**Evaluation and recommended ranking of the applicants for the position as postdoctoral fellow within ………………….  
at the Department of ………….., University of Bergen**

*Please remember that this is a two-part evaluation:*

* *The first part is based on the candidates’ applications and scientific accomplishments.*
* *The second part (red box) contains impressions from interviewing the top candidates, and information from references.*

*It is imperative that the two parts do not overlap, i.e. more specifically the first part must not contain information from interviews and references. This is due to the candidates’ rights to review the information from the evaluation report.*

*Please remember that it is the Head of Department’s responsibility to assess whether teaching duties should be added to the position (in the event that this has been advertised).*

**Short description of the position**

A ..-year position as postdoctoral fellow within ………….. 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:

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……………….*

**Recommended ranking based on the candidates’ formal qualifications**

*Compare how the qualified candidates level up to each other, and the discussion should be clear in leading to the conclusion and ranking of the top candidates based on formal qualifications.*

1. *First name Surname*
2. *First name Surname*
3. *First name Surname*
4. …

Based on the above, the candidates *First name Surname (applicant number), First name Surename (applicant number),* … and … were summoned to interviews. The interviews were conducted over Skype/at the department. *The Head of Department/The Research Group Leader/The Project Leader* was present at the interviews. The committee has also contacted referees.

**Interview notes** (motivation, presentation and communications skills / language and other skills / personal fitness)

**Note:** Interview notes, referee reports and the comparison are exempt from public disclosure and will not be sent to the candidates. In case of a formal complaint, the candidate complaining will be entitled to read the interview notes concerning him/her.

***First name Surname***

*……………………………*

***First name Surname***

*……………………………*

***First name Surname***

*……………………………*

**Referee reports** (the referees’ names must **not** be included in the report)

***First name Surname***

*The referees ……..*

***First name Surname***

*The referees ……..*

***First name Surname***

*The referees ……..*

**Comparison of the top candidates**

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

…………………………

**Conclusion and recommended ranking**

*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 |