Senior Clinical Investigator - Score Grid Renewal

1. ***Evaluation previous period (progress report)***

Unacceptable	Weak (-2)	Reasonable (-1)	Good (0)	Very Good (+1)	Excellent (+2)
1.a scientific output during the previous period + growth as independent researcher					
No high-quality scientific results were realised during the previous period.	The scientific output during the previous period is considered as weak.	• Based on the quantity and quality of the scientific output, the obtained scientific results during the previous period are considered as reasonable • AND based on the o number of grants/developed research lines o mentoring tasks the growth to scientific independence is considered as limited	• The quality and quantity of scientific output during the previous period is on track; the planned results and deliverables are realised. • AND there is clear evidence of growing scientific independence: o Number of grants/developed research lines o Mentoring tasks (PhD, master)	• The quality and quantity of the scientific output during the previous period is better than expected; the planned results and deliverables are realised. • AND there is clear evidence of growing scientific independence: o Number of grants/developed research lines o Mentoring tasks (PhD, master)	• The quality and quantity of the scientific output during the previous period is exceptionally good; the planned results and deliverables are more than realised. • AND there is clear evidence of growing scientific independence: o Number of grants/developed research lines o Mentoring tasks (PhD, master) • AND the candidate is demonstrating scientific leadership
1.b Impact of scientific results on clinical practice					
There is no evidence indicating that the obtained scientific results will have an impact on the clinical practice.	The chance that the obtained scientific results will in time have a clear positive impact on the clinical practice is considered as low.	There is a reasonable chance that the obtained scientific results will in time have a clear positive impact on the clinical practice.	The obtained scientific results will in time have the potential to have a clear positive impact on the clinical practice.	The obtained scientific results will in time have the potential to have an important positive impact on the clinical practice.	The obtained scientific results will have an important positive impact on the clinical practice.

1.c International recognition of clinical-scientific work of the candidate					
The available evidence indicates that the candidate has developed a weak international recognition within her/his field of expertise during the previous period OR There is no evidence supporting the international recognition of the candidate.	The available evidence indicates that the candidate has developed a rather weak international recognition within her/his field of expertise during the previous period	The available evidence indicates that the candidate has developed a reasonable international recognition within her/his field of expertise during the previous period	There is clear evidence that the candidate has developed a good international reputation within her/his field of expertise during the previous period	There is clear evidence that the candidate has developed a very good international reputation within her/his field of expertise during the previous period	There is clear evidence that the candidate has developed an excellent international reputation within her/his field of expertise during the previous period. Based on the existing evidence the candidate seems to have obtained a key opinion leader position.
1.d Bridge between basic research and clinical practice					
There is no evidence of collaboration(s) with (a) group(s) active in basic research	The collaboration with (a) group(s) active in basic research is rather limited.	The collaboration with (a) group(s) active in basic research is rather good.	The collaboration with (a) group(s) active in basic research is good and it reflects an active interaction.	Same as 'Good' AND the collaboration has the potential to have an important positive impact on the clinical practice.	• Same as 'Very Good' AND the candidate was the initiator and holds a key position in the collaboration(s)
1.e International collaboration					
	There is no evidence of international collaborations during the previous period.	The number of international collaborations during the previous period is rather limited	• There is clear evidence of multiple international collaborations during the previous period. • AND the collaborations are intensive; active network	• Same as 'Very Good' • AND the candidate was the initiator and holds a key position in the international collaboration(s)	
1.f Substitution for the clinical tasks (50%) of the mandate holder (during previous and next mandate)					
No evidence was given for the substitution (50 % or alternatively 20% *) of the clinical tasks of the candidate. * as an alternative for the 50% substitution, in exceptional cases the candidate can opt for a 20% substitution in combination with the aid of a PhD fellow	A substitution is mentioned in the report of the previous mandate and also in the renewal, • but without clear indications of name and profile, • nor indication of the proportion of the substitution (the substitution should be at least 40% or alternatively 20%*) • OR the proportion of substitution is less than 40% or less than 20% (*)	• There is clear evidence for a substitution (name, profile of the substitute) of the clinical tasks during the past mandate • AND the share of substitution was minimum 40 % or alternatively 20%* • BUT there is no clear indication of the proportion of the substitution in the next mandate • OR of the name and profile of the substitute in the next mandate	• There is clear evidence for a substitution (name, profile of the substitute) of the clinical tasks during the past and the future mandate • AND the share of substitution is minimum 40 % or alternatively 20%*.	• There is clear evidence for a substitution (name, profile of the substitute) of the clinical tasks during the past and future mandate • AND the share or substitution is clearly 50 % • OR in case of the alternatively 20% solution: the share of the substitution is min. 20% AND the scientific collaborator (PhD, postdoc, …) for the renewal is already known	

2. *Evaluation of the research programme for the next period*

Unacceptable	Weak (-2)	Reasonable (-1)	Good (0)	Very good (+1)	Excellent (+2)
2.a Originality and contribution to the scientific state-of-the-art					
The targeted research results are not original and will not contribute to the international state-of-the-art.; they will be clearly behind the current state-of the art.	The targeted research results have a limited innovative character. There will be a very limited contribution to the international state-of-the-art.	The research proposal is moderately original. There will be a contribution to the international state-of-the-art, but rather limited.	The targeted research results are innovative and original. There will be clear added value to the international state-of-th-art.	The targeted research results are innovative and original. They will offer a substantial added value relative to the international state-of-the-art.	The proposal is highly innovative and very unique. It provides an unmistakable added value with regard to the international state-of-the-art. It distinguishes itself in an outstanding manner from the ongoing research at the international level ("pioneering project")
2b. ***Quality of the research approach***					
• The targeted scientific objectives will not be realised with the proposed research approach OR • The targeted scientific objectives are intrinsically not feasible OR • The research approach is insufficiently elaborated to allow a correct evaluation	The research approach is characterised by serious flaws or shortcomings. Structural adjustments to the research approach are needed.	The research approach is reasonable but contains some gaps or shortcomings. There is room for improvement.	The research approach is well elaborated and justified, and well matched to the realisation of the scientific objectives. There are no significant gaps or shortcomings.	• The research approach is well elaborated and justified, and well matched to the realisation of the scientific objectives. There are no short comings. AND • The research approach also includes a precise identification of the potential risks with alternative strategies and fall-back research options.	• Same as 'very good' AND • The research plan is focused on a high level of integration, cross-fertilization and synergy with the collaborating research partners (cfr. translational gap between lab and the bed). AND • The approach is cost-efficient..

2.c Feasibility					
The proposal is elaborated in an insufficient way whereby it is unclear if the targeted goals are feasible within the project boundaries (timing, resources). OR Reaching the scientific project goals is evaluated as not feasible within the project goals (timing, resources) OR The project proposal contains too little research activities for a half-time period of 5 years.	The feasibility of the project within the project boundaries (budget, resources) is low. OR The proposed research activities are considered as low for a half-time period of 5 years.	The feasibility of the planned research activities within the project boundaries is reasonable. OR The proposed research activities are considered as minimal for a half-time period of 5 years.	The feasibility of the planned research activities within the project boundaries is good. AND The project consist of enough research activities for a half-time period of 5 years.	The proposal provides an optimal balans between the number of research activities and the proposed timing and resources.	
2.d Clinical impact					
It is unclear how the research goals will result in clinical applications.	The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as low	• The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as quite realistic. AND • The impact of these applications for the patient and/or healthcare is considered as limited.	• The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as quite realistic. AND • The impact of these applications for the patient and/or healthcare is considered as quite high.	• The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as very realistic. The impact of these applications for the patient and/or healthcare is considered as quite high. OR • The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as quite realistic. The impact of these applications for the patient and/or healthcare is considered as very high.	• The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as very realistic. AND • The impact of these applications for the patient and/or healthcare is considered as very high.

3. Planning for the after-FKM period (only applicable at the last renewal)

Unacceptable	Weak (-2)	Reasonable (-1)	Good (0)	Very good (1)	Excellent (2)
3.a. future of the research lines, that were initiated during FKM					
There is no evidence if the FKM-research programme will lead to new research lines and how it will be continued.	• The FKM-research programme is leading to the development of (a) separate research group(s) or unit(s), implementing (a) new research line(s). • AND this will not be continued after the FKM period. • OR the FKM-research programme is NOT leading to the development of (a) separate research group(s) or unit(s), implementing (a) new research line(s) and will end after the FKM period	• The FKM-research programme is leading to the development of (a) separate research group(s) or unit(s), implementing (a) new research line(s). • AND it is not yet clear how this will be continued after the FKM-period	• The FKM-research programme is leading to the development of (a) separate research group(s) or unit(s), implementing (a) new research line(s). • AND this will be continued, not necessarily by the FKM-holder (not specified yet).	• The FKM-research programme is leading to the development of (a) separate research group(s) or unit(s), implementing (a) new research line(s). • AND this will certainly be continued. • AND it is already known by whom.	• Same as 'Very Good' • AND the FKM-holder will have the leadership over the unit(s) and/or research line(s).
3.b. future career prospects for the FKM-holder					
	• The future career prospects of the FKM-holder are still unclear. There is no evidence that she/he will continue to have a role in the research.	• The future career prospects of the FKM-holder are rather concrete. She/he will continue to have a role in the research.	• The future career prospects of the FKM-holder are already concrete. • AND she/he will continue to have a leading role in the research.	• Same as 'Good' • AND there is clear evidence that she/he will be involved in the research for at least 20% of the working time.	