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

***Text in red is for guidance.***

*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 *dd/mm/yyyy.*

**The applicants**

At the application deadline*, xx* candidates had applied for the position.

1. *Name (applicant number)*
2. *Name (applicant number)*
3. *Name (applicant number)*

………

**The assessment committee**

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

On *dd/mm/yyyy* 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.

**Qualifications and personal qualities**

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

(copy from the advertisement text)

All the applicants have been asked to include the following in their application:

*(copy from “Your application must include:” in the advertisement text)*

**Evaluation of the applicants**

The assessment committee initially selected the candidates who seemed to fulfil the criteria 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:

*NB! The description of the candidates’ qualifications, and/or lack of qualifications, must refer directly to the criteria listed in the advertisement text (and thus be easily recognizable for those who are not familiar with the subject area, for instance members of the hiring board who will be the ones giving the final approval of the case).*

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): Therefore, the following candidates 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?**

**Educational competence**

*See the following website for further information:* [*https://regler.app.uib.no/regler\_en/Part-3-Human-Resources-and-HSE/3.1-Human-Resources/3.1.2-Rules-for-appointment/Rules-for-assessing-educational-competence-at-UiB*](https://regler.app.uib.no/regler_en/Part-3-Human-Resources-and-HSE/3.1-Human-Resources/3.1.2-Rules-for-appointment/Rules-for-assessing-educational-competence-at-UiB)*.*

*NB! The educational competence should not affect the ranking of the candidates unless specific educational requirements have been included in the announcement.*

The applicant fulfills the requirements for educational competence, and has documented this in an educational portfolio including the following:

* The candidate has completed formal pedagogical training (relevant courses in combination with actual teaching experience could replace a university pedagogy program).
* Documented overview of practical experience and competence
* A brief reflection statement primarily describing the applicant’s own teaching philosophy and an evaluation of own teaching in relation to his/her knowledge of students’ learning at a higher education level.

*or*

The applicant does **not** fulfil the requirements regarding educational competence: ………..

*When applicants for associate professor posts are unable to document adequate educational competence upon appointment, the assessment committee shall describe what remains.*

***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 that*

1. *at least three candidates should be ranked, if three candidates are found to be qualified*
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 SurnameJob titleUiB | First name SurnameJob titleOrganization | First name SurnameJob titleOrganization |