**Discussion on scoring scheme**

Reviewers will score the applicants on three categories:

- Scientific contribution

- Community contribution

- Potential to contribute to VYA

Scores will be 0 to 10 with 0 to be the lowest, and 10 to be the highest.

**The challenge is different people may have different expectation for each score.**

Proposed scoring system to be discussed:

10 – an absolutely outstanding candidate,

           should become a member by any means

9 – a most excellent candidate, far above the average expectations; highly sought after as member

8 – an excellent candidate, above the average expectations

7 – a good candidate who fully matches the expectations, around the average standard across the academy

6 – a candidate who could be within the spectrum of members of the academy, but slightly below average

5 – a candidate just below what to be expected as minimum, may become eligible for in the near future

3 –4 a candidate far below the minimum expectations, and not yet suitable for academy but might be suitable in the future

1-2 – a candidate not suitable and very unlikely suitable in the future

0 – a candidate not at all suitable

Note: This draft proposition considers a minimum grade 6 for being elected, while grade 7 is the academy average, and grade 8 an excellent candidate standing out from the academy average.

**New membership application**
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1. **Eligibility**

*Criteria:*

☐ Have a real connection with Vietnam

☐ Have been awarded a PhD degree (or equivalent) after 2002 (less than 15 years at the time of application)

☐ Agree with the VYA constitution

☐ Submit one (or more) reference letter

**Instruction to reviewers**:

* Any individual who serves in the member selection committee is not eligible for writing a recommendation letter to the applicants.
* The applicants won’t go to the next round - the applicant fails the eligibility step - if **at least one criteria** is violated.
1. **Scoring system**

1. ☐ Score on scientific contribution (0-10)

2. ☐ Score on community contribution (0-10)

3. ☐ Score on potential to contribute to VYA (0-10)

**Instruction to reviewers**:

* Contribution could be translated to contribution per year for fair comparison
* Please consider the **career stage of the applicants** when you score them. For example, score of 8 from the person who received PhD for 5 years means the applicants are in the top 20% of people who got PhD in 2012, but the score will be much lower if the person has the same contribution yet had received PhD for 15 years.
* Please include your explanation for the scores you give at the end of this file.
* Selected applicants should have an average
	1. **Minimum score of 6** for each of score averaged from all reviewers (required, no exception is allowed)
	2. **Total of 20** or more for all three scores. Total score from all reviewers will be averaged to form final total score.
	3. Total scores among reviewers are not different from the final score by less than **20%**
* If the evaluation fails criterion c, it requires discussion for final decision, unless all evaluations of the various reviewers put it below the minimal requirements (score of 6 for each of the categories and score of 20 for the sum of the 3 categories).
* Recommend: Accept ☐ Reject ☐ To be discussed ☐
1. **Result announcement**
* The final decision will be made by selection committee based on reviewers’ scores and comments.
* We will not publish the name of the reviewers
* We will send the applicants our comments on what they score low for improvement.
* We will encourage potential candidates to come back the following year.

**Explanation for each of the three scores (II.1, II.2, II.3**): (to be filled out by reviewers)

**Please note that reviewers will send evaluation directly to the chair of selection committee and the scores are not revealed until the OC meets for discussion.**