fwo
Opening
new
horizons

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

During the interview, the candidate is assessed on his/her competence as an independent researcher on a post-doctoral level. Important aspects are the motivation and vision on the own professional future, intellectual capacity and creativity, reasoning skills and critical mindset, scientific knowledge and insight in the proposed project.

D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
				>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/reasonable		Good/very good		Excellent/outstanding	
1. Competence as a post-doctoral researcher							
No scoring possibility	Manifest gaps and shortcomings in the knowledge of the state-of-the-art. Reasoning skills and/or critical mindset are poor, and/or quite unfamiliar with the topic of the project. Insufficient insight in the relevance of the proposed research strategy and techniques, and/or poor motivation, not based on a fundamental interest in the proposed project, and/or no vision on his/her professional future	Fair but incomplete knowledge of the state-of-the-art; without further risk for the implementation of the project, and/or moderate reasoning skills or critical mindset and/or moderate to sufficient insight into the relevance of the proposed research strategy and techniques, and/or moderate motivation and vision on professional future is less clear.		Very good knowledge of the state-of-the-art within own field of research. Reasoning skills and critical-scientific mindset are good. The candidate presents new concepts based on well-founded arguments; and He/she has a good insight in the proposed approach and techniques; positions the proposed research in an international context, and convincing and motivated candidate, who expresses a clear vision on his/her professional future.		Excellent knowledge of the state-of-the-art, even outside own field of research. Creative and independent thinking and reasoning, and proper scientific mindset; the candidate presents new concepts in a very sound manner; and an excellent insight in the proposed approach and techniques is demonstrated, well positioning the proposed research and the candidate shows clear commitment and drive. Bright, concrete and realistic vision on own professional future.	

fwo
Opening
new
horizons

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

D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
				>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
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							
Project focuses on (economic/societal) valorization with one stakeholder (cfr. "innovation mandates" at Flanders Innovation & Entrepreneurship), and/or The project does not contain real scientific risks or challenges.	The project proposal is rather a catch-up effort relative to the state-of-the-art. and/or Rather limited level of scientific risks and pronounced challenges (or challenges not identified).	The added value of the project with respect to the international state-of-the-art is acceptable, but less pronounced or less well elaborated. and/or The project is less challenging or the project is sufficiently challenging but the potential is insufficiently explored		High-quality fundamental research project with good level of risks, challenges and inventiveness. and The project is original and fully builds upon and extends the international state-of-the-art.		Requirements as in "(very) good", and Highly ambitious and original project of potentially groundbreaking nature and large scientific impact, and Very high level of scientific risks and shows clear inventive and challenging ideas, novel concepts and strategies.	
2.b Quality of the research approach and feasibility of the project							
Evident discrepancy/mismatch between research goals and research approach. and/or The realization of the scientific goals is not feasible with the proposed research approach.	The project approach and project planning are flawed. The intrinsic feasibility is low or the objectives are formulated in insufficiently concrete terms, making it difficult to evaluate their feasibility, and/or The research approach and the project planning display serious flaws and shortcomings, and/or there is some mismatch between the research goals and the research approach,	The research methodology is reasonable, but with some shortcomings or a lesser fit to the scientific goals, and/or feasibility is less realistic, but it is likely that the scientific goals will be partially reached.		The research approach is adequate to achieve the targeted results, the planning is clear. Proposed methodology & work plan are solid and realistic within the 3-year time frame. Risks are identified and dealt with. The project fits well in research activities of the research group and in the personal development plan of the candidate,		Requirements as in good, and thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and "fall back" research options.	