

Guidelines for assessing postdoctoral applications

Faculty of Medicine, UiB

Approved by the Research Committee, 30.05.2016 and amended on 09.06.2017.

A number of factors should be taken into account in the assessment of postdoctoral applications, and it is important that all those assessing the applications are conscious of this and that they use the entire grading scale. These guidelines describe what the various grades entail, and are intended to aid the assessment process and ensure that the grading scale is applied as consistently as possible by all evaluators.

Postdoctoral positions

Candidate (40 %)

Factors to be considered:

- scientific qualifications and previous scientific production
- ability to do independent research
- planned stays abroad and/or exchanges to/affiliations with new research groups
- the mentor declaration

The number and quality of publications during and after the applicant's doctoral studies can be seen as an indication of the strength of candidates, but also the time period when the research was conducted/published must be considered. This is to ensure that candidates can qualify a relatively short time after completing their doctoral studies. The candidate's contribution to the publications should be taken into account (e.g. by considering the order of authors and type of publication).

Grading - Grading scale 1-5

Grade 5: Applicants who have published at least once in a leading international journal, and who had a leading role in this publication. Applicants who have published several articles since completing their PhD.

Grade 4: Applicants who have published at least twice in very good international journals within their field (level 2). Applicants who have published several articles since completing their PhD. (<https://dbh.nsd.uib.no/publiseringskanaler/Forside>)

Grade 3: Applicants who have published at least two articles in good international journals. Applicants who have published several articles after their PhD.

Grade 2: Applicants who have only one or a few publications since completing their PhD (Note: see comments above).

Grade 1: Applicants who have not published since completing their PhD (Note: see comments above).

Project (30 %)

Factors to be considered:

- Is the scientific concept in the application sensible?
- Is the aim of the project's original and clearly described?
- Is the proposed methodology adequate for the project?
- Is the proposed methodology available to the research group?
- Does the application include a reasonable time plan?
- Is the scope of the project realistic within the available time frame?
- Have the necessary ethical questions been addressed?
- Are there plans for publication?
- Is there a realistic budget?
- Does the research group have the necessary funds available for the project?
- Is there potential for innovation in the project?

Grading - Grading scale 1-5

Grade 5: Original, innovative and very good project, focused and realistic. Data from the project is likely to be published in a highly acclaimed journal.

Grade 4: Good project, data from the project is likely to be published in good journals.

Grade 3: Good project, but no documentation that the project will lead to high quality publications.

Grade 2: Good project, but cannot compete.

Grade 1: Poor project not worthy of support.

Comments: It is important that the assessment of the project is not merely an assessment of the research community, even though this is relevant to some extent. It should be possible to compete with an excellent project, even if the research group in itself is not regarded as excellent. In such cases the potential, realism and feasibility must be duly considered.

Research community (30 %)

Factors to be considered:

- the research merits of the research community, in particular those of the mentor
- the international reputation of the research community
- the international network of the research community
- relevant publishing activities by the community as a whole
- the level of academic supervisor experience within the community
- the candidate output of the community
- multi- or interdisciplinary cooperation in the community
- the community's methodological strengths and breadth,
- resources available to the group, including funds to cover running costs in the project

Where the use of bibliometric tools is appropriate, please use Web of Science:

http://apps.webofknowledge.com/UA_GeneralSearch_input.do?product=UA&SID=X1r85X2rw3uv5eE2MRb&search_mode=GeneralSearch. Choose "All databases" and search by name within the

“Author” category. The relevant publication profile will appear by pressing "citation report". If logged in via iPad or PC/MAC outside UiB network, please use the following link: <http://apps.isiknowledge.com.pva.uib.no/> Log in using your UiB user name and password. Please note that bibliometrics is only a technical tool, and that the faculty has good research groups and traditions that would not be able to compete if these tools were to be used without due caution. This is particularly relevant for younger mentors, where age must be considered when assessing the publication profile.

Please note that the wider research community, including partners is relevant in the assessment of the research group.

Grading - Grading scale 1-5

Grade 5: Internationally leading research community that publishes in the best journals. The mentor is highly merited considering their age and research field. The community receives/has received funding from the EU and/or the Research Council of Norway.

Grade 4: Nationally leading research community that publishes in very good journals within their field (level 2). The supervisor/mentor is well merited considering their age and research field. The community receives/has received funding from the EU and/or the Research Council of Norway, Samarbeidsorganet or equivalent external sources.

Grade 3: Locally leading research community that publishes in good international journals. The community receives/has received funding from Samarbeidsorganet or equivalent external sources.

Grade 2: Non-established research communities.

Grade 1: Unqualified research communities.

General comment:

It is important that the potential of the applicant, project and mentor be assessed. This means that if the candidate has made a very good start to their research career and has the potential to become a leading researcher, nationally or internationally, the highest grades may be awarded. The same applies to a very promising project, and in those cases where the mentor is still young but shows very good scientific development and an ability to build a productive and high quality research group.