



Advanced Olympic Research Grant Programme

Assessment and Selection Process

November 2020



Introduction

The Advanced Olympic Research Grant Programme was created in 2014 to promote advanced research with a humanities or social sciences perspective by established researchers in priority fields of research identified annually by the IOC.

This procedure is intended to allow the selection of projects which can provide the most relevant outcomes for the IOC's programmes and activities, but also to guarantee the academic quality of the selected projects and their contribution to enriching Olympic knowledge.

> Who contributes to the selection process?

The projects are evaluated by four separate groups, each one providing a different yet complementary point of view:

IOC departments: Assess the relevance of the applications regarding the priority fields of research and provide feedback on how the research results could be applied and used in future IOC activities.

Peer-reviewers: Provide an academic and independent assessment based on the specific academic knowledge required for each application supported by the IOC departments and the Selection Committee in stage 2.

Academic members of the Olympic Studies Centre (OSC) Selection Committee: Complement the IOC departments' assessments in stage 2 (see below), and make the final recommendations to the IOC regarding the applications to be awarded a grant, based on the assessment made by the relevant IOC departments and the peer reviewers (arbitration role).

The OSC: Validate the acceptance of the applications based on the eligibility criteria and the application guidelines; coordinate the assessment by the peer reviewers; and validate the final Selection Committee recommendations in coordination with the IOC administration.

> Description of the assessment and selection process:

Stage 1: Acceptance of the applications (February)

All complete applications which fulfil the admission criteria and meet the objectives of the programme will receive a confirmation message from the OSC, at the latest one week after the candidature is received.

Incomplete applications or applications which do not meet the requirements will be rejected and returned to the applicants.



Stage 2: Assessment by the IOC departments and the Selection Committee (February-March)

All eligible applications will go through an initial assessment based on quality and relevance criteria by the OSC Selection Committee. The applications meeting these criteria will be reviewed by the appropriate IOC department representatives, who will assess the relevance of the applications to their priority fields of research and provide feedback on how the research results could contribute to the department's future activities.

Based on this assessment, the projects that best respond to the IOC priority fields of research will be selected for stage 3. The academic members of the Selection Committee will have the opportunity to select for stage 3 additional projects not originally selected by the IOC departments, but which are excellent in terms of academic quality and relevance.

The academic members of the Selection Committee will have to sign a document declaring that they do not have any conflict of interests with the applicants submitting the application. They will review the document and give an undertaking not to communicate with candidates in any circumstances, and to not disclose and/or make use, in subsequent project submissions either by themselves or by close colleagues, of the content of the proposals they have evaluated.

The OSC will inform the applicants who have not been selected for the next stage of the assessment and selection process. No feedback will be provided at this stage.

Stage 3: Assignment and assessment by peer reviewers (March-April)

The applications selected in stage 2 will be reviewed by two peer reviewers, previously identified by the OSC in cooperation with the Selection Committee. When appropriate and possible, one peer reviewer will be chosen from the list of referees proposed by the candidates in their application form, and the other one from the OSC's pool of international peer reviewers.

As with the Selection Committee members, all the peer reviewers involved in the assessment process will have to sign a document declaring that they do not have any conflict of interests with the applicants submitting the application and give an undertaking not to communicate with candidates in any circumstances, and to not disclose and/or make use, in subsequent project submissions either by themselves or by close colleagues, of the content of the proposals they have evaluated.

The peer reviewers will be requested to assess the relevance of the proposal in the research field, the academic quality and feasibility of the project, and the applicants' ability to carry out the research. They will be explicitly requested to support their scores with qualitative comments, and, based on their assessment, they will recommend whether or not the proposal should be funded.



Stage 4: Final recommendations by the Selection Committee (April-May)

The Selection Committee, composed of academic members and the Manager of the OSC's External Relations and Academic Programmes, will ensure the link between the operational and the academic assessments. It will take into consideration the applications and the scores and comments provided by the IOC department representatives and the peer reviewers (blind copies) in order to produce a shortlist of projects that best combine academic quality and relevance based on the IOC priority fields of research.

Stage 5: Validation by the IOC (May)

The IOC, through its OSC, will validate the final selection of applications to be awarded a grant based on the recommendations of the Selection Committee.

Stage 6: Notification of the results (June)

The OSC will inform the applicants of the results of their application. Grant-holders will receive a blind copy of the peer reviewers' assessment as additional input for their project.

Upon request, the OSC will also provide the non-selected applicants who continued in the process after the second selection with a copy of the blind Peer Reviewer reports related to their application.