

Please note: the grades communicated hereunder summarize the jury's evaluation during the selection phase, and result from the thorough analysis of:

1. the amended project document;
2. the delta document;
3. the presentation and subsequent discussion during the hearings.

Hence, these grades are not directly comparable to those communicated at the end of the pre-selection phase.

| Evaluation summary | | | Grade |
|---|---------------------------------|---|-------|
| Strategies: research, education, openness and partnership | Research | 1. Scientific power and intensity | B |
| | | 2. Quality and attainability of the scientific ambition | C |
| | Education | 3. Attractivity and coherence of the teaching offer | B |
| | | 4. Education: ambition and innovation | C |
| | Openness and partnership | 5. Economic partnerships, result exploitation and technology transfer | B |
| | | 6. International and European policy | B |
| Governance, steering and resources | Governance | 7. Current governance | B |
| | | 8. Governance: transformation and structuration at the 4 and 10 year marks | B |
| | Steering | 9. Quality of the roadmap, planning and associated milestones | B |
| | | 10. Effectiveness of the procedures and management | B |
| | Resources | 11. Quality of the resource allocation system | B |
| | | 12. Ambition and dynamism of the human resource (HR) policy | A |
| Main positive points of the proposal: | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad spectrum of activities, of high level with added potential in some research areas; • Excellent HR policy, in particular regarding the integration of foreign researchers; • A leading position in life-long learning; • Strong support from regional authorities. | | | |
| Main negative points of the proposal: | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite progress in the merging of 3 universities, the overall transformation process is too slow; • Scientific excellence is not equally distributed; • Emerging excellence is not adequately integrated into the long-term vision; • The proposal lacks ambition and drive for innovation, especially in the education component; • The proposed reinforcement of the PhD program falls short of what is expected from a highly visible research university; in particular, the target number of PhD students remains insufficient for a university of this size and scope; • The benchmarking lacks critical comparative analysis with the 5 universities selected. | | | |

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment:

There is a need for:

- a more ambitious and dynamic transformation process that will attract other partners, for example engineering schools;
- a better articulated long-term vision of what choices UDL must make to transform itself into a world-class university;
- taking full advantage of the unique geographical location of UDL and of the high quality of neighbouring universities to maximise visibility and increase attractiveness;
- a full benchmarking analysis leading to an effective action plan to reach the proposed ranking goal.

Global appreciation of the proposal

This project still requires major changes to reach the level expected from an IDEX.

Proposition of decision for the selection phase

| | | |
|--|--|---------------|
| | | Do not select |
|--|--|---------------|