***Annex No. 2 to the Regulations on the Conduct of Recruitment Processes for Scientific Positions at the institute of Immunology and Experimental Therapy, Polish Academy of Sciences***

**CANDIDATE ASSESSMENT FORM**

for the position

**SELECT SCIENTIFIC POSITION**

1. **Candidate Personal Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Candidate’s Title/Professional/  Academic Degree | Candidate’s First and Last Name |
| Select Title or Degree | **Enter name and surname** |

1. **Formal Evaluation of Candidate’s Submitted Documents**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Documents or qualifications specified in the recruitment process** (**in accordance with Annex No. 1 and § 4(3)(k, l, m) of the Regulations**) | **Fulfills formal recruitment criteria?** (YES/NO) |
| **Documents specified in § 4(3)(m) of the Regulations** | |
| Enter document type**[[1]](#endnote-2)** | **Select** |
| **Documents enabling the assessment of compliance with the minimum formal requirements specified in Annex No. 1 of the Regulations** | |
| Copy/certified copy of the master's, doctoral, habilitation degree diploma, or professorial nomination in the field/discipline specified in the recruitment process | **Select** |
| List of publications | **Select** |
| Enter document type**a** | **Select** |
| **Documents certifying compliance with additional formal and merit-based requirements in accordance with § 4(3)(k) of the Regulations** | |
| Enter document type**a** | **Select** |
| Documents certifying compliance with additional requirements in accordance with § 4(3)(l) of the Regulations | |
| Enter document type**a** | **Select** |

*Comments regarding the formal evaluation of documents (if necessary) and confirmation of whether the Candidate meets the formal requirements specified in the recruitment announcement*

1. **Formal evaluation of documents submitted by the candidate after request by the Committee (if applicable). Please indicate the document type and whether it meets the formal requirements after completion.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document specified in the recruitment process** | **Fulfills formal recruitment criteria?** (YES/NO) |
| Enter document type**a** | Select |

*Comments regarding the formal evaluation of submitted documents and confirmation of whether the candidate meets the formal requirements specified in the recruitment announcement after submitting additional documents.*

1. **Candidate Merit-Based Achievement Evaluation Based on Submitted Documents**

*Candidate evaluation is based on the scoring system presented below, on a scale of 0-5 points, with increments of 0.5 points through the range of points 3-5, as appropriate for the position outlined the recruitment process:*

* **0** – No achievements or achievements significantly below the expected requirements (**unsatisfactory**)
* **1** – Achievements below the expected requirements (**poor**)
* **3** – Achievements meeting the requirements (**good**)
* **4** – Achievements exceeding the requirements (**very good**)
* **5** – Achievements significantly exceeding the requirements (**excellent**)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Achievement required in the recruitment processb** | **Achievement grade**  **(0-5 points)** |
| **1. Candidate’s Scientific Achievements**  Evaluation is based on, among other factors, published works and a description of past achievements. The Committee assesses the significance of the achievements for the development of the scientific discipline, the scope and impact of publications, the candidate’s contribution and role in the published works, and the number of citations. | **Select** |
| 1. **Candidate’s Organizational Achievements in Securing Research Funding**   Evaluation is based on, among other factors, the scientific significance of grants obtained by the candidate, including their type, duration, and amount of funding received. Assessment also considers the scope of the grants (national or international), the candidate’s role in securing and managing the grant (project leader, assignment leader, or researcher), and the results achieved, such as publications, doctoral dissertations, or patents. | **Select** |
| 1. **Teaching Achievements and Leadership in Scientific Teams, Including Training of Young Researchers**   Evaluation is based on, among other factors, supervision of interns and trainees, mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students, supervision of doctoral dissertations, and mentoring of academic staff. It also considers experience in leading scientific teams or participating in such teams, including international research groups. | **Select** |
| 1. **Scientific Activity Conducted in More Than One Scientific or Research Institution**   Evaluation is based on, among other factors, the type of activity (such as training, internship, or research), the source of funding (provided by the host institution, the sending institution, or external sources), the duration of the activity, the institution involved (domestic or international, and its ranking), and the outcomes achieved, including the acquisition of unique and significant skills, knowledge, or results that would not have been attainable at the candidate’s home institution. | **Select** |
| 1. **Additional Experience and Professional Achievements Indicating the Candidate’s Scientific Potential**   Evaluation includes, among other factors, participation in scientific courses and internships (both domestic and international), training in soft skills and technical competencies, involvement in scientific societies and associations, participation in academic decision-making bodies (such as scientific councils and review panels), attendance at conferences (considering their scope, nature of participation, and invitations), receipt of awards and scholarships (international, national, local, or institutional), and contributions to the popularization of science. | **Select** |
| 1. **Additional Experience and Professional Achievements Indicating the Candidate’s Organizational Potential**   Evaluation includes, among other factors, participation in organizing conferences, securing infrastructure funding, managing administrative units, and leading or participating in committees and councils. | **Select** |
| 1. **Research Plan Evaluation**   Evaluation includes, among other factors, the innovativeness of the proposed research, the feasibility of its implementation at the Institute considering its current state and the candidate’s development plans, as well as the potential for establishing scientific collaborations (both national and international) to support the execution of the planned research. | **Select** |
| **Total Score (Maximum 35 points)** | **Enter points total** |

*Comments on the merit-based evaluation of the candidate (if necessary) and information on the decision made by the Committee in an open vote regarding the invitation of the candidate to an interview and/or to deliver a seminar in accordance with § 6(7) and (9) of the Regulationsd*

1. **Evaluation of Achievements and Candidate’s Suitability for the Scientific Position Based on the Interview and Delivered Seminar (if applicable)**

*Evaluation includes, amongst other factors, the candidate’s knowledge of the field/discipline, familiarity with the host unit’s research at the laboratory/department/institute level, experience in a similar position, and potential for scientific development.*  
0 – **Unsatisfactory**, 1 – **Low**, 2 – **Average**, 3 – **Good**, 4 – **Very Good**, 5 – **Excellent**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grade Category** | **Grade**  **(0-5 points)** |
| 1. Motivation to work in the role | **Select** |
| 1. Merit-based preparation for the role | **Select** |
| 1. Scientific development plans | **Select** |
| 1. Self-presentation, including clarity of expression, communication skills, and accuracy of speech in Polish**[[2]](#endnote-3)**and English | **Select** |
| 1. Candidate’s fit for working in the scientific team/organizational unit | **Select** |
| **Total score (Maximum 25 points)** | **Enter points total** |

*Committee Comments (if necessary)*

1. **Evaluation of Achievements and Candidate’s Suitability for the Scientific Position Based on the Delivered Seminar (if applicable)**

*Evaluation includes the candidate’s knowledge of the field/discipline, familiarity with the host unit’s research at the laboratory/department/institute level, experience in a similar position, and potential for scientific development.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grade Category** | **Grade/Recommendation**  **Positive/Negative** |
| 1. Delivery of a Seminar within the Institute’s Unit or at the Institute’s Forum | **Select** |
| 1. Delivery of a Seminar Before the Scientific Council of the Institute **[[3]](#endnote-4)** | **Select** |

*Committee Comments (if necessary)*

1. **Summary of the Candidate’s Evaluation**

Candidate’s Strengths

Candidate’s Weaknesses

1. **Committee’s Decision on Recommending the Candidate for Employment at the Institute in Accordance with § 6(15)[[4]](#endnote-5)**

**Signatures of Committee Members**

**1.**

**2.**

**3.**

**4.**

**5.**

1. Please duplicate as needed.

   **b**The requirements for candidates depend on their stage of scientific development. The recommended minimum formal requirements necessary for candidate evaluation are presented in Annex No. 1.

   **c**The maximum number of points may be lower for assistant and adjunct positions, depending on the candidate’s academic achievements.

   **d**The result of the open vote must be recorded in the recruitment process protocol in accordance with § 5(7) of the Regulations. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
2. **e**Individuals for whom Polish is not their native language are assessed only based on their response in English, unless otherwise specified in the recruitment announcement. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
3. **f**Evaluation based on the resolution of the Scientific Council of the Institute in accordance with § 6(12) of the Regulations; the voting protocol should be attached to the recommendation submitted to the Director of the Institute in accordance with § 7(3). [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
4. **g**It is required to prepare a protocol of the secret ballot and attach it to the recommendation submitted to the Director of the Institute in accordance with § 7(3) of the Regulations. [↑](#endnote-ref-5)