**Evaluation and recommended ranking of the applicants for the position as associate professor in ………………….  
at the Department of ………….., University of Bergen**

*Please remember that the evaluation is based on the candidates’ applications and scientific accomplishments, and that it is* ***not*** *this committees’ responsibility to interview the candidates or to contact referees.*

**Short description of the position**

A position as associate professor in ………….. was announced with an application deadline ………………………..

**The evaluation committee**

*Three members, both genders represented, two external member (from outside UiB). Please make certain that all members are legally competent to assess all applicants.*

At the application deadline date month year, xx candidates had applied for the position.

On date month year the Dean 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, name of external institution
* **First name Surname**, title, name of external institution

The impartiality of the committee members towards all applicants has been assessed.

**Required qualifications for the position: Selection criteria**

The committee has evaluated the applicants in accordance with the formal requirements listed in the advertisement text:

(cited from the advertisement - example)

1. The applicant must have a doctoral degree in the relevant field or equivalent qualifications.
2. Experience from......
3. Ability to obtain external research funding
4. Work independently and in a structured manner, and have the ability to cooperate with others.
5. Basic pedagogical training is a requirement for the position. The successful applicant will be offered training if this requirement is not met prior to employment.

All the applicants have been asked to include in their application

* CV
* Diplomas
* References
* Complete list of publications
* List with appendices that document your pedagogical qualifications
* List of academic work that the applicant believes should be taken into consideration in the assessment, including information about where this work was

***(ensure that these lists match the requirements in the advert)***

**Evaluation of the applicants**

The evaluation committee initially selected the candidates who seemed to fulfil the requirements 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, the candidates’ motivation for applying, their research interests and how well this position would fit into their career plans based on the application letter, have been evaluated. The assessment is most extensive for the best qualified applicants. The assessment and ranking take into account the time span over which the results have been achieved, and places most emphasis on recently achieved results.

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, background that gives good understanding of the research topic, [*other essential competence*] and/or did not provide all the material required for the assessment (see above): The following candidates therefore were not considered further (applicant number in brackets):

**First name Surname** (applicant number), *brief outline of qualifications, along with a description how they failed to meet the requirements for the position*

**First name Surname** (applicant number), etc……

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, and are therefore not considered further:

**First name Surname** (applicant number), *brief outline of qualifications, along with a description how they fell short of the top candidates for the position*

**First name Surname** (applicant number), *brief outline of qualifications, etc…*

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 and academic qualifications:*** He/She completed a doctorate within ….. at the University of …. in ….

***Professional experience:*** He/She has worked …. years as a …. at the Institute of ….. in …., and [other work experience]

***Research experience and publication record:*** He/She has .. relevant peer reviewed papers (as first author/participated), published in ……………. in yyyy.He/She has good knowledge of and skills in …………….. (subject area and relevant methods).

***Public outreach?***

***Teaching and supervision experience:***

***Overall assessment:***

He/She is [highly] [well] *formally* qualified for the position as associate professor.

Etc……………….

**Conclusion and recommended ranking**

*The conclusion should compare how the qualified candidates level up to each other, and describe the academic distance between the qualified candidates. The discussion should be clear in leading to the conclusion and final ranking of the top candidates. Please remember, 1) at least three candidates should be ranked, if three candidates are found to be qualified, and 2) candidates who are not qualified must not be ranked.*

Based on all credentials, the committee ranks xx candidates in the following order:

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

Date month year

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Signature | Signature | Signature |
| First name Surname Job title UiB | First name Surname Job title Organization | First name Surname Job title Organization |