

# Guidelines

## for the Review of Draft Proposals for Centres for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences

### I Programme Information

Centres for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences enable experienced and well-established researchers to advance a research topic in the humanities or social sciences at a given site.

Such centres are based at universities. The collaborative working methods should facilitate addressing a topic that is broadly defined enough that it ties into existing interests and strengths at the site, while remaining capable of providing a framework for the integration of individual research ideas.

Centres for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences are characterised by the intensive independent research performed by the researchers responsible – made possible by being exempted from teaching obligations where possible – and a fellows programme for visiting researchers from Germany and abroad. These fellows can be invited for periods of up to two years and maintain contact with the centre following their stay.

Projects in the social sciences are explicitly permitted, provided it can be shown that the interaction between topics, the collaborative working methods and qualified research personnel are suitable for advancing the proposed topic.

The total funding duration is generally eight years. The first funding period is four years. Further funding requires the submission and approval of renewal proposals (see Guidelines for Centres for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences – DFG form 50.09).

[www.dfg.de/formulare/50\\_09](http://www.dfg.de/formulare/50_09)

Please note:

General Guidelines for Reviews (DFG form 10.20) are available at:

[www.dfg.de/formulare/10\\_20](http://www.dfg.de/formulare/10_20)

The review should not exceed two pages in length.

## II Criteria for the Review

1. How would you assess the **originality** and the anticipated **contribution to knowledge**?

How would you evaluate the topic in terms of the development of the subject or the research area? Are the working hypotheses convincing, and has an appropriate subject matter been chosen considering the open structure/format of the centre? Are the methodological approaches suitable? Does the research question require funding of at least eight years?

2. Is **the collaborative working method** particularly suited to addressing the research issues, especially in contrast to individual-project based cooperation? How would you evaluate the proposed cooperation among the applicants and among the group of applicants and fellows and others (where applicable)? Is the **fellows programme** suitably structured?
3. How do you evaluate the **qualifications of the applicants** with regard to the planned field of research? Does the combined expertise of the applicants lead you to believe that they can carry out the planned research successfully? How do you rate the national and international **visibility** of their research?

Please also comment on the extent to which the **spokesperson** of the planned centre meets the requirements in terms of his/her scientific track record, experience in leading projects, including third-party-funded projects, and integration and leadership skills.

4. How would you assess the **structural and research environment**?

Is/are the host institution(s) suitable for the implementation of the project, particularly in terms of the necessary equipment and facilities?

5. If **other measures** are planned, such as a research professorship, support of researchers in early career phases – even if this is not a structural part of such centres –, transfer projects or including additional researchers and social stakeholders, etc., are these suitable to the aims and objectives of the centre?

6. How do you rate the explanations on the handling of research data?

7. Please provide a **clear recommendation** as to whether the applicants should be invited to submit an establishment proposal. Where appropriate, take into account whether or not the planned funding appears reasonable.