



## DULBECCO TELETHON INSTITUTE CAREER AWARD PROGRAM GUIDELINES FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS - 2015

---

The mission of Fondazione Telethon is to advance excellent research in Italy towards the cure of human genetic diseases. To this end, Telethon funds Career Awards to outstanding scientists wishing to establish their independent laboratory in a public or private non-profit Italian research institution.

The successful Candidates will join the **Dulbecco Telethon Institute (DTI)**, a virtual institute whose members are given the title of “Telethon Scientists”. These talented scientists work on a broad range of topics and in different Italian Institutions but share the same principles of rigour and excellence in the pursuit of scientific research aimed at understanding, preventing and curing genetic diseases.

**The list of the active Telethon Scientists is accessible on the Telethon website at <http://dti.telethon.it/dti-labs>**

In the 2015 call, **two Assistant Telethon Scientist** position is of **610,000 Euro** over five years according to the following funding scheme:

- annual **salary** of 40,000 Euro for the first three years and 45,000 Euro for the remaining two years
- **research grant** of 70,000 Euro/year
- **overhead** to the Host Institution of 5,000 Euro/ year
- **start-up grant** of 25,000 Euro.

### THE THREE-STEP EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation of applications for the Telethon Career Award is a multi-step process.

#### Step 1:

Each Application is assigned to three Committee Members of the Telethon Scientific Committee on the basis of their specific field of expertise.

The Reviewers are first asked to shortlist the Candidates eligible for the interview that represents the final step of the selection process, on the basis of the following criteria:

- Scientific Merit of the research project
- Applicant’s Curriculum Vitae.

Please assign a **score** between 1.0 and 5.0 to each Application, according to the scale reported below. Please note that the score will reflect your recommendation whether the Candidate should be invited to the interview.

SCORE	VALUE	RECOMMENDATION FOR INTERVIEW
4.0 - 5.0	Excellent to Outstanding	Strongly recommended
3.5 - 3.9	Good	Suggested
1.0 – 3.4	Poor	Not suggested

## Step 2:

Each shortlisted Application is then reassigned to three Committee Members with different roles: **Primary**, **Secondary** and **Tertiary Reviewer**:

- The **Primary Reviewer** will be responsible for introducing the Candidate and the project to the Committee before the discussion, and for leading the interview in conjunction with the other two Reviewers
- **Primary** and **Secondary** Reviewers need to submit written comments
- The **Tertiary Reviewer** has a reader role and does not submit written comments.

Each Application is also assigned to two ad-hoc External Reviewers chosen from among distinguished experts in the relevant fields. The names of External Reviewers of the project and their evaluation are reported on the Proposal Evaluation page. Please note that the External Reviewers written comments will be automatically emailed to the relevant Committee Member as soon as submitted.

Finally, Committee Members (Primary and Secondary) complete their written evaluation and all three Members assign a score to each application.

## Step 3:

The final step of the evaluation process involves a **plenary review meeting** of the Committee Members. During the meeting, the shortlisted Candidates are invited for an **interview**.

The Primary Reviewer introduces the Candidate to the Committee (5'), then the interview takes place (20'). A final discussion (15') follows in order to globally assess the Candidate.

In the end, all Committee Members score each Candidate so that the available positions are assigned on the basis of a merit scale.

## THE EVALUATION

The evaluation should focus on the **scientific quality** of the proposed project, the **scientific level** and the degree of **independence** of the Candidate and the **Host Institution's commitment** to his/her career growth.

Written comments are an essential part of your review and are critical in developing summary statements for the applicants.

**Your individual critiques will be directly and anonymously incorporated into a complete review report that will be fed back to the Applicant.** It is therefore important that your written material is accurate, clearly written, and does not include derogatory language.

**Please note: External Reviewers' written comments will also be included as such in the review report.** Therefore, please do not report External Reviewers' sentences in your written comments, as this would result in a duplicated feedback to the Applicant.

The **Evaluation form** is structured in the following sections:

**Comments on Applicant (max 2000 chars):** The potential of the Applicant to develop into a completely independent scientist and the intellectual ownership of the proposed research should be assessed. His/her training and publication record should be considered as well as the drive and motivation to succeed in establishing his/her own laboratory and mentoring junior staff.

Fondazione Telethon does not apply assessment of Candidate's CVs based on journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factors. The Fondazione has signed and endorses the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA, <http://am.ascb.org/dora/>).

### **Comment on Research Proposal:**

- 1) Scientific merit (max 10,000 chars).** This section should present a comprehensive evaluation of the application. Evaluate the overall scientific merit of the proposal by providing an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses on the basis of the following parameters:

- **Significance:** Does this study address an important problem? If the aims of the Application are achieved, how will scientific knowledge be advanced? What will the effect of these studies be on the concepts or methods that drive this field?
- **Originality of science:** Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches or methods? Are the aims original and innovative? Does the project challenge existing paradigms or develop new methodologies or technologies?
- **Appropriateness of design and methods:** Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well-integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project?
- **Preliminary results:** Are proof-of-principle experiments provided, adequately supporting new principles to be tested in the proposal? Are novel tools or reagents well-characterized?
- **Feasibility/safety:** Does the Candidate acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics? Please also evaluate the adequacy of the proposed protection for humans, animals or the environment, to the extent they may be adversely affected by the project proposed in the Application (if any).
- **Link to the genetic disease:** what is the potential of the proposed project to unravel/clarify the patho-physiological mechanism of the disease(s) of interest or to develop a therapeutic approach specific to the disease(s) of interest?

**2) Impact on patients (max 2,000 chars).** What is the potential of the proposed project to make progress towards therapy? How close in time is such a development envisaged?

**Comments on Host Institution (max 4,000 chars):** The commitment and the appropriateness of the host institute (including space and facility allowance, and scientific environment) should be specifically stated.

**Overall evaluation (max 2,100 chars):** Provide the **key reasons** for your overall rating indicating the relative **strengths, weaknesses** and **final considerations** in the specific fields.

**Score:** Score the proposal as a whole using the following scale:

<b>SCORE</b>	<b>VALUE</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
4.5 - 5.0	Outstanding	Highest priority for funding
4.0 - 4.4	Excellent	Funding is recommended
3.5 - 3.9	Good to Very good	Needs improvements to be considered for funding
3.0 - 3.4	Average	Not fundable
2.0 - 2.9	Below average	
1.0 - 1.9	Unacceptable	

### **THE ONLINE FORMATTING EDITOR**

A text-formatting editor is available only in the specific fields inside the online form where “click to edit” is shown.

The main editor’s functions are the following:

1. Copying and pasting text from Microsoft Word while retaining text formatting as well as tables
2. Easy formatting of entered text with standard intuitive buttons
3. Typing special characters including all Greek letters

### **Formatting editor instructions**

1. **The formatting editor allows the user to copy and paste text from Microsoft Word while retaining text formatting, with the following restrictions:**
  - a. You must use Microsoft Word to retain text formatting when copying and pasting: the use of other document editing software is not supported and could lead to errors in our online system
  - b. In order to fully retain the original formatting in Word, use the button  [Paste from Word], to copy text into the online field
  - c. Once text is pasted from Word, the default font will be automatically set to Arial with minimum size of 16 pt (corresponding to Arial 11 when printed). Please verify in the PDF output all text is clearly readable.
2. Hovering the mouse over the editor buttons will display a tooltip indicating their functions
3. Please note that the font Symbol (Greek characters) is not supported: you should use the “***Insert Special Character***” button  in the formatting editor.

To verify that the correct text formatting **has been applied please check the PDF of the Application by clicking on the “Download PDF” button.**

**The Application PDF is always available while filling in the online Application; it is automatically generated every time the “Download PDF” button is clicked.**