

Screening of applications for the University of Tsukuba Basic Research Support Program (Type B)

Screening of applications for the University of Tsukuba Basic Research Support Program is conducted in accordance with the following procedures and methods:

I. Procedures and methods for screening

(1) Screening of application documents

Screening of application documents is conducted by members of the research promotion conference and other committee members (screening committee members).

Screening committee members conducted comprehensive evaluation of application documents from a broad perspective, focusing on the elements of Appendix: “Criteria for evaluation in screening”.

(2) Selection of candidate research subjects to be accepted

The vice president in charge of research select candidate research projects to be accepted to fulfill the objective of the program, based on the results of screening of application documents conducted by screening committee members, according to the following table:

If the scores of two research subjects on the borderline are the same, consideration will be given to research subjects submitted by female researchers.

Classification	Evaluation
A	Accepted as a candidate
B	Accepted as a candidate depending on the situation
C	Rejected

(3) Adoption of research subjects

Research subjects are adopted from candidate research subjects at a research promotion meeting to fulfill the objective of the program.

II. Others

(1) Publication

To ensure the transparency and fairness of screening, information on the numbers of applications and adopted research subjects, as well as the details of research subjects will be published. Applicants will be informed of an assessment ranking of submitted research subjects as feedback.

(2) Exclusion of interested people

Screening committee members involved in a research subject must be excluded from their screening and evaluation (screening of application documents), as well as specific deliberations, discussions, and making decisions on the subjects at meetings.

If it is difficult for screening committee members to conduct neutral and fair screening, consideration will be given to each individual situation.

(3) Confidentiality

- Committee members must not disclose personal and other information related to screening obtained through its process.
- Committee members must separate information obtained as a committee members (including the application and other documents) from other information, and manage it under a duty of care as good managers.

Appendix

Criteria for evaluation in screening

The following are criteria for the evaluation of each item in screening:

*References in the application are written within the brackets ().

[Type B]

1 Handling of the results of hearing screening and the first stage of the examination to acquire Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research

Research subjects that did not pass hearing screening for Grants-in-Aid for Specially Promoted Research, Scientific Research on Innovative Areas, and Scientific Research (S) shall preferentially be adopted.

2 In screening of application documents, the following aspects of research subjects are evaluated:

I. The scholarly significance/validity of research subjects and the validities of research plans/methods (“Research summary”, “Self-analysis on the rejection and measures (including changes to the plan)”)

- Are clear visions of analyses and measures presented to apply for Grants-in-Aid the next fiscal year?

II. Appropriateness of research skills

- Previous achievements and awards to suggest that the researcher has excellent research skills required to implement the research plan.

III. Validity of expenditure for research (“Reasons for the necessity of the support of the program and the positive effects of the research subject on applications for Grant-in-Aid in FY 2017” and “research expenses”)

- Is the effective use of the support of the program expected? Is the research subjects expected to have positive effects on applications for Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research the next fiscal year?
- Expenditure to purchase equipment that is really necessary to implement the research plan
- Confirmation of the validity of expenditure to implement the research plan if the expense of equipment accounts for more than 50% of the total expenditure.

Classification	Evaluation
4	Excellent
3	Good
2	Inadequate
1	Poor

IV. General evaluation

General relative evaluation of the research subject is conducted based on the above-mentioned evaluation items (I to III).

Classification	Evaluation
5	A significantly excellent research subject that should be adopted as the highest priority
4	An excellent research subject that should be adopted
3	A research subject including inspiring discussion and its adoption may be considered.
2	A research subject that should be improved and should not be adopted
1	A research subjects with problems that should be rejected