



Proposal number: _____

Date and time: _____

Evaluator's name: _____

Criteria to be scored in Anubis after the interview	Example questions	Notes
Interview 2, Project and career: Score the match between candidate's career goals, and suggested project with host group.	In what ways does this project align with your long-term career goals? How and what will you contribute to the hosting group as you pursue your project, e.g., specific skills, intellectual input, methodologies? What skills or competencies are you most interested in developing at this stage of your career? What are you looking for in a team or research environment?	
Interview 2, Project and career: Score the applicant's justification to take part in the program at the host institution.	How do you see SciLifeLab, your suggested hosting department and university supporting your development and career goals? What factors influenced your decision to apply specifically to SciLifeLab PULSE and the hosting institution rather than other programs/hosts? How did you identify your host laboratory? How would you rate your own and your project's fit with SciLifeLab PULSE and the hosting institution on a scale of 1–10? Please explain.	
Interview 2, Project and career: Score the applicant's understanding of proposed infrastructure.	Are there any anticipated technical difficulties that will need to be solved? Please explain and provide how you plan to approach solving them. Which SciLifeLab or other research infrastructures will you use for your project? How will these infrastructures contribute to the project? Do you foresee any gaps in competence or capacity of the infrastructure in supporting your project and, if so, how will you handle this situation?	

Interview 2, Project and career: Score the applicant's motivation for secondments and Associated Partners.	What is your understanding of the role and purpose of secondments in SciLifeLab PULSE? How do you expect the secondment to influence your career perspective? How do you anticipate using and applying what you learn during the secondment in your project? How do you see collaboration with the proposed secondment host benefiting your project? What influenced you in your choice of suggested secondment host?	
Interview 2, Transferable skills: Score the applicant's motivation for transferable skills' improvement.	What do "transferable skills" mean to you? Which transferable skills do you consider most important for your career, and why? Can you give an example of a situation where a transferable skill was critical to your success or where a lack of it was a challenge? How committed are you to engaging in PULSE training activities focused on transferable skills? What challenges do you anticipate in developing these skills, and how would you address them?	
Interview 2, Transferable skills: Score the applicant's declared skills in "Leadership and problem-solving capacity"	Can you give an example of how you motivated others to achieve a goal? What aspects of your leadership would you like to improve? How do you handle disagreements within a team when solving a problem? Can you describe a time when you led others through a challenging situation?	

Scoring

Each criterion should be scored 0-5, according to descriptions in the table below. Evaluators should provide brief feedback comment, describing the scoring. The summary score and feedback comment will be communicated to the applicants after each selection step.

0	Insufficient. The proposal cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
1	Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
2	Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
3	Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
4	Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
5	Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion; shortcomings, if any, are minor.





the European Union

European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.