## POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP: scoring descriptors criterion “Candidate” (interview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>0 / D</th>
<th>1 / C</th>
<th>2 / B-</th>
<th>3 / B</th>
<th>4 / B+</th>
<th>5 / A-</th>
<th>6 / A</th>
<th>7 / A+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Fair/Reasonable</td>
<td>Good/Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent/Outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 / D</td>
<td>&gt;30%</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>&gt;10%</td>
<td>&gt;5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### No scoring possibility

- Manifest gaps and shortcomings in the knowledge of the state-of-the-art. The candidate appears to be quite unfamiliar with the topic of the project and shows insufficient insight in the relevance of the proposed research strategy and techniques.
- Reasoning skills and/or critical mindset are poor.
- The candidate doesn’t come across as motivated, and there seems to be no real vision on his/her professional future.

### 1. Competence as a post-doctoral researcher (criterion “candidate”)

The interview is meant to assess the candidate’s competence as an independent researcher on a post-doctoral level. Important aspects are the scientific knowledge and insight in the proposed project, intellectual capacity and creativity, reasoning skills and critical mindset, and motivation and vision on the own professional future. Descriptions in the score grid (“scientific expertise”, “ability”, “skills”, “mindset”, …) implicitly also take into account the evaluation findings of the preselection phase.

- The candidate has the required scientific expertise to successfully execute the project. (Very) good knowledge of the state-of-the-art within own field of research. He/she has a good insight in the proposed approach and techniques; positions the proposed research in an international context.
- Reasoning skills and critical-scientific mindset are good. The candidate presents new concepts based on well-founded arguments; convincing and motivated candidate, who expresses a clear vision on his/her professional future.
- The candidate demonstrates the ability to conduct ground-breaking research. Excellent/outstanding knowledge of the state-of-the-art, even outside the own field of research. Excellent insight in the proposed methodology and techniques, well positioning the proposed research.
- Candidate demonstrates a proper scientific mindset with creative and independent thinking and reasoning; she/he presents new concepts in a very sound manner.
- Candidate with clear commitment and drive, and a bright, concrete and realistic vision on the own professional future.
## POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP: scoring descriptors criterion “Project” (preselection + interview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 / D</th>
<th>1 / C</th>
<th>2 / B-</th>
<th>3 / B</th>
<th>4 / B+</th>
<th>&gt;30%</th>
<th>&gt;20%</th>
<th>&gt;10%</th>
<th>&gt;5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Fair/Reasonable</td>
<td>Good/very good</td>
<td>Excellent/outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.a Scientific quality, relevance and challenge, originality

#### One or more of the following items apply:
- The project is **out of scope**: it does not comply with the scope of the panel it was submitted to. *(preselection only)*

#### One or more of the following items apply:
- The project does not contain real scientific risks or challenges. There is no contribution to the international state-of-the-art

#### One or more of the following items apply:
- The project focuses on (economic/societal) valorization with one stakeholder *(cf. “innovation mandates” at Flanders Innovation & Entrepreneurship - VLAIO)*.

#### One or more of the following items apply:
- The project proposal is rather a catch-up effort relative to the state-of-the-art.

#### One or more of the following items apply:
- Rather limited level of scientific risks and of pronounced challenges (or challenges not identified).

#### One or more of the following items apply:
- The added value of the project w.r.t. international state-of-the-art is acceptable, but less pronounced or less well elaborated.

#### All of the following items apply:
- The project is original and soundly builds upon and significantly contributes to the international state-of-the-art.

#### All of the following items apply:
- The project proposal is rather a catch-up effort relative to the state-of-the-art.

#### One or more of the following items apply:
- Rather limited level of scientific risks and of pronounced challenges (or challenges not identified).

#### One or more of the following items apply:
- The potential is sufficiently challenging but the potential is insufficiently explored.

#### All of the following items apply:
- The research methodology and planning are well elaborated and justified, and suitable to reach the targeted scientific objectives. The intrinsic feasibility is good and risks are identified and dealt with.

#### All of the following items apply:
- The project fits well in the research activities of the research group and in the personal development plan of the candidate, enhancing the feasibility.

#### Requirements as in “very good”, AND
- Thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and “fall back” research options.