant contribution in generating knowledge or developing theory and/or methods for the field? Has existing knowledge been used adequately? Is there any related research that is not mentioned in the proposal of which the applicant(s) should be aware? Is the proposal innovative?

2. Research setup and methods
Important questions in assessing the proposal are: Have the problem definition and research questions been defined clearly and carefully, sufficiently demarcated, and adequately worked out? Is the research proposal clearly substantiated? Are the proposed methods and the proposed framework suitable for realising the problem definition and answering the research questions? Does the working plan have a logical setup, and is it suitably phased and realistic? Are the sources mentioned accessible and suitable for answering the research questions?

3. Quality of candidate, supervision and institutional environment
Important questions in assessing the proposal are:
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- What is the quality of the PhD candidate in terms of education, extracurricular activities and motivation, but also in terms of the presentation and persuasiveness.
- What is the quality of the supervision in terms of experience in supervising PhD students and expertise, demonstrated in publications.
- What is the quality of the institutional environment in terms of access to necessary expertise and the reputation of the research group or institutional environment.

4. Knowledge exchange and impact

Potential
- contribution to society and/or other academic areas;
- disciplines and organisations that might benefit from the results.

Implementation
- action plan to allow the outcomes of the research project to benefit the potential knowledge users;
- if and how the potential knowledge users will be involved;
- (concrete) outcomes for society and/or other academic disciplines;
- the period over which knowledge utilisation is expected to occur.

The assessment committee assesses:
- whether the applicant has given a realistic description of the potential for knowledge utilisation
- and to what extent the applicant has presented a concrete and convincing plan for the implementation of the available potential.
- If a researcher is of the opinion that the proposed research is not appropriate for knowledge utilisation then he/she should explain why he/she thinks that knowledge utilisation is not applicable. The assessment committee will assess the arguments given for this.

Since 2009, NWO has pursued a concrete policy that aims to stimulate the transfer of knowledge generated with the help of funding from NWO. This transfer can take place to other scientific disciplines as well as to users outside of science (industry/society). The knowledge utilisation policy is mainly targeted at increasing researchers’ awareness of knowledge utilisation. NWO therefore requests all researchers applying for funding to provide an explanation regarding the possible knowledge utilisation of their project by means of answering several questions (for example: how will knowledge utilisation be implemented and how does the researcher intend to facilitate knowledge utilisation?). This explanation is one of the assessment criteria.

During the assessment, attention is paid to:
- a realistic representation of the knowledge utilisation possibilities (or the lack of possibilities);
- the extent to which the action plan is made tangible with respect to knowledge utilisation.

NWO realises that the possibilities for knowledge utilisation differ per discipline and that some research projects have few if any opportunities for (direct) knowledge utilisation. In this case, an applicant should explain why no knowledge utilisation can be expected for his or her project. The selection committee members will still be asked to assess this explanation: if they are convinced that the research project indeed has no knowledge utilisation possibilities and that the applicant has
satisfactorily explained this, then this should not negatively influence the overall assessment score.

Examples of knowledge utilisation can be found at www.nwo.nl/en/policies/knowledge+utilisation.

Data management
The data management section is not an assessment criterion for the research proposal. The committee only looks at the data management sections of the proposals put forward for funding after the prioritisation of the proposals has been established. The committee can make suggestions and give advice that could be helpful for the researcher in drawing up the data management plan to be submitted after funding was awarded.

For more details see paragraph 6.2 of this call for proposals.
5 Contact details and other information

5.1 Contact

5.1.1 Specific questions

For specific questions about Research Talent and this call for proposals please contact:

NWO
Domain SSH
Postbus 93461
2509 AL Den Haag

Drs. J.S. (Joris) Voskuilen, coordinator
E.V. (Eelco) van Dongen, PhD, staff member
E. (Erica) van Liempt, secretariat

Tel: +31 (0)70-344 09 44
E-mail: maqwot@nwo.nl
Websites: www.nwo.nl/maqwonderzoekstalent (grant page) www.nwo.nl/maqwot (general information)

For the program PhDs in the Humanities, see:
www.nwo.nl/gw/promotiesindegeesteswetenschappen.

5.1.2 Technical questions about the electronic application system ISAAC

For technical questions about the use of ISAAC please contact the ISAAC helpdesk. Please read the manual first before consulting the helpdesk. The ISAAC helpdesk can be contacted from Monday to Friday between 10:00 and 17:00 hours CE(S)T on +31 (0)20 346 71 79. However, you can also submit your question by e-mail to isaac.helpdesk@nwo.nl. You will then receive an answer within two working days.
6 Annexe(s)

6.1 Discipline Codes

The scientific domain of the Social Sciences is divided into four discipline groups that are in turn subdivided into a number of (sub-)disciplines. Applications (pre proposals and full proposals) submitted to Research Talent have to fall within one of these (sub)disciplines, as does the candidate’s master that meets the requirements with respect to average grades or GPA. As such, one of the six-figure codes mentioned below has to be mentioned on the application. The provided code will determine the committee that will assess the proposal. The discipline code list can also be consulted at www.nwo.nl/magw.

**Discipline group Economics and Business Administration**

Economics

- 38.10.00 Microeconomics
- 38.20.00 Macroeconomics
- 38.30.00 Econometrics

Business Administration

- 39.90.00 Business Administration

**Discipline Group Behaviour and Education**

Psychology

- 40.10.00 Clinical psychology
- 40.20.00 Biological and medical psychology
- 40.30.00 Developmental psychology
- 40.40.00 Psychonomics and cognitive psychology
- 40.50.00 Social and organisational psychology
- 40.60.00 Psychometrics

Educational Sciences

- 41.90.00 Educational Sciences

Pedagogics

- 42.00.00 Pedagogics

**Discipline Group Law and Public Administration**

Law

- 43.10.00 Private law
- 43.20.00 Constitutional and administrative law
- 43.30.00 International and European law
- 43.40.00 Criminal law and criminology

Public Administration and Political Science

- 44.10.00 Public administration
- 44.20.00 Political science

**Discipline group Social Sciences**

Sociology

- 45.90.00 Sociology
Cultural anthropology
46.90.00 Cultural anthropology

Communication Science
47.90.00 Communication Science

Demographics
48.90.00 Demographics

Geography and Planning
49.10.00 Geography
49.11.00 Planning

Environmental Science
50.90.00 Environmental science
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6.2 Explanation to data management

NWO wants to contribute to the development of good data management by asking researchers to make all relevant data sustainably available for reuse. For the Research Talent Grant the data management section is only required for full proposals. Therefore in the data management section, researchers will be asked before their research starts to think about how the data collected should be ordered and categorised such that it can be made freely available. Researchers will often need to take measures to this effect during the production and analysis of the data.

NWO understands 'data' to include collected, unprocessed data as well as analysed, generated data. This includes all conceivable forms of digital and non-digital data (such as samples, completed questionnaires, sound recordings, etc.).

**NWO only requires the storage of data that are relevant for reuse.** NWO assumes that within disciplines there are widely held opinions about which data are relevant for storage and reuse. Research Data Netherlands offers a checklist for the selection of data that can be eligible for archiving. [http://www.researchdata.nl/diensten/datamanagement/onderzoeksgevens-selecteren/](http://www.researchdata.nl/diensten/datamanagement/onderzoeksgevens-selecteren/)

Research results should be stored in such a way that they can be retrieved and reused in the long term, also by researchers in disciplines and organisations other than those in which the research took place. The operating principle is that all stored data are, in principle, freely accessible and that access is only limited if aspects such as privacy, public security, ethical limitations, property rights and commercial interests require that.

The costs of data management are eligible for funding and should be included in the project budget. Important factors that determine the costs are:

- the type of data;
- the capacity needed for storage and backup;
- the amount of manual work needed to allocate metadata and the compilation of other documentation such as codebooks and the queries used in the statistical package;
- the extent to which the data needs to be protected;
- the hiring in of external data management expertise or other expertise.

With the data management section NWO mainly wants to raise awareness about the importance of responsible data management. The section is therefore not included in a committee's decision about whether a proposal should be awarded funding or not. NWO does, however, submit this section to the committee and referees for advice. After a proposal has been awarded funding the researcher should elaborate the section into a data management plan. For this, applicants can make use of the advice they have received.

For more information see: [https://www.nwo.nl/en/policies/open+science/data+management](https://www.nwo.nl/en/policies/open+science/data+management)
6.3 Weights and scores

In assessing the proposals, a 9 point scale will be used, on which 1 represents the highest/best score, and 9 the lowest/worst. All criteria will be scored (and in assessing the pre-proposals also the elements within the criteria). On the basis of the scores and overall weighted average score will be calculated. This overall average score constitutes the final score. The final score will determine the position in the ranking.

In calculating the final scores, the different weights allocated to the criteria (or elements within them) will be taken into account.

Weights applicable for pre-proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Element within criterion</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First year master’s</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular</td>
<td>Academic/ Non-academic</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research idea</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each criterion applicable for pre-proposals, relevant points for the assessment have been listed in paragraph 4.2.1.

Scoring criteria for pre-proposals

For the first criterion (Education) a starting score of 5.4 applies for both bachelor and master. This score means ‘good’. The reason for this starting score is that admitted pre-proposals meet the set criteria for admission. For studies with a specific research-oriented character, such as a research master’s, a better starting score of 4.4 applies. In assessing both elements within this criterion the relevant points listed in paragraph 4.2.1 play a role and can lead to deduction of points, i.e. to a better score.

Also for the second criterion (Extracurricular activities) as starting score applies: 5.4 when activities have been carried out, 5.5 when no activities have been carried out.

No starting score applies to the criteria ‘Motivation’ and ‘Research Idea’. The entire 9 point scale applies for scoring these criteria. Pre-proposals do not receive a qualification.

Weights applicable for full proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Originality and contribution to science</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research setup and methods</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of candidate, supervision, environment</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge exchange and impact</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring criteria for full proposals

The entire 9 point scale applies for scoring the criteria. The score assigned to the pre-proposal does not play any role during the assessment of the full proposals.
Qualifications full proposals

The assessment of full proposals results in a qualification. The final score relates to a qualification for Research Talent the final score relates as follows to a qualification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range scores</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 – 1.4</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 – 3.4</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 – 5.4</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 – 9.0</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 Grades and US Grade Point Average (GPA)

Candidates who follow, or have concluded, an academic education in the Netherlands will usually have been graded on a scale from 1 to 10. In case the candidate has concluded, or follows, an academic education in the Netherlands, the minimal average grades relate to the Dutch grading system, i.e. the overall weighted average for the bachelor’s programme must be at least a 7,5, for the concluded first year of the master’s programme (or the concluded master’s programme) the weighted average grade must at least be 8,0. The average grades are calculated to one decimal maximally. A weighted average includes the weight that has been allocated to courses in the programme, usually expressed in ECTS. Candidates having received grades using the Dutch grading system do not convert their grades to a GPA.

Candidates who follow, or have concluded, (parts of) their academic education outside of the Netherlands, will most likely have been graded according to a different system. In these cases candidates are asked to calculate a United States Grade Point Average (GPA) on a 4 point scale. A GPA is also a weighted averaged, taking into account the weight that has been allocated to courses followed. There are different ways to calculate and represent a GPA. The Research Talent scheme follows the calculation and representation that is common in the United States, using the four point scale. GPA’s on a different scale than the US 4 point scale will not be taken into consideration.

On the internet several calculators are available to convert grades to a GPA on a 4-point scale, many of which are adaptable to the grading system used in a given country. Calculators converting US letter grades to a GPA on a 4 point scale are available on the internet as well.

In case you have calculated your GPA on a 4 point scale, you will be requested in the form for the pre-proposal to provide either the link to the online calculator, or provide the formula used. NWO reserves the right to check the provided results at random.

Utrecht University has published a conversion table for Dutch grades to the 4-point scale US GPA. On the basis of this table, the Dutch grade 7,5 equals a GPA of 3.37, and the Dutch grade 8,0 equals a GPA of 3.95. The conversion table can be consulted at http://students.uu.nl/praktische-zaken/regelingen-en-procedures/grade-point-average.