RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE
Liberté
Égalité
Fraternité

Inserm
La science pour la santé
From science to health

DR2 Evaluation Criteria

(CSS application)

The evaluation must take into account the specific characteristics of the discipline as well as the number of years of professional activity:

- In the case where the candidate is a tenured CR Inserm, the evaluation should focus on activities carried out since their appointment to the CR Inserm position.

- In the case of an external application (no tenured CR Inserm), the evaluation should cover the candidate's entire career since the completion of their doctoral degree.

All criteria must be assessed, and the overall appraisal should be consistent with the accompanying comments. The elements listed in the description of each criterion are provided for guidance only; researchers are not required to check off every item listed.

Curriculum-professional experience

The committee must assess:

- If the curriculum is linear or multidisciplinary (experience in laboratories with different research themes or complementary technological approaches);
- If the work in different laboratories is appreciated (publication as first author, co-first author, or other achievements).

Achievements

The committee must assess:
- the candidate's personal contribution, the conceptual, methodological, or technological significance of their work, and its impact for Inserm;
- the quality, importance, and innovativeness of the candidate's achievements:

Publications:
Inserm is a signatory of the San Francisco Declaration (DORA). The Impact Factor (IF) should not be used as a substitute for evaluating scientific quality. The committee should focus on the scientific content of articles rather than the journal's reputation.

The committee must provide a reasoned assessment (without exhaustively listing) of the quality and visibility of:
- original articles published in peer-reviewed journals,
- other peer-reviewed publications: reviews, conference publications, books, FC3R Short Notes, and preprints (PCI, Review Commons, ...), …

Articles that are submitted or under review (not yet published) are not accepted.

The committee must take into account the researcher's level of involvement, the research field, and the community's conventions.
It must specify whether the original contributions are internationally visible and whether the authorship position is consistent with the DR2 rank (last author, corresponding author).

- Comment on the valorization activity (economic, clinical, societal) based on the provided information:
  - Economic transfer: inventions (patents, licenses, industrial contracts); company creation; development of tools (biobanks, software, databases, ontologies, ...).

- Clinical transfer: proof-of-concept studies, PHRC, clinical studies; … involvement (sponsor,coordinator, partner) in transversal structures (cohorts, surveys, reference centers, CIC, CRB, ...).
- Societal transfer: production of tools, recommendations, and freely accessible or open-source systems peer-reviewed; transfer of results to practices or public policies and implementation of interventions and health innovations (prevention, care); other outputs from participatory research (co-design, co-production, …).

https://pro.inserm.fr/rubriques/en-labo/recherche-participative/vers-de-bonnes-pratiques-de-recherche-participative

Project

The committee must analyze and evaluate:

- the originality and relevance of the research question, risk-taking, clarity of objectives, positioning within the national, European, and international context, and methodological appropriateness;
- whether the project continues previous work or proposes a conceptual and/or technological break;
- the researcher's personal contribution;
- the feasibility of the project in the host Inserm laboratory: adequacy of human, financial, methodological, and technological resources (access to platforms, availability of tools, ...);
- the ability to participate in, develop, or coordinate research collaborations internally or at the national and/or international level;
- the expected impact on advancing knowledge in the primary field as well as in other disciplines;
- the potential for economic, clinical, and societal transfer;
- consideration of ethical rules and regulatory aspects: rigor and integrity (statistical methodology, conflicts of interest, reproducibility, ...).

Leadership

Taking into account the information provided in the scientific application, the CV, and the form Abstract achievements and project (section "Supervision and career development of personnel"), the committee must provide an assessment of the candidate's leadership abilities, based on the following points:

- operational responsibilities for a research axis/group/team;
- participation in the direction or coordination of major national, European, or international projects/networks;
- ability to secure funding for the research of their group/team and for their unit; level of responsibility (coordinator, PI, co-PI, partner, work package leader);
- supervision of personnel: students, PhD candidates, postdoctoral researchers, technicians, engineers, researchers, ...;
- ability to develop the skills of collaborators (training, participation in conferences, seminars, ...);
- for supervised PhD students/postdoctoral researchers, indicate whether they publish and specify their career outcomes;
- capacity for recruitment and/or attractiveness of personnel;
- establishment of academic or industrial partnerships.

The committee must provide an opinion on managerial skills, particularly regarding mentoring and career development of supervised personnel.

Animation and dissemination of knowledge

The committee must provide an assessment of the candidate's abilities in scientific leadership and knowledge dissemination, based on the following points:

- presentations of research at national, European, and international conferences and seminars (oral presentations, posters, invited talks),
- organization of scientific conferences and symposia (national, European, international);
- scientific communications in the form of freely accessible preprints not peer-reviewed (bioRxiv, …),
- participation in scientific networks (national, European, international levels);

- participation in the collective life of the unit (seminars, management, hygiene and safety, good practices, quality, platforms, ...);
- involvementin the ecological transition initiatives of their team/unit;
- involvement in data-sharing initiatives (structuring, depositing/sharing on dedicated platforms, ...);
- participation in the assessment of scientific activity (manuscripts, grant applications, committees, juries, ...);
- teaching activities and level of responsibility (Master's programs, doctoral school modules, ...);
- organization or coordination of events, programs, and training, including with patient associations or other groups;
- activities and mechanisms for disseminating and transferring knowledge and skills to patients and the general public, as well as efforts to promote their engagement in research;
- mediation and knowledge brokerage activities for decision-makers, healthcare system operators, and other field actors;
- science communication outputs (articles, interviews, publications, videos, science mediation tools, science–society debates, …).

Oral presentation

The committee should evaluate the quality of the oral presentation, considering:

- structured, rigorous and didactic character,
- ability to convince, dynamism,
- ability to be concise.

Discussion

The committee should evaluate the relevance of responses during the discussion, paying attention to:

- analytical skills, creativity, critical thinking, ability to listen and debate, and conciseness of responses,
- autonomy, team spirit, ability to lead a group/team, openness to share knowledge and collaborate,
- scientific and/or administrative culture,
- behavioral intelligence.

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

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