

DR2 Evaluation Criteria

(CSS application)

Curriculum-professional experience

For the curriculum, the Evaluation Committee Members must indicate:

- If the curriculum is linear or multidisciplinary (presence in laboratories with different themes or complementary technological approaches, etc.);
- If the work in different laboratories is appreciated (publication as first author or other presentation of work);
- The reputation of associated laboratories throughout the career: give your opinion on the laboratories with which the candidate was affiliated, specifying their recognition on the international level.

Achievements

Publications: The Evaluation Committee Members must give their reasoned opinion on:

The quality, visibility and level of involvement of the candidate on:

- Original articles in peer-reviewed journals;
- Other publications: reviews, FC3R Short Notes, peer-reviewed preprints (PCI, VeriXiv, ReView COMMONS), journals without a review board, books, etc.)

Specify if:

- Original contributions that are highly visible internationally;
- The rank is consistent with the DR2 grade (last position).

Valorisation: The Evaluation Committee Members must give their opinion on the candidate's development capabilities in terms of:

Economic development:

- Invention (patents, licenses, industrial contracts)
- Business creation
- Development of tools (software, databases, anthologies, etc.)

Clinical transfer:

- Proof of concept study, PHRC, CHRT, clinical study, etc.
- Involvement (promoter, coordinator, partner, etc.) in transversal structures: cohorts, surveys, referral centers, CIC, CRB, etc.

Societal valuation:

- Co-production of tools or devices in partnership with associations or other collectives;
- Implementation of registers, cohorts, questionnaires on the initiative and/or in consultation with associations or other collectives.
- Creation of associations and/or participation in their governance.

Project

The Evaluation Committee Members must specify:

- Whether the project is in line with previous work or introduces a conceptual and/or technological interruption;

- The expected impact on the advancement of knowledge in the principle field as well as in other disciplines.

Analyze and evaluate:

- Originality and relevance of the research question asked, taking of risk, clarity of objectives, positioning in the national and international contexts, methodological relevance;
- Adequacy of resources (human and financial) and environment (access to platforms, availability of tools);
- Ability to participate, develop or coordinate research collaborations internally or nationally and/or internationally;
- Potential for economic, clinical and societal development;
- Consideration of ethical rules and regulatory aspects: rigor and integrity (statistical methodology, conflicts of interest, reproducibility, etc.).

Leadership

The Evaluation Committee Members must give their opinion on the leadership capabilities, taking into account the actual experience of the candidate:

- From research group that established fruitful interactions between researchers in the group or between projects (co-productions);
- Within national, European or international scientific networks (coordination of projects or co-production with partners);
- Thesis supervision
- The relevance of the composition of the team (or group) as compared to the production and ambition of the project.

Comment on the candidate's abilities to:

- Finance his/her research, distinguishing between national and international funding, the nature of contracts (public contracts, industrial contracts, associative contracts, etc.) and the degree of their involvement (principal investigator or partner);
- Attract post-doctoral researchers;
- Be involved in guidance and follow-up with employees, in particular in the career support and follow-up of supervised doctoral students and post-docs;
- Managerial skills.

Animation and dissemination of knowledge

The Evaluation Committee Members must give comment on the following activities:

- The notoriety of the conferences at which the candidate presented his/her work;
- The level of involvement in the organization of conferences/symposia;
- Talks in institutes of international reputation;
- Participation in scientific networks (national, European, international level);
- National, European or international collaborations (subject, laboratories and/or programs, countries);
- Evaluation of scientific activity (manuscripts, calls for projects, commissions, juries...);
- Participation in national, European or international expert committees or bodies (such as Anses);
- Missions to analyze societal demand, prospective analysis, etc.;
- Participation in the community life of the unit (seminars, management, hygiene and safety, good practices, quality, etc.);
- Teaching activity and level of responsibility in teaching, (Master's supervision, Doctoral level module activities, etc.);
- Organization of events with patient associations or other groups (care professionals, caregivers, users, etc.);
- Popular science (articles for the general public, interviews, editions, videos, scientific mediation products, science and society debates, actions in partnership with associations, etc.);
- Involvement in data sharing (structuring, depositing/sharing on dedicated platforms, etc.);
- Perform scientific communication in the form of preprints open access not peer-reviewed (bioRxiv type).

Oral presentation

The Evaluation Committee Members must comment on the quality of the oral presentation and evaluate the:

- Structured, rigorous and didactic character;
- Ability to convince, enthusiasm;
- Ability to be concise.

Discussion

The Evaluation Committee Members must comment on the relevance of the answers during the discussion by evaluating:

- Ability to analyze, imagination, critical thinking, ability to listen and debate, conciseness of answers;
- Autonomy of the candidate, team spirit, ability to lead a team, willingness to transmit and collaborate;
- Scientific and/or administrative literacy;
- Behavioral intelligence.

The Evaluation Committee Members give an assessment for each criteria evaluated:

☐ Remarkable ☐ Excellent ☐ Very Good ☐ Good ☐ Average ☐ Insufficient ☐ Out of Scope