


POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP EVALUATION/ score grid with scoring descriptors - INTERVIEWS
POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP: scoring descriptors criterion “Candidate” (interview)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
				>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/reasonable		Good/very good		Excellent/outstanding	
1. Competence as a post-doctoral researcher (criterion “candidate”)							
<i>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.</i>							
No scoring possibility	One or more of the following items apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> Reasoning skills and/or critical mindset are poor. <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate doesn’t come across as motivated, and there seems to be no real vision on his/her professional future 	One or more of the following items apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Fair/reasonable, but incomplete knowledge of the state-of-the-art; without real risk for the implementation of the project. Moderate to sufficient insight into the relevance of the proposed research strategy and techniques. <input type="checkbox"/> Reasoning skills or critical mindset do not convince. <input type="checkbox"/> Motivation and candidate’s vision on professional future are less pronounced. 	All of the following items apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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, <input type="checkbox"/> Reasoning skills and critical-scientific mindset are good. The candidate presents new concepts based on well-founded arguments; <input type="checkbox"/> Convincing and motivated candidate, who expresses a clear vision on his/her professional future. 	All of the following items apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate demonstrates a proper scientific mindset with creative and independent thinking and reasoning; she/he presents new concepts in a very sound manner. <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate with clear commitment and drive, and a bright, concrete and realistic vision on the own professional future. 			



POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP EVALUATION/ score grid with scoring descriptors - INTERVIEWS

POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP: scoring descriptors criterion “Project” (preselection + interview)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
				>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%		
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/Reasonable		Good/very good		Excellent/outstanding			
2.a Scientific quality, relevance and challenge, originality									
<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The project is out of scope: it does not comply with the scope of the panel it was submitted to. (preselection only) <input type="checkbox"/> The project does not contain real scientific risks or challenges. There is no contribution to the international state-of-the-art <input type="checkbox"/> The project focuses on (economic/societal) valorization with one stakeholder (cf. “innovation mandates” at Flanders Innovation & Entrepreneurship - VLAIO). 	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The project proposal is rather a catch-up effort relative to the state-of-the-art. <input type="checkbox"/> Rather limited level of scientific risks and of pronounced challenges (or challenges not identified). 	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The added value of the project w.r.t. international state-of-the-art is acceptable, but less pronounced or less well elaborated. <input type="checkbox"/> The project is fairly/reasonably challenging or the project is sufficiently challenging but the potential is insufficiently explored 	<p>All of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The project is original and soundly builds upon and significantly contributes to the international state-of-the-art. <input type="checkbox"/> High-quality fundamental research project with good level of risks, challenges and inventiveness. 	<p>All of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Highly ambitious and original project of potentially groundbreaking nature and large scientific impact, <input type="checkbox"/> Very high level of scientific risks. Clear inventive and challenging ideas, novel concepts and strategies. 					
2.b Quality of the research methodology and feasibility of the project									
<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Evident discrepancy or mismatch between the research goals and research methodology. <input type="checkbox"/> The realization of the scientific goals is not feasible with the proposed research methodology and/or project planning. 	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The research methodology and project planning are flawed in terms of matching with project objectives. The intrinsic feasibility is low. <input type="checkbox"/> The objectives are formulated in insufficiently concrete terms, making it difficult to evaluate their feasibility, 	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The research methodology is reasonable but with some shortcomings or a lesser fit to the scientific goals, <input type="checkbox"/> The feasibility is less realistic, but it is likely that part of the scientific goals will be reached. 	<p>All of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> 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”, <u>AND</u> <input type="checkbox"/> thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and “fall back” research options.					