


POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH EVALUATION: score grid with scoring descriptors - INTERVIEW
POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP: scoring descriptors criterion “Candidate” (interview)

Please note that the score grid for the candidate criterion differs from the preselection score grid.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding		
1. Competence as a postdoctoral researcher								
<p><i>The interview is meant to assess the candidate’s competence as an independent researcher on a postdoctoral level. Important aspects are the scientific knowledge and insight in the proposed project, intellectual capacity and creativity, reasoning skills and critical mindset, and motivation and vision on the own professional future. Findings from the preselection phase pertaining to descriptions in this score grid (i.e. scientific expertise, ability, skills, mindset, motivation, vision, ...) may also be taken into account at this stage of the evaluation.</i></p>								
<p><i>No scoring possibility</i></p>	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Manifest gaps and shortcomings in the knowledge of the state of the art. The candidate appears to be quite unfamiliar with the topic of the project and shows insufficient insight in the relevance of the proposed research strategy and techniques. <input type="checkbox"/> Reasoning skills and/or critical mindset are poor. <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate doesn’t come across as motivated, and there seems to be no real vision on their professional future. 	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Fair/reasonable, but incomplete knowledge of the state of the art; without real risk for the implementation of the project. Moderate to sufficient insight into the relevance of the proposed research strategy and techniques. <input type="checkbox"/> Reasoning skills or critical mindset do not convince. <input type="checkbox"/> Motivation and candidate’s vision on professional future are less pronounced. 	<p>All of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate has the required scientific expertise to successfully execute the project. (Very) good knowledge of the state of the art within own field of research. They have a good insight in the proposed approach and techniques; positions the proposed research in an international context. <input type="checkbox"/> Reasoning skills and critical-scientific mindset are good. The candidate presents new concepts based on well-founded arguments. <input type="checkbox"/> Convincing and motivated candidate, who expresses a clear vision on their professional future. 	<p>All of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate demonstrates the ability to conduct ground-breaking research. Excellent/outstanding knowledge of the state of the art, even outside the own field of research. Excellent insight in the proposed methodology and techniques, well positioning the proposed research. <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate demonstrates a proper scientific mindset with creative and independent thinking and reasoning; they present new concepts in a very sound manner. <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate has a clear commitment and drive, and a bright, concrete and realistic vision on their own professional future. 				



POSTDOCTORAL 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							
<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. (preselection only) <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: scoring descriptors criterion “Interdisciplinarity”

Specific Interdisciplinary Panel only

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
3. Level of interdisciplinarity							
<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>							
<input type="checkbox"/> The project is not interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary at all. The proposed research is focused within one discipline.	<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>One or more of the following items apply:</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>All of the following items apply:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> There is more than one discipline involved in the proposed project, and these disciplines are sufficiently distinct. <input type="checkbox"/> The disciplines are at a similar coordinated level and each discipline is essential to achieve the expected outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> The state of the art is advanced in all involved disciplines and/or in a shared area.		<p>Requirements as in “good/very good”,</p> <p><u>AND</u></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><u>AND</u></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.	