

Proposal for Criteria by section 09 of the CoNRS

General remarks on the profession of researcher and its evaluation

The profession of researcher involves many different activities. The quality of a researcher's investment in his/her work can take different forms. When carrying out an evaluation, the members of the section are particularly attached to the primacy of scientific contributions while bearing in mind the involvement and integration of researchers in all the different facets of their professional activities.

In 2018, the CNRS signed the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) which puts the emphasis on qualitative assessment and avoiding quantitative bibliometric indicators which, although objective, are meaningless and often misleading. Thus, the evaluation will not be based on a simple examination of quantitative indicators and instead on the nature, scope, quality and impact of the implementation of a researcher's activities, assessed in their scientific, material and human contexts.

In accordance with the recommendations of the CNRS's Ethics Committee, the section will pay close attention to the accuracy and consistency of the information provided both in the application and orally.

It is important to bear in mind that **the following common and specific criteria are presented in a non-exhaustive manner and in no particular order of importance** solely to help candidates draft their application files. Candidates are not expected to meet all these criteria as **the whole of the career path will be considered in terms of its context and dynamics**.

Recommendations for writing applications

There are many ways of achieving quality work in terms of scientific contributions, training, the dissemination of knowledge, tasks of collective interest, etc. Therefore it is advisable for researchers to highlight the main lines and key developments of their activity for all aspects, to relate these to their career path and thus shed light on the strong points and highlights of their work in the contexts of these aspects.

A **clear and synthetic** presentation for the evaluation file will require the judicious selection of the salient points. A description of your **completed or planned activities** and 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**. Researchers are invited, if they so wish, to mention events that have had an impact on their professional career.

Common evaluation criteria for the CR and DR grades

- Quality of the **activity** and (for the full-term evaluation) of the scientific project.
- Quality of scientific **output** with an explanation of your role.
- Impact of the **most significant** contributions / state of the art.
- Quality of **dissemination** activities within the community.
- Quality of **training** activities.
- **Technology transfer** towards society.
- Investment in **tasks of collective interest**.

Specific criteria for the DR grade

Involvement in the professional environment is expected.

- Recognised **expertise** in a field.
- Personal or collective **influence** (national or international)
- Autonomy in **designing and carrying out projects**.
- Quality in the **exercise of leadership and in the exercise of general interest responsibilities**.
- Ability to develop a **forward-looking, creative and innovative vision of his/her field**.

Periodic evaluation of researchers

Important technical points:

- File format (provided) to be respected.
- Report limited to 15 pages (mid-term) and 30 pages (full-term).
- Emphasise changes as compared to the previous report.
- An opportunity to explain any difficulties encountered.

Promotion of researchers

- The above criteria used to assess contributions since tenure or the last promotion.
- The thematic or geographical quality and diversity of the candidate's education, training and research experience
- Quality and originality of the research project in the short, medium and long term, in line with the themes of the section. Scientific vision, capacity to develop scientific independence.
- Potential or proven ability to meet some of the common evaluation criteria for all researchers.
- Quality of the presentation and answers to the jury's questions.

Promotion to DR2 grade

The essential point is to identify the **originality and the impact of the researcher on his/her field and environment**.

- Development of an original scientific path.
- The quality of the proposed research project.
- Ability to meet the assessment criteria specific to the DR2 grade.
- Quality of the presentation and answers to the jury's questions if there is a jury session.