Guide for the Evaluation Report

Note that the team is evaluated by three experts, whose names will be made public. But avoid writing your name in the report so that the individual experts cannot be trivially identified.

This guide is structured in 11 sections, that must all be filled with a paragraph or two. Under each heading, a list of questions is provided as a guide to help you understand the kind of material we expect. It does not constitute a list of questions that you are required to answer. These questions were designed in a general way to cover the whole diversity of the Inria teams and therefore not all questions may be relevant for the team you evaluate. And, of course, you may introduce other considerations which you may deem relevant for your assessment. The typical total length of this report would be between 3 and 6 pages.

1 Domain, topics and research objectives of the team

[The following indicative questions are to be removed and replaced with a paragraph or two. These paragraphs should for instance address the following questions: Could you summarize the domain and major topics of the team (around 5 lines)? Are they established domains? emerging domains? is the research community of the team a large one? Are the research objectives clearly identified? Are they timely and relevant for this domain? Are the research objectives well positioned w.r.t. the international competition?]

2 Main achievements of the team

[The following indicative questions are to be removed and replaced with a paragraph or two. These paragraphs should for instance address the following questions: Bearing in mind that each team may be different in terms of theoretical or applied contributions, what would be the core contributions you identify for this team? Could you identify and summarize the contributions of the team in terms of "progress of knowledge" (new results and quality of the publications) and "advancement of technology" (research software, dataset, resources, artifacts, standards and other developments)? Could you assess the major results and contributions of the team? Do you consider that these results are significant for this domain? Why? What is expected is your personal qualitative assessment of scientific depth, originality and relevance (not based on bibliometric indicators). Would you have any suggestion regarding the publication strategy of the team? If relevant for this domain, could you assess the artifacts produced (software, dataset, hardware, etc.) and what is their outreach (communities, benchmarks, etc.)? Do you think that the team's scientific risk-taking is sufficient?]

3 International Standing and Collaborations in the Field

[The following indicative questions are to be removed and replaced with a paragraph or two. These paragraphs should for instance address the following questions: Does the team produce significant results which are at the best international level? Is the team active and visible at an international level in terms of publications, invitations, international collaborations, projects, etc.? Has the team significantly contributed to the animation of its scientific community and provided major momentum (professional service activity, editorial boards, committees, etc.)? How do would you

compare the team with other players on the world stage? Do you see the team as a leader in the community? Does the team have a large collaboration network?]

4 Economic, societal and environmental impact and applications

[The following indicative questions are to be removed and replaced with a paragraph or two. These paragraphs should for instance address the following questions, bearing in mind that this impact may take many forms: If relevant, are there clearly identified application domains for the team? Can you identify the impact the team has had in its application domains? Does the team have a clear strategy for technology transfer and industrial partnership, or startup creation, for those domains? Can you identify major results transferred to industrial and/or non-industrial bodies (software, patents, licensing, training, etc.)? Is the team involved in standardization initiatives related to its domains? Is the team involved in public policy initiatives? In its research, does the team account for ethical issues and for the impact on the society and the environment?]

5 Team life-cycle

[The following indicative questions are to be removed and replaced with a paragraph or two. These paragraphs should for instance address the following questions: Are the size and composition (profiles, expertise, skills) of the team adequate w.r.t. its objectives? Did you see any opportunities for the evolution of the team and of the collaborations within the team? Does the team have the adequate structure and working environment to perform its activities? Was the set of core topics clearly identified, coherent and shared among the team members? Are the organization and animation (management activities, seminars, meetings) of the team in place and working properly? Did you identify any issues concerning the careers of the tenured members of the team?]

6 Training and dissemination

[Note: There is a major difference in the French academic system between full-time researchers, who do not have (or have very few) teaching duties, and faculty members who usually have heavy teaching duties (around 200h per year) in addition to being sometimes involved in the administration of teaching. The following indicative questions are to be removed and replaced with a paragraph or two. These paragraphs should for instance answer to the following questions: As part of its research activity, is the team actively involved in the transmission of knowledge to young researchers and R&D engineers? What do you think about the job prospects and the future careers of former members of the team (PhD students, post-doc, research engineers, etc.)? Do people disseminate the core competencies of the team to a wider audience through teaching in Master degree programs, summer research schools, tutorials, books, MOOCs, etc.? Do team members share their knowledge with a wider audience (non-scientists); science fairs, high schools, tv-shows, etc.? Does the team have a consistent training strategy w.r.t. its research agenda?]

7 Perspectives and future plans

[Note: Even if this is an ex-post evaluation, experts are invited to comment on the objectives of the team for the next four years and to propose potential improvements, if need be. The following indicative questions are to be removed and replaced with a paragraph or two. These paragraphs should for instance answer to the following questions: How would you assess the future plans of

the team? How relevant and significant are they for the research domain? How innovative and original are they? How realistic are they and how clear is the strategy to achieve them? Are there key relevant research directions that are missing? Should the team place more emphasis on certain research directions?]

8 Main strengths and opportunities, and possible weaknesses and risks for this team

[Considering your answers to the previous sections, what would be, in your opinion, the main strengths, opportunities, weaknesses and risks for this team? and for each one, why did you name these and how would you recommend to implement or address them specifically?]

9 Assessment conclusions and recommendations

[Please provide a short synthesis (5-10 lines) of your assessment of the research team, followed by suggestions and recommendations for improvements. Your recommendations are very valuable to both the research team and the Inria evaluation committee, and may concern any aspect of the team and its activity: the team's composition, its functioning, the work methods, and, most of all, the scientific directions.]

10 Questions to the team

[Please phrase here actual questions you would like the team to answer. The time frame can be short term or long term, the questions can be specific or wide open. The questions can be related to any of the previous sections. Some important issues are rarely addressed spontaneously by the teams. For example, you may ask whether the team has a specific policy for open science (data sharing, etc.), whether the team has a specific policy to increase the number of women scientists, or whether the team is concerned about the diversity of its scientists (including, for example, people with disabilities).]

11 Comments (to be completed in the second phase only)

[After receiving the team's answers to your questions, you can either update your report or use this section to add comments on the team's response (this may be a very short comment in some cases).]

12 Private feedback (to be put on a separate page)

[Do you have private comments for the Inria Evaluation Committee? Were there any aspects that you wanted to mention that were not covered by the previous sections? Were any major topics of the team outside your expertise? Do you have any concerns that you would like to share privately? You may also mention here if you have any relation with the team.]