

General comments on the tasks of researchers and his/her evaluation

The researcher job typically involves a wide range of activities, which can all be assessed by the CoNRS committee. The members of the CoNRS sections monitor the quality of scientific contributions as well as the researcher commitments to their professional environment.

The evaluation will be based on the nature, extent, quality and impact of these activities, bearing in mind the local surroundings (scientific, material, human). The evaluation process will not be reduced to a mere examination of quantitative indicators. The quality and impact of results will be looked at, taking into account the stage of his or her career and trajectory, the contextual elements available and any elements that the researcher wishes to present to shed light on this context and his/her capacity to participate in some types of activities.

Recommendations for writing reports and applications

There are many ways of producing quality work (both for scientific contributions and for duties of general interest to the community) and it is recommended to focus on the key points and highlights of your activity in a concise, yet precise, manner.

The general criteria given below are not presented in order of importance. For some criteria, examples of elements that could be looked for in the report are suggested in the footnotes for information only and are not exhaustive.

The aim is not to fulfill all of these criteria; the researcher activity will be considered in its entirety, context and dynamics. A clear and concise report/application should highlight the strengths and significant developments. The description of the actions (past or planned) and the assessment of the quality of the implementation of the actions carried out, including factual data, self-evaluation as well as information on the context (scientific, material, human), in particular elements that the person concerned wishes to bring to the attention of the evaluators.

Evaluation of researchers

Common criteria

- Quality of the **activity** and (for standard evaluation) of the scientific **project**.¹
- Quality of **scientific output** (publications in peer-reviewed journals, patents, book chapters, monographs, calculation codes), explaining for each the role of the researcher.²
- Quality of **dissemination** activities within the scientific community (availability of data or software, participation in recognized conferences, congresses or seminars).³
- **Valorization** and collaborations, links with socio-economic partners.⁴
- Quality of **collaborations** (local, national, international).⁵
- Quality of **management** (students, non-permanent staff, project teams, permanent staff).⁶
- **Teaching, training, knowledge transfer, dissemination** of ethical practices, scientific culture and other **outreach** to the civil society or to the general public.⁷
- Investment in **tasks of collective interest**⁸ including participation in the activities of his/her scientific community.⁹

CRCN grade

Common criteria listed above.

CRHC grade

In addition to the common criteria listed above, the following criteria apply:

- Recognized **expertise** in a field.¹⁰
- Investment in the **transmission** (for the laboratory, for the community) **of scientific or technical knowledge** derived from an expertise and the ability to develop it if necessary.¹¹

DR2 grade

For Director of Research, involvement in the professional environment is expected, with the primacy of scientific contributions.

In addition to the common criteria listed above, the following criteria must be met:

- Recognized **expertise** in a field¹⁰
- **Prominence** (national or international), personal or collective.¹²
- Ability to **design and lead projects**.¹³
- Investment in the **transmission** (for the laboratory, the community, etc.) **of scientific or technical knowledge** derived from expertise, and the ability to pass it if necessary.¹¹
- Quality of **leadership and general interest responsibilities** (team leadership, administrative responsibilities, active participation in committees or research management, management functions, leading collective projects).¹⁴

DR1 grade

In addition to the common criteria and the criteria specific to the grade of DR2 listed above, the following criteria must be met:

- Ability to develop a **forward-looking, creative and innovative vision** of the research field.
- Ability to foster **high-quality interaction with the environment** and to define and implement a strategy useful to the working-environment.¹⁵

DRCE grade

In addition to the common criteria and the specific criteria for the DR2 and DR1 grades listed above, the following criteria must be met:

- Breakthrough, major contribution, exceptional **stature** in a scientific field.¹⁶
- Exceptional personal or collective **recognition**.¹⁷
- Leading role in the **structuring of research**.¹⁸

Periodic evaluation of researchers

The above common criteria will be used to evaluate the contributions produced during the evaluation period, at 30 months ("mid-wave") and at 60 months ("wave"). For the mid-wave evaluation, the

presentation of the scientific project is not required. The report may also provide an opportunity to explain any difficulties encountered (e.g., a drop in scientific output as a result of taking a risk).

Grade advancement for researchers

The criteria adopted will be used to assess contributions since the last promotion. The dynamics of the career path will also be taken into account in the evaluation. As explained above, it is not necessary to meet all of these criteria.

The common criteria and the specific criteria for each grade (promotion to CRHC, DR1 and DRCE) are those given in the periodic assessment section.

Recruitment of researchers

General comments on recruitment

The criteria below will be used to assess all the scientific contributions made prior to the recruitment competition and the quality of the proposed project. As explained above, it is not necessary to meet all of these criteria.

Specific criteria according to grade

Access to the CRCN grade

The essential point concerns the assessment of the candidate potential to become excellent researchers at CNRS. This assessment will take into account the candidate scientific career, in proportion to its length, and the quality of the project.

- Quality and diversity (thematic, geographical) of **training and research experience**.
- Quality of the short- and medium-term **research project**, in line with the aims of the proposed host team and consistent with the training program.
- Quality of the **presentation** and **answers** to the panel questions.
- **Potential or proven ability** to meet some of the evaluation criteria common to researchers.

Access to the DR2 grade

The essential point of the assessment is to identify the originality and impact of the scientist on his or her field and environment. This assessment will be made in relation to the context (scientific, material, human) and the opportunities available to the researcher. As explained above, it is not a question of satisfying all of these criteria, but rather of considering the activity as a whole, in its context and overall dynamic.

- **Potential or proven ability** to meet a substantial part of the evaluation criteria specific to DR2.¹⁹
- Quality of the proposed research **project**.²⁰
- If auditioned, quality of **presentation** and **answers** to the panel questions.
- Development of an original **scientific career path**.²¹

Access to the DR1 grade

- **Potential or proven ability** to meet a large proportion of the assessment criteria for DR1.

Application for or renewal of emeritus status

The following criteria will be used:

- Quality of scientific **activity**.
- Integration of the project and scientific activity into the **collective strategy** of the laboratory and host team.
- Investment in enabling the laboratory and host team **to benefit from his/her network**, new collaborations, and the transfer of knowledge and skills.

¹ Consistency, originality and risk-taking (relevance to the state of the art, local, national and/or international positioning), progress and development of the project, with the capacity for training where appropriate, thematic mobility and/or interdisciplinary approach.

² Impact of the most significant contributions in relation to the state of the art, efforts made in the open science approach.

³ Type of availability (open archives, databases, etc.), type of contributions (oral communications, posters), ability to encourage the involvement of members of his scientific entourage, importance of the conference in his/her field for the most significant presentations.

⁴ Drafting of projects, ability to find fundings, role and position in partnerships, description of post-research promotion activities if any.

⁵ Relevance of collaborations to the project, management of the collaboration over time (formalization, co-supervision, joint visits), quality of the results of the collaborations.

⁶ Description of his/her functions and the way in which they are carried out, efforts made to promote the respect for individuals and scientific integrity, efforts to improve practices (recruitment methods, supervision, monitoring) future of non-permanent and permanent staff.

⁷ Nature, impact and volume of activities.

⁸ Description of activities (simple participation, expertise, facilitation, management, steering, etc.) and the way in which they are carried out, volume and level of complexity of the most important activities, ability to train for these activities, impact of their actions.

⁹ In the broadest sense, i.e. the host organization's internal community, the local, national and international community, professional networks, working groups, committees, learned societies, large (infra)structures.

¹⁰ Specialist in the development of specific compounds, materials or systems, specialist in advanced characterization, elaborated simulations or the interpretation of complex data.

¹¹ Description of activities and the way in which knowledge is passed on, and the developments that have taken place.

¹² Impact of the most significant contributions, distinctions or invitations obtained or honored on a personal basis or by collaborators or by supervised persons (conferences, articles, book chapters, seminars, etc.), organization of recognized scientific events in his/her field, editorial activity (books, recognized journals in the field).

¹³ Funded projects, establishment of collaborative networks (sustainability, impact of results, etc.), industrial contracts.

¹⁴ Description of his/her role in the context, scope and impact of his/her action, level of responsibility, promotion of collective work, ability to promote the progress of supervised people.

¹⁵ Description of his/her role in the context, scope and impact of its action, ability to link his/her activity to the needs of the structure and to mobilize the instruments available, achievement of good governance (i.e. ability to manage interdependencies in a way that is useful for the structure as a whole: proper functioning of internal bodies, ability to set up or operate (self-) assessment systems

¹⁶ Ability to create a school of thought, vision and ground-breaking scientific trajectory.

¹⁷ Prestigious prizes, long-term invitations or plenary lectures at major conferences in the discipline, won or honored in a personal capacity by collaborators or supervised staff.

¹⁸ Description of role (on national and international steering bodies, councils, steering committees, committees in charge of drafting calls for tenders, structuring participation in the activities of learned societies, etc.), impact.

¹⁹ HDR (Habilitation or equivalent, non-restrictive).

²⁰ Ability to explain the importance of the chosen challenges (scientific, societal, etc.) and how they relate to the project.

²¹ Strategic vision for his/her field and originality in the national and international context.