**Evaluation and recommended ranking of the applicants for the position as a researcher in ………………….  
at the Department of ………….., University of Bergen**

**Text in red is for guidance.**

*Please remember that the evaluation is based on the candidates’ applications and scientific accomplishments, and that it is* ***not*** *this committees’ responsibility to interview the candidates,* ***nor*** *to contact referees.*

**Short description of the position**

A ..-year position as a researcher in ………….. was announced with an application deadline ……………………….. The position is affiliated to the research project “……………………..…..”, funded by the ……………….. programme from the Research Council of Norway/other source(s)..

*Alternatively: The position is financed by the University of Bergen*

**The applicants**

At the application deadline *dd/mm/yyyy, xx* candidates had applied for the position.

1. *Name (applicant number)*
2. *Name (applicant number)*
3. *Name (applicant number)*

………

**The evaluation committee**

*Three members, both genders represented, one external member (from outside UiB). Please ascertain that all members are legally competent (impartial) to assess all applicants.*

On *dd/mm/yyyy*, the Head of Department appointed a committee to evaluate the applications consisting of the following members:

* ***First name Surname,*** *title*, Department of ………………, University of Bergen (chair)
* ***First name Surname****, title*, Department of ………………, University of Bergen
* ***First name Surname****, title*, name of external institution

**Qualifications and personal qualities**

The committee has evaluated the applicants in accordance with the criteria listed in the advertisement text:

(copy from the advertisement text)

All the applicants have been asked to include the following in their application:

*(copy from “Your application must include:” in the advertisement text)*

**Evaluation of the applicants**

The evaluation committee initially selected the candidates who seemed to fulfil the criteria listed in the advertisement text. These candidates were further evaluated with respect to how well they cover the area of expertise sought after and whether they have the specific skills required, based on the provided material. Furthermore, we have evaluated the candidates’ motivation for applying, their research interests and how well this position would fit into their career plans judged from the application letter.

Based on the given criteria the candidates were divided into three groups:

*NB! The description of the candidates’ qualifications, and/or lack of qualifications, must refer directly to the criteria listed in the advertisement text (and thus be easily recognizable for those who are not familiar with the subject area, for instance members of the hiring board who will be the ones giving the final approval of the case).*

1. **Candidates who failed to demonstrate** in their application that they fulfil one or more of the **requirements** for the position (relevant PhD, **required** competence (cf. advertisement text) (background that gives good understanding of the research topic), and/or did not provide all the material required for the assessment (see above). Therefore, the following candidates were not considered further (applicant number in brackets):  
   *First name Surname (applicant number), unfulfilled requirements..*

*First name Surname (applicant number), unfulfilled requirements..*

*Etc….*

1. **Formally competent candidates who also fulfill all *requirements* in the announcement,** but who fell short of the top candidates on one or more criteria (advantages), and are therefore not considered further:   
   *First name Surname (applicant number), fell short on following criteria…*

*First name Surname (applicant number), fell short on following criteria…*

*Etc……*

1. **The top candidates***First name Surname (applicant number), First name Surname (applicant number), etc……*

**A summary of the top candidates (in alphabetic order) is given below:**

***First name Surname*** (…. years old)

**Education:***He/She* has a Master in …………… from the University of ………….. in yyyy. *He/She* *completed / will complete* a doctorate within ….. at the University of …. in …. (*It is essential to verify that the PhD thesis has been submitted* *according to the wording in the advertisement text)*

**Professional experience:***He/She* has worked …. years at the Institute of ….. in …., and [*other work experience*]

**Scientific qualifications:***He/She* has .. relevant peer reviewed papers (*as first author/participated*), published in ……………. in *yyyy*.*He/She* has good knowledge and skills in …………….. (subject area and relevant methods).

**Overall assessment:**

*He/She* is (*highly* / *well)* formallyqualified for the postdoctoral position.

*Etc……………….*

**Conclusion and recommended ranking**

*Compare how the qualified candidates level up to each other. The discussion should be clear in leading to the assessment committee’s conclusion and final ranking of the top candidates.*

*Please remember that*

1. *at least three candidates should be ranked,* ***if*** *three candidates are found to be qualified*
2. *if fewer than three candidates has been ranked, the committee should consider if any of the candidates in group 2 (that is, the candidates who fulfill* ***all the required qualifications****) should be invited for an interview. If not, please provide an explanation.*
3. *candidates who are* ***not*** *qualified must not be ranked.*

Based on all credentials, references and interviews the committee recommends the following ranking:

1. *First name Surname*
2. *First name Surname*
3. *First name Surname*

*Date, month, year*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Signature | Signature | Signature |
| First name Surname Job title UiB | First name Surname Job title UiB | First name Surname Job title Organization |