

Senior clinical investigator: *Score grid for renewal*

1. Evaluation of previous period (progress report)

Please take into account the candidate's scientific seniority and, where appropriate, allow for mentioned career breaks.

The assessment should be based on a range of scientifically relevant activities, skills, experiences and achievements, such as the quality and impact (rather than quantity) of the publication record, as well as other meaningful scientific output. Consider also other impact (societal/economical/...) beyond publications and obtained research funding.

Unacceptable	Weak (-2)	Reasonable (-1)	Good (0)	Very Good (+1)	Excellent (+2)
1a. 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> number of grants/developed research lines mentoring tasks (PhD, master) the growth to scientific independence is considered as limited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> number of grants/developed research lines mentoring tasks (PhD, master) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> number of grants/developed research lines mentoring tasks (PhD, master) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> number of grants/developed research lines mentoring tasks (PhD, master) AND the candidate is demonstrating scientific leadership.
1b. 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.

Unacceptable	Weak (-2)	Reasonable (-1)	Good (0)	Very Good (+1)	Excellent (+2)
1c. International recognition of clinical-scientific work of the candidate					
The available evidence indicates that the candidate has developed a weak international recognition within their 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 their field of expertise during the previous period.	The available evidence indicates that the candidate has developed a reasonable international recognition within their field of expertise during the previous period.	There is clear evidence that the candidate has developed a good international reputation within their field of expertise during the previous period.	There is clear evidence that the candidate has developed a very good international reputation within their field of expertise during the previous period.	There is clear evidence that the candidate has developed an excellent international reputation within their field of expertise during the previous period. Based on the existing evidence the candidate seems to have obtained a key opinion leader position.
1d. 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).
1e. 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is clear evidence of multiple international collaborations during the previous period. • AND the collaborations are intensive; active network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as 'good' • AND the candidate was the initiator and holds a key position in the international collaboration(s). 	
1f. Substitution of the clinical tasks (during previous and next fellowship)					
No evidence was given for the substitution (at least 40% or alternatively 20%) of the clinical tasks of the candidate. <i>As an alternative for the 50% substitution, in exceptional cases the candidate can opt for a 20% substitution combined with the aid of a PhD fellow or other scientific/technical staff.</i>	A substitution is mentioned in the report of the previous fellowship and also in the renewal, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is clear evidence for a substitution (name, profile of the substitute) of the clinical tasks during the past fellowship • 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 fellowship OR of the name and profile of the substitute in the next fellowship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is clear evidence for a substitution (name, profile of the substitute) of the clinical tasks during the past and the future fellowship • AND the share of substitution is minimum 40 % or alternatively 20%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is clear evidence for a substitution (name, profile of the substitute) of the clinical tasks during the past and future fellowship • AND the share of substitution is clearly 50 % • OR in case of the alternative 20% option: the share of the substitution is min. 20% AND the scientific/technical aid 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)
2a. 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-the-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					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research approach is well elaborated and justified, and well matched to the realisation of the scientific objectives. There are no shortcomings. AND The research approach also includes a precise identification of the potential risks with alternative strategies and fall-back research options. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
2c. 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.	

Unacceptable	Weak (-2)	Reasonable (-1)	Good (0)	Very Good (+1)	Excellent (+2)
2d. 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 or healthcare is considered as limited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 or healthcare is considered as quite high. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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 or healthcare is considered as very high. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 or healthcare is considered as very high.

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

Unacceptable	Weak (-2)	Reasonable (-1)	Good (0)	Very good (1)	Excellent (2)
3a. Future of the research lines, that were initiated during the fellowship					
There is no evidence if the research programme of the fellowship will lead to new research lines and how it will be continued.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research programme of the fellowship is leading to the development of separate research group(s) or unit(s), implementing new research line(s). AND this will not be continued after the period of the fellowship. OR the research programme of the fellowship is NOT leading to the development of separate research group(s) or unit(s), implementing new research line(s) and will end after the period of the fellowship. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research programme of the fellowship is leading to the development of separate research group(s) or unit(s), implementing new research line(s). AND it is not yet clear how this will be continued after the period of the fellowship. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research programme of the fellowship is leading to the development of separate research group(s) or unit(s), implementing new research line(s). AND this will be continued, not necessarily by the candidate (not specified yet). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The research programme of the fellowship is leading to the development of separate research group(s) or unit(s), implementing new research line(s). AND this will certainly be continued. AND it is already known by whom. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as 'very good' AND the candidate will have the leadership over the unit(s) and/or research line(s).
3b. Future career prospects					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The future career prospects of the candidate are still unclear. There is no evidence that the candidate will continue to have a role in the research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The future career prospects of the candidate are rather concrete. The candidate will continue to have a role in the research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The future career prospects of the candidate are already concrete. AND the candidate will continue to have a leading role in the research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as 'good' AND there is clear evidence that the candidate will be involved in the research for at least 20% of the working time. 	