


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

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
				>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%	
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding		
1.a. Scientific contribution of the candidate								
<p>Please take into account the candidate’s scientific seniority (in a “jr.” resp. “sr.” context, and taking into account possible career breaks). Assess important research results and scientific contributions to the field as evidenced by (rather than the quantity) the quality and impact of the publication record, as well as other scientific output (invited contributions, conferences, patents, teachings, monographs, ...), and impact beyond publications. An emerging scientific reputation and an upward trajectory are relevant criteria as well. For senior post-docs, scientific independence (as e.g. evidenced by publications without PhD supervisor, ...) is a relevant asset.</p>								
<i>No scoring possibility</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Rather limited scientific contribution to the state-of-the-art, and little evidence of an upward trajectory.	<input type="checkbox"/> Average scientific contribution to the state-of-the-art. Some evidence of a starting upward trajectory <u>or</u> (sr.) earlier upward trajectory is not continuing.	<input type="checkbox"/> Meaningful contributions to the state of the art, properly acknowledged in the scientific community. Evidence of emerging (international) reputation in a clear upward trajectory. AND <input type="checkbox"/> (sr. :) Developing scientific independence.	<input type="checkbox"/> Impressive scientific contribution: original, clear achievements beyond the state-of-the-art. Emerging international recognition for influential research output. AND <input type="checkbox"/> (sr. :) Proven clear path towards scientific independence.				
1.b. Motivation and substantiation of relevant competences of the candidate								
<p>This criterion assesses whether the candidate has the right scientific background and competences, in relation to the proposed project, and as required for a postdoctoral researcher in general. Has the candidate gained relevant experience and performed relevant collaborations outside the host institution (mobility)? In general, is the candidate acquiring the proper skills in terms of the anticipated career development, and does the application (motivation statement) reveal proper motivation and vision? Senior postdoc candidates: research supervision and mentoring and the involvement of the candidate as (co-)promotor in research projects can be taken into account.</p>								
<i>No scoring possibility</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Little evidence of (development of) some crucial competences, such as scientific background and the building up of proper career-related expertise as mobility and collaboration, (sr. :) supervision/mentoring.	One or more of the following items apply: <input type="checkbox"/> Proper scientific background and built-up expertise is substantiated, but still shows some flaws, that are not all being dealt with in the application. <input type="checkbox"/> there is less evidence of acquiring or acquired career-related competences as mobility and collaboration, (sr. :) supervision/mentoring.	All of the following items apply: <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate is developing (jr.) or has developed (sr.) good skills and expertise to execute research beyond the state-of-the-art. Potential flaws are identified and being dealt with. <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate provides evidence of carefully and motivatedly building up a research career as well as the required skills (w.r.t. mobility and collaboration outside host institution, (sr. :) supervision and mentoring, ...	All of the following items apply: <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate is developing (jr.) or has developed (sr.) excellent skills and ample scientific experience , and shows the ability and potential to propose and conduct ground-breaking research. <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate is ready to acquire (jr.) or has acquired (sr.) competences, as well reveals the drive that improve the prospects of reaching/reinforcing a position of professional maturity and independence.				



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. (<i>preselection only</i>) <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. 	<p>Requirements as in "very good",</p> <p><u>AND</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and "fall back" research options. 					