



POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH EVALUATION: score grid with scoring descriptors - PRESELECTION

POSTDOCTORAL 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	
<p>1.a. Scientific contribution of the candidate</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>- Assess evidence of an emerging scientific reputation and an upward trajectory.</p> <p>- Assess the scientific independence of the candidate (as e.g. evidenced by publications or other achievements without PhD supervisor, as well as by <u>(inter)institutional</u> mobility since the PhD). For senior postdocs this is considered as a crucial asset, and a strict requirement for certain scores.</p>							
<p><i>No scoring possibility</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 <u>or</u> (senior:) the earlier upward trajectory is not continuing.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> Developing scientific independence (e.g. achievements without PhD supervisor, (inter)institutional mobility). For junior postdocs this is considered an asset, for senior postdocs this is a strict requirement for a score of 5 or higher.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> Proven clear path towards scientific independence (e.g. achievements without PhD supervisor, (inter)institutional mobility). For junior postdocs this is considered an asset, for senior postdocs this is a strict requirement for a score of 5 or higher.	


POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH 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								
<p>- 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, does the candidate have a clear plan to acquire the proper skills and expertise in terms of the anticipated career development.</p> <p>- 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).</p>								
<i>No scoring possibility</i>	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> It is questionable whether an appropriate scientific background and crucial competences are sufficiently present to carry out the proposed postdoctoral research project. <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate shows a limited number of activities to build up a research career and appropriate expertise. 	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> Motivation and vision are present but less pronounced with respect to the development of a research career and the mentioned activities, skills and experiences on networks, collaborations, mobility and the like. 	<p>All of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate has a convincing scientific background and expertise to execute the proposed project. <input type="checkbox"/> 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, with respect to networks, collaborations, mobility and the like... (<i>senior</i>: supervision and mentoring activities and other responsibilities). 	<p>All of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate has an excellent scientific background and expertise, showing the ability and potential to propose and conduct groundbreaking research. <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate shows a bright, concrete and realistic vision on the own professional future. They reveal 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, with respect to networks, collaborations, mobility and the like (<i>senior</i>: supervision and mentoring activities and other responsibilities). 				



POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP: scoring descriptors criterion "Project"

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/Reasonable	Good/very good	Good/very good	Good/very good	Excellent/outstanding	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 with respect to the 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 "good/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. 			



POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH EVALUATION: score grid with scoring descriptors - PRESELECTION

POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP: scoring descriptors criterion “Interdisciplinarity”

Specific Interdisciplinary Panel only

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/Reasonable	Good/Very good	Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
<p>3. Level of interdisciplinarity</p> <p><i>This criterion, only used in the Specific Interdisciplinary panel, invites you to assess to what extent the application is interdisciplinary. You may take both the project proposal, the profile of the candidate and the research group(s) in which they will be working into account in applying this criterion.</i></p> <p><i>A minimum score of 4 on the aspect ‘Interdisciplinarity’ is necessary in order to be able to receive funding from the Specific Interdisciplinary Panel.</i></p>							
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The project is not interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary at all. The proposed research is focused within one discipline.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The project is multidisciplinary instead of interdisciplinary in nature. Although the research covers at least two different disciplines, the expertise, methods, tools, data, ... of one discipline are merely used as an ‘instrument’ for the other domain. The various domains do not offer benefits to one another nor do they mutually influence each other. Instead they are juxtaposed. The outcomes of the project are not likely to impact all involved disciplines.</p>	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some characteristics of interdisciplinarity are present, but not all requirements for the category “good/very good” are met. While there is more than one discipline involved in the proposed project, these disciplines are not sufficiently distinct. This is for example the case if these disciplines are located in the same FWO panel.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Although mutual interactive input is necessary from at least two distinct disciplines to address the research question(s) under investigation, the level of coordination and integration is insufficiently extensive/profound.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The involved disciplines do not sufficiently influence one another and as a result they do not benefit to the same extent from the project.</p>	<p>All of the following items apply:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There is more than one discipline involved in the proposed project, and these disciplines are sufficiently distinct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The disciplines are at a similar coordinated level and each discipline is essential to achieve the expected outcome.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The state of the art is advanced in all involved disciplines and/or in a shared area.</p>	<p>Requirements as in “good/very good”,</p> <p><u>AND</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There is a pronounced synergy between all involved disciplines, that strongly benefit from and mutually influence each other in an integrated and well-designed way.</p> <p><u>AND</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The outcomes will clearly impact all involved disciplines and as such there is substantial added value for each involved discipline and/or new bridges between previously rarely related fields are built or new subdisciplines could result from this project.</p>			