



General principles for the periodic evaluation and recruitment of researchers

*These principles were drafted and proposed by the members of the CoNRS during the 2016-2021 mandate then completed and approved by the members of the 2021-2026 mandate in **June 2022**.*

General remarks

The profession of researcher involves multiple activities. The quality of an individual researcher's commitment can take different forms. In their evaluation work, the members of the section are particularly attached to the prime importance of scientific contributions. However, they also take into account the involvement and integration of researchers in their professional environment. For all these aspects, the evaluation is based on the nature, extent, quality and impact of these activities, assessed in their scientific, material and human context, as well as in the professional opportunities/scientific outreach they offer to the researcher being assessed. An evaluation never examines solely quantitative indicators. Researchers are invited, if they so wish, to mention events that have had an impact on their professional career. The section is sensitive to the notions of ethics and integrity.

Recommendations for the preparation of the evaluation files

There are several ways of achieving quality work in terms of both scientific contributions and tasks of collective interest thus, researchers are advised to highlight in their application the main lines and important developments of their activity on both aspects, and relate these to their career path. The general and specific criteria detailed below are not presented in order of importance. For some criteria, the committee provides some examples for information purposes only, examples which should be not considered as exhaustive.

The aim is not to succeed in all of these criteria, as the entire career path will be considered fully in its context and dynamics. A **clear and synthetic** presentation of the application file will require a judicious selection of the most salient points. A description of the researcher's completed, ongoing or planned activities, as well as an assessment of the quality of completed activities are expected. These should include factual data, self-evaluation data and information on the scientific, material and human contexts within which these activities occurred. Researchers are invited, if they so wish, to mention events that have had an impact on their professional career



1. Evaluation of researchers

The general criteria set out below will be used to periodically evaluate researchers' contributions during the two evaluation periods: **at 30 months** (*mid-term, a report no longer than 15 pages*); and at **60 months** (*full term, a report no longer than 30 pages*). For the mid-term evaluation, it is not required to present a scientific project. The report the researcher provides to the committee is also the opportunity to explain any difficulties encountered (e.g., reduced scientific output following a risk being taken, etc.). The evaluators consider the quality and impact of the results obtained by the researcher and take systematically into account the stage of his/her career, the whole career path and the available contextual elements. This facilitates an appropriate evaluation of achievements in the light of the researcher's capacity to take part in certain types of activities, the coherence of his/her activities or the outreach of the results obtained during the period under consideration.

General criteria for periodic evaluations

- Quality of the scientific **activity** and (for the full-term evaluation) of the scientific **project** ¹
- Quality of scientific **outputs** (e.g., in alphabetical order: archives, articles in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters, conference proceedings, corpora, databases, monographs, resources, software, etc.) with a description of the researcher's role ²
- Quality of the **dissemination** activities delivered within the scientific community (making data or software available, taking part in top academic events, international conferences, congresses or seminars, etc.) ³
- **Technology transfer** and contracts, links with socio-economic actors ⁴
- Quality of the **collaborative network** (internal, local, national, international) ⁵
- Quality of **management and supervision** (students, non-permanent staff, teams, permanent staff, etc.) ⁶
- **Teaching, training, knowledge transfer, dissemination** of ethical practices, of scientific culture and other mediation actions aimed at civil society or the general public: the nature, impact and volume of those activities, etc.

¹ Coherence, originality and risk-taking (relevance as regards the state of the art in the researcher's given field, local, national and/or international position, etc.), progress and evolution of the project, capacity for self-training, thematic mobility and/or interdisciplinary openness, etc.

² Impact of the most significant contributions in relation to the state of the art in the given field, efforts made as regards open science, etc.

³ Type of dissemination (open archives, databases, etc.), type of conference presentations (spoken presentations, posters), a researcher's capacity to involve members of his/her scientific environment, importance of a scientific conference in the field of competence of the researcher for the most significant presentations, etc.

⁴ Projects submitted, ability to find funding, role and position in partnerships, description of post-research technology transfer activities if any, etc.

⁵ Relevance of collaborative initiatives as regards the project, management of collaborative initiatives over time (formalisation of a collaboration/network, student/young researcher co-supervision, work and practice exchange), quality and outreach of the results of the collaboration, etc.

⁶ Description of the researcher's duties and responsibilities, how they are carried out, efforts to promote the progress of people supervised and guarantee respect for individuals and scientific integrity, efforts made to improve his/her own practices (methods of recruitment, supervision, monitoring, etc.), information about their contribution in the future career progress of non-permanent and permanent staff, etc.



- Investment in **tasks of collective interest** ⁷ including taking part in the activities of his/her scientific community (in the broad sense - the internal community of the host structure, the local, national and international community, professional networks, working groups, committees, scientific societies, research (infra)structures, etc.)

Specific criteria by rank

CRCN Rank

See the general criteria listed above.

CRHC Rank

The following criteria are additional to the general criteria listed above:

- Regular activity in recent years with particular features of excellence that may differ from those for the DR2 rank
- Recognised **expertise** in a relevant scientific field belonging to section 34 ⁸
- Engagement in the working life of the host structure and in **scientific or technical knowledge sharing** (within the laboratory, the research community, etc.) linked to that expertise, and ability to make such knowledge evolve if necessary: description of actions and the way in which knowledge is shared, changes/progress achieved, etc.

DR2 Rank

DRs (research professors) are expected to be actively **involved in** their professional environment, and the outreach of their scientific contributions is essential. The following criteria are additional to the general criteria listed above:

- Recognised **expertise** in a relevant scientific field covered by section 34 ⁸
- National or international **outreach** ⁹

⁷ Description of the activities (taking part in expert panels, scientific responsibilities, research management, participation in steering committees, etc.) and the way these are carried out, the volume and level of complexity of the most important activities, the ability to provide training, the impact of these activities, etc.

⁸ *Phonetics, phonology, morphology, lexicology, lexicography, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, discourse, texts and dialogue, philosophy of language, evolution of languages, typology, language diversity, historical and comparative linguistics, sociolinguistics, language contact, dialectology, psycho- and neuro-linguistics, language acquisition, natural language processing, computational linguistics, corpus linguistics, history of linguistic theories.*

⁹ Impact of the most significant contributions, distinctions or invitations obtained or honoured personally or by collaborators or supervised people (conferences, articles, book chapters, seminars, etc.), organisation of top scientific events in the field, editorial activity (books, top-ranked scientific journals in the field), etc.



- Ability to **initiate and lead projects** ¹⁰
- Enhanced quality and sustainability of research training and **supervision** of students, Ph.D. candidates, postdoctoral fellows and young researchers
- Engagement in **sharing** and **transmitting** (within the laboratory, the scientific community, etc.) **scientific or technical knowledge** linked to the researcher's expertise, and ability to make such knowledge evolve if necessary ¹¹
- Quality of **leadership** and execution of general interest duties (team leadership, administrative responsibilities, active participation in evaluation or research steering committees, management functions, leadership of collective projects, etc.) ¹²

DR1 Rank

The following criteria are additional to the general and specific DR2 criteria:

- Ability to develop a **forward-looking, and have a creative and innovative vision of his/her field**
- Ability to foster **quality interactions with his/her colleagues**, and to define and implement a **useful strategy** for his/her working environment ¹³

DRCE Rank

The following criteria are additional to the general and specific DR1 and DR2 criteria:

- Breakthroughs, major contributions, exceptional **influence and outcomes** in a scientific field ¹⁴
- Exceptional **contribution recognised by the peers** beyond disciplinary boundaries ¹⁵
- Leading role in **initiating and structuring research** ¹⁶

¹⁰ Funded projects, collaborative networks (sustainability, impact of results, etc.), industrial contracts, etc.

¹¹ Description of activities and the way knowledge is shared, further developments, etc.

¹² Description of his or her role in leading positions, scope and impact of a duty or leadership activity, level of responsibility, promotion of collective work, ability to help supervised persons progress, etc.

¹³ Description of the researcher's role in the working environment/research structure (lab, team etc.), scope and impact of their activities and interactions with colleagues, capacity to link their activity to the needs of the research structure, to find and use the available resources and tools, to achieve good governance (i.e., capacity to manage interdependencies in a way that is useful for the structure: the proper functioning of internal bodies, the capacity to provide means of (self-)evaluation) or make these work adequately, etc.

¹⁴ Ability to create a school of thought, a breakthrough scientific vision and path, etc.

¹⁵ Prestigious prizes, long-term invitations or plenary presentations in the discipline's major conferences obtained or honoured in a personal capacity, by collaborators or supervised persons, etc

¹⁶ Description of the researcher's roles and impact (in national and international policy-making bodies, stakeholders, councils, steering committees, committees in charge of drafting research calls, in structuring the activities of scientific societies, etc.).



2. Promotion of researchers

The selected criteria will be used to evaluate a candidate's contribution and progress since his/her **last promotion**. The dynamics of the career path will also be taken into account in the evaluation. As mentioned above, not all of these criteria have to be met. The general and specific criteria by rank (promotion to CRHC, DR1 and DRCE) are those provided above in the section about periodic evaluations.

3. Application for obtaining (or the renewal of) an emeritus status

The following criteria are used:

- Quality of the scientific **activity**
- Integration of the project in the **collective strategy** of the laboratory and the host team
- Personal involvement of the researcher to **enable the laboratory and the host team to benefit** from his/her network, new collaboration initiatives, knowledge and skills.

4. Recruitment of researchers

The committee evaluates both the overall scientific contributions of the researcher before the recruitment process and the quality of the proposed project. As mentioned above, not all of the criteria have to be met. The assessment takes into account the entire career and scientific activity of the researcher and considers them fully in their context and dynamics. The criteria for the periodic evaluation of researchers (see above) are the basis for the examination of the applications.

Specific criteria by rank

Recruitment of candidates to the CRCN rank

The essential point is the evaluation of the candidate's capacity to become a CNRS researcher. This evaluation takes into account the entire scientific career path of the researcher (in relation to the length of their professional activity), the quality of their research project, and their ability to meet the general **evaluation criteria** for researchers. In addition, the committee takes into account:

- The thematic and geographical diversity of the candidate's **education, training** and research experience,
- The quality of the short- and medium-term **research project** in the context of the research orientations of the proposed host team,
- The quality of the **presentation** and **answers** to the jury's questions during the audition
- The capacity of the candidate to **work autonomously and as part of a team**.



Recruitment of candidates to the DR2 rank

The essential point is to identify the originality and the impact of the researcher on his/her field and scientific environment. This assessment is made in relation to the context (scientific, material, human) and the opportunities available to him or her. The committee takes into account, their ability to meet the **assessment criteria specific to the DR2** rank as well as:

- Their ability to supervise scientific research ¹⁷
- The quality of the proposed research **project** ¹⁸
- The quality of the **presentation** and answers to the **jury's questions** (if audition)
- The development of an original **scientific path** ¹⁹

¹⁷ Through an HDR accreditation (habilitation to supervise research), or equivalent.

¹⁸ Ability to explain the relevance of the selected challenges (scientific, societal, etc.), the articulation with their research project, etc.

¹⁹ Strategic vision of their disciplinary field and originality in the national/international context, etc.