

1. POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP: scoring descriptors criterion “Candidate” (preselection)

1.a Scientific contribution of the candidate (output)

This criterion assesses the scientific contribution of the candidate, taking into account the scientific seniority (jr./sr.) (and possible career breaks) of the candidate.

Has the candidate obtained important research results and scientific contributions to the field as evidenced by e.g. the quality and impact of the publication record, invited contributions, conferences, patents, teachings, monographs, ... ? Note that focus is not on the number of publications, but rather quality and impact. Other scientific output is also taken into account.

For senior post-docs, scientific independence (as e.g. evidenced by publications without PhD supervisor, ...) becomes an important criterion.

1.b Relevant competences

This criterion assesses if the candidate has the right competences in relation to the proposed project and competences required for a postdoctoral researcher in general.

Has the candidate the right scientific background for the proposed research program? Match between the candidate’s profile and the project. Has the candidate gained relevant experience in research (research institutions or research-intensive industry) abroad? Is the candidate acquiring the proper skills in terms of the anticipated career development?

In particular for senior postdoc candidates: research supervision and mentoring, the involvement of the candidate as (co-)promotor in research projects and experience with supervision of PhD/MSc students can be taken into account.

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

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.a. Scientific contribution of the candidate							
No scoring possibility	Rather limited scientific contribution. Little evidence of developing a reputation or suggesting an upward trajectory.	Average scientific contribution, but some evidence of starting upward trajectory.		<i>(w.r.t. seniority level)</i> meaningful contributions to the state of the art, properly acknowledged in the scientific community. Emerging (international) reputation and clear upward trajectory; <u>and (sr.)</u> evidence of developing scientific independence		Impressive scientific contribution by the candidate. Original, clear achievements beyond the state-of-the-art, emerging international recognition for influential research output. Promising development towards independency	
1.b. Motivation and substantiation of relevant competences of the candidate							
No scoring possibility	Little evidence of (development of) some crucial competences (scientific background, supervision/mentoring, mobility, collaboration,...).	The candidate substantiates to have the right scientific background and built-up expertise. There is less evidence of acquiring or acquired competences as on promotorship, international collaboration, ...		Good skills and expertise to execute research beyond the state-of-the-art. <i>(sr.:)</i> Evidence of primary supervision /mentoring, and of collaboration activities outside host institution , <u>and</u> the candidate provides evidence of carefully building up a research career as well as transferable skills.		The candidate has excellent skills & ample experience to execute the proposed research proposal. Shows the ability and potential to propose and conduct ground-breaking research, <u>and</u> the candidate is ready to acquire (jr) or has acquired (sr) competencies that improve the prospects of reaching/reinforcing a position of professional maturity and independence.	

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

D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
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), <u>and/or</u> 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. <u>and/or</u> 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. <u>and/or</u> 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. <u>and</u> The project is original and fully builds upon and extends the international state-of-the-art.		Requirements as in “(very) good”, <u>and</u> Highly ambitious and original project of potentially groundbreaking nature and large scientific impact, <u>and</u> 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. <u>and/or</u> 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 <u>or</u> the objectives are formulated in insufficiently concrete terms, making it difficult to evaluate their feasibility, <u>and/or</u> The research approach and the project planning display serious flaws and shortcomings, <u>and/or</u> 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, <u>and/or</u> 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, <u>and</u> thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and “fall back” research options.	