POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP EVALUATION/ score grid with scoring descriptors - PRESELECTION

POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP: scoring descriptors criterion "Candidate" (preselection)

Please take into account the candidate's scientific seniority in a 'jr.' resp. 'sr' context, and where appropriate allow for mentioned career breaks.
The assessment should be based on a range of scientifically relevant activities, skills, experiences and achievements.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	**Weak**	**Fair/Reasonable**		**Good/Very good**		**Excellent/Outstanding**	

1.a. Scientific contribution of the candidate

- *Assess the candidate's scientific contribution to the state-of-the-art, as evidenced by a **range of scientifically relevant activities and achievements**, such as the **quality and impact** (rather than the quantity) **of the publication record**, as well as **other meaningful scientific output.** The latter may include (e.g.) software, prototypes, (keynote) lectures at scientific meetings, the organisation of such meetings, the organisation of or participation in exhibitions, acting as a scientific evaluator for submitted papers or grant applications and the like, and any other relevant output. Consider also scientific or other (societal, economic, …) **impact** beyond publications and obtained research funding.*
- *Assess evidence of an emerging scientific reputation and an upward trajectory.*
- *For senior post-docs, **scientific independence** (as e.g. evidenced by publications or other achievements without PhD supervisor, as well as by (inter)institutional mobility since the PhD) is seen as a relevant asset.*

No scoring possibility	☐ Rather limited scientific contribution to the state-of-the-art, in terms of scientifically relevant activities and achievements (publications and/or other relevant research output and impact), and little evidence of an upward trajectory.	☐ Average scientific contribution to the state-of-the-art, taking into account scientifically relevant activities and achievements (publications and/or other research output and impact). There is some evidence of a starting upward trajectory or (*senior*:) the earlier upward trajectory is not continuing.	☐ Meaningful scientific contribution to the state of the art, taking into account a variety of scientifically relevant activities and achievements properly acknowledged in the scientific community (quality and impact of publication record and/or other research output and impact). An emerging (international) reputation in a clear upward trajectory is evidenced. AND *(senior, allowing score >=5)* ☐ Developing scientific independence (e.g. achievements without PhD supervisor, (inter)institutional mobility).	☐ Impressive scientific contribution through a range of scientifically relevant activities and original, clear achievements beyond the state-of-the-art (evidenced by publications and/or other relevant research output and impact). There is an emerging international recognition for the candidate's influential research output. AND *(senior)* ☐ Proven clear path towards scientific independence (e.g. achievements without PhD supervisor, (inter)institutional mobility).

POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP EVALUATION/ score grid with scoring descriptors - PRESELECTION

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	**Weak**	**Fair/Reasonable**		**Good/Very good**		**Excellent/Outstanding**	

1.b. Motivation and substantiation of relevant competences of the candidate

- *Does the "Motivation Statement" reveal a proper **motivation and research vision**? Assess the candidate's **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 in general, is the candidate acquiring the proper skills and expertise in terms of the anticipated career development.*
- *Assess further evidence in terms of a range of relevant **career and expertise building activities**, such as education activities, membership of scientific organisations and societies, (past as well as planned) active participation in networks, research collaborations and/or research stays ((inter)national, inter-sectoral and other types of mobility), R&D services provided to third parties, relevant training and the like. For senior postdoc candidates, also research supervision and mentoring of bachelor, master and PhD students, and the involvement of the candidate as (co-)promotor in research projects can be taken into account, as well as institutional responsibilities (e.g. governance, administration).*

No scoring possibility	**One or more of the following items apply:** ☐ It is questionable if an appropriate scientific background and crucial competences are sufficiently present to carry out the proposed postdoctoral research project. ☐ The candidate shows a limited number of activities to build up a research career and appropriate expertise.	**One or more of the following items apply:** ☐ The candidate's scientific background and built-up expertise are adequate, except for some flaws, that are not all being dealt with in the application. ☐ Motivation and vision are present but less pronounced w.r.t. the development of a research career and the mentioned activities, skills and experiences on networks, collaborations, mobility and the like.	**All of the following items apply:** ☐ The candidate has a convincing scientific background and expertise to execute the proposed project. ☐ The application reveals a strong motivation and research vision regarding the anticipated career development. This is evidenced taking into account a variety of (past and planned) activities, skills and experiences, w.r.t. networks, collaborations, mobility and the like… (*senior:* supervision and mentoring activities and other responsibilities).	**All of the following items apply:** ☐ The candidate has an excellent scientific background and expertise, showing the ability and potential to propose and conduct ground-breaking research. ☐ The candidate shows a bright, concrete and realistic vision on the own professional future. She/he reveals the drive that improve the prospects of reaching/reinforcing a position of professional maturity. This is visible in a wide range of activities, skills and experiences, w.r.t. networks, collaborations, mobility and the like (*senior:* supervision and mentoring activities and other responsibilities).

POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP EVALUATION/ score grid with scoring descriptors - PRESELECTION

POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP: scoring descriptors criterion "Project"

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	**Weak**	**Fair/Reasonable**		**Good/Very good**		**Excellent/Outstanding**	
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) ☐ The project does not contain real scientific risks or challenges. There is no contribution to the international state-of-the-art. ☐ 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. ☐ 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. ☐ The project is fairly/reasonably challenging or the project is sufficiently challenging but the potential is insufficiently explored.		**All of the following items apply:** ☐ The project is original and soundly builds upon and significantly contributes to the international state-of-the-art. ☐ High-quality fundamental research project with good level of risks, challenges and inventiveness.		**All of the following items apply:** ☐ Highly ambitious and original project of potentially groundbreaking nature and large scientific impact. ☐ 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							
One or more of the following items apply: ☐ Evident discrepancy or mismatch between the research goals and research methodology. ☐ The realization of the scientific goals is not feasible with the proposed research methodology and/or project planning.	**One or more of the following items apply:** ☐ The research methodology and project planning are flawed in terms of matching with project objectives. The intrinsic feasibility is low. ☐ The objectives are formulated in insufficiently concrete terms, making it difficult to evaluate their feasibility.	**One or more of the following items apply:** ☐ The research methodology is reasonable but with some shortcomings or a lesser fit to the scientific goals. ☐ The feasibility is less realistic, but it is likely that part of the scientific goals will be reached.		**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. ☐ 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> ☐ thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and "fall back" research options.	