

**Internal regulations:
EDSP2 Doctoral Contract Award Jury**

(adopted in the EDSP2 Council on 22/01/2026)

- 1- Competition Calendar
- 2- Major fields and doctoral specializations
- 3- The jury
- 4- The observant doctoral student
- 5- Role of representatives from major sectors and subject matter experts
- 6- Pre-selection meeting for candidates in preparation for the auditions
- 7- Auditions
- 8- Jury deliberations

1- Competition Calendar

The dates for the two days of hearings, as well as the competition schedule, are approved at the EDSP2 Council meeting in December. This information is then communicated to the laboratory directors (for internal distribution), to the heads of the major research areas within EDSP2, and posted on the doctoral program website.

The calendar is established annually as follows:

May: Validation of the composition of the competition jury and the doctoral student-observer by the EDSP2 Council

Submitting applications to the heads of the 3 main areas of the Doctoral School

Mid-June: Deadline for submitting application files in Adum

Last week of June: Pre-selection meeting for candidates in preparation for the auditions
Update on the organization of the competition

The following day, of the competition. an email was sent to the candidates: end or continuation
Email to jury members: files of candidates to be auditioned

Auditions will be held in the first two ^{weeks} of July, over two consecutive days.
Candidate interviews
Jury deliberations

Communication of results (email to candidates, posting on the website)

2 - Major fields and doctoral specializations

A manager for each major area is appointed by the management of EDSP2 for the duration of the five-year contract.

The 3 main areas as well as the specializations (and options) of EDSP2 are presented below:

Field of study: "Social Sciences"

Ethnology, specializing in social and cultural anthropology

Sociology

Political Science

Political Science Option: Political Economy

Field of study: "Humanities"

Language, Languages, Cultures, Society,
Psychology
Educational sciences and training;
Sciences and techniques of physical and sporting activities
Cognitive Sciences and Ergonomics - Ergonomics Option
Cognitive Science and Ergonomics - Cognitive Science Option

Field of study: "Public Health - Pharmacology"

Pharmacology Option: Pharmacoepidemiology, Pharmacovigilance
Public Health Option Biostatistics
Public Health Option Epidemiology
Public Health Option Computer Science and Health
Public Health Option: Intervention and Health Economics

3 - The jury

Composition

The jury is composed of teacher-researchers and researchers elected to the EDSP2 Council and the EDSP2 management (the director and the two deputy directors).

The jury is thus composed of 5 members from each major area of EDSP2 (15 voters), and the director of EDSP2 designated as President of the jury (non-voting).

If an elected member is unavailable on the dates of the hearings, the laboratory director to whom the elected member is attached shall propose to the EDSP2 management a tenured professor or researcher from their laboratory, in the same discipline as the elected member, and holding a HDR (Habilitation à Diriger des Recherches) or authorization to register for an HDR, or an ADT (Advanced Doctoral Diploma). Substitute members must not propose candidates in the year they participate in the jury.

The composition of the jury is ratified during the ED Council meeting in May.

Functioning

The jury members are required to be present on both days of the hearing.

They also participate in the pre-selection meeting for applications with the heads of the three main areas of EDSP2.

Following the pre-selection meeting for candidates for the auditions, the jury receives the following information by email:

- The program for the hearing days
- The audition schedule
- Candidate files

- Summary table of applications
- The candidate evaluation grid
- The personal declaration form relating to links and conflicts of interest (to be returned to EDSP2 before the hearings).

Evaluation grid:

- The jury uses a common evaluation grid comprising the following sections: Prior record; Written project; Oral presentation
- The jury members complete the first 2 sections before the auditions.
- The third section is completed during the hearings. EDSP2 does not collect the ratings. For each member, the ratings serve as the basis for voting and discussions/deliberations.

Members are bound by confidentiality regarding the jury's deliberations. The documents/templates are attached to this document.

4 - The Doctoral Student Observer

Designation

Each year, the representatives of doctoral students elected to the EDSP2 Council organize themselves so that one of them puts himself forward as an observer doctoral student.

This proposal is endorsed by the EDSP2 Council.

He is not a member of the jury but his name and his status as an observer are added to the list of jury members.

Role

He observes the progress of the EDSP2 competition in its candidate hearing and jury deliberation phases.

He does not intervene during the hearings and deliberations of the jury and has neither an advisory nor a deliberative vote.

Like the jury members, he is bound by the confidentiality of the jury's deliberations.

He reports his observations in the EDSP2 Council meeting, held in December following the competition, an item is dedicated to discussing the jury's procedures (relevance of the methods used, fairness of the candidates, etc.). If necessary, adjustments/modifications are proposed and approved at this meeting. The observing doctoral student participates in this discussion.

5 - Role of representatives of major sectors and subject matter experts

The heads of the major fields set up their own schedule (in line with the competition schedule), to organize with the PhD specialty referees, the collection of application intentions.

The managers of the major estates therefore have the following mission:

- To collect and synthesize applications from across the entire field it represents;
- To interact with the subject matter experts to organize this feedback;
- To ensure the fairness of the procedures implemented by all specialties in their field;
- To present a summary of it at the pre-selection meeting.

Before the pre-selection meeting, the heads of the major fields communicate their list of candidates to EDSP2 (edsp2@u-bordeaux.fr) for verification of applications in Adum .

The head of the Public Health department also organizes the pre-selection of candidates for the EHESP Doctoral Network in Public Health competition.

The specialist advisors have the following mission:

- To organise (with all colleagues in the relevant specialty) the selection of applications;
- To communicate to the head of the major domain the results of the pre-selection process, as well as all the procedures implemented to collect and validate (or even classify) the selected applications.

The heads of major areas and the subject matter experts are listed below:

"Social Sciences" Department: Head Antoine Roger

Ethnology, specializing in social and cultural anthropology: Contact person Isabelle Gobatto

Sociology: Contact person Pascal Ragouet

Political Science: Contact Person Antoine Roger

Humanities Department: Head: Bruno Quintard

Language, Languages, Cultures, Society: Contact person Martine Derivry;

Psychology: Contact person Stéphanie Mathey

Educational Sciences and Training: Contact Person Luc Robène;

Sciences and Techniques of Physical and Sports Activities: Contact Person Fabien Sabatier;

Cognitive Sciences: Contact Person Bernard N'Kaoua

Public Health - Pharmacology Department: Head: Cecilia Samieri

Public Health: Contact Person H el ene Jacqmin -Gadda

Pharmacology: Contact person Antoine Pariente

6 - Pre-selection meeting for candidates in preparation for the auditions

During the candidate pre-selection meeting, each head of a major area presents their summary of applications. A maximum of 30 candidates (10 per area) are selected for the interviews.

The meeting also aims to reiterate the jury's operating procedures.

The head of the Public Health-Pharmacology Grand Domain also presents his summary of applications and the names of the candidates shortlisted for the RDSP competition (depending on the year and the RDSP guidelines, from 1 to 3 candidates per doctoral school).

7- Auditions

A file (paper format) is given to each member of the jury. It includes:

- The program for the hearing days
- The audition schedule
- Summary table of applications (completed data/M2 grades)

The jury members bring their laptops, in particular to carry out the online vote during the deliberation.

The day begins with a reminder of the rules by the president. He also reviews the personal declarations regarding links and conflicts of interest submitted by the jury members.

Audition format

Candidates open their PPT present on the EDSP2 laptop and sign the attendance sheet.

Candidate presentation: 10 minutes

Questions and answers between candidate and jury: 10 minutes. The jury members' questions are concise and neutral (no element of judgment). The tone is supportive.

After each hearing (in the candidate's absence), the jury president asks the same two questions to the jury members in the relevant fields (maximum 8 minutes). Question 1: relevance of the presentation; Question 2: relevance of the candidate's answers.

Members with a link or conflict of interest are not allowed to speak.

8 - Jury deliberations

The deliberation includes a vote, followed by a deliberation, a second vote (if necessary) and the establishment of supplementary lists.

Vote

A majority judgment vote is conducted online

The voting link is sent to jury members just before deliberations.

Candidates are evaluated using a 5-category scale: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Insufficient

The jury has access to the voting results once all members have voted.

This first vote helps to identify the successful candidates (considered excellent by the jury) as well as the candidates that the jury does not wish to retain in the next stage of deliberation.

Deliberation

The deliberation focuses on the remaining candidates (after the vote). Each remaining application is then discussed (2 minutes) by the jury members (with the exception of members with a conflict of interest).

For each candidate:

- A summary document (candidate's background) is projected and serves as a basis for discussion.
- The same two questions (relating to the written document and the oral presentation) are asked by the president and discussed by the jury.

The deliberation then begins to determine the required number of candidates (excluding those on the reserve list). Candidate excellence remains the primary selection criterion. The balance between major fields/disciplines is only discussed when the jury deems the candidates to be of equivalent caliber.

Second vote (if necessary)

In the absence of a consensus, a second vote (traditional, paper-based, secret ballot) is held to select the remaining successful candidates. Each member writes the names of their preferred candidates on a ballot (the number of candidates corresponds to the number of contracts remaining to be filled). The main list is thus established in order of ranking.

Supplementary list

Three supplementary lists (one for each major field), ranked in order of preference, are established. If a candidate on the main list declines the proposed doctoral contract, the released funding, according to their major field, is offered to the first-ranked candidate on the supplementary list for the same major field. The rankings of candidates on the supplementary lists are determined by the jury based on the ranking established after the voting process.

Déclaration sur l'honneur

Je, soussigné-e, (Prénom NOM).....

Déclare sur l'honneur :

- n'avoir aucun lien avec les candidats sélectionnés au concours « contrats doctoraux EDSP2 »
- avoir un ou des lien(s) d'intérêt avec le ou les candidat(s) suivant(s)¹ :

Nom du candidat	Prénom	Nature du lien <i>Choisir dans le menu déroulant la nature du lien avec le candidat en cause</i>
		Choisissez un élément.

Je m'engage à respecter le principe d'impartialité exigeant que, lorsqu'un membre du jury a avec l'un des candidats des liens, tenant à la vie personnelle ou aux activités professionnelles, qui seraient de nature à influencer sur son appréciation, ce membre doit **s'abstenir** de participer aux interrogations et aux délibérations concernant le candidat lors de la **phase des auditions**.

Date :

Signature :

Déclaration sur l'honneur



Grille indicative d'aide à la détection de situations de partialité à disposition des membres du jury du concours EDSP2
--

Nature des liens**Liens familiaux**

Un membre du jury a l'obligation de s'abstenir de participer aux interrogations et délibérations relatives à un candidat avec lequel il a des liens, du fait de la vie familiale, de nature à influencer sur son appréciation. Ainsi, les parents, frères et sœurs ou alliés des candidats ne doivent pas prendre part aux travaux des comités de sélection. Il s'agit d'une présomption quasi-irréfragable de partialité (CE 10 février 1922, *Sieurs Aldeguer et Branlière*, père d'un candidat).

Liens affectifs/intimes

Le simple fait, pour un membre du jury, de connaître un candidat n'est pas en soi une atteinte au principe d'impartialité. Toutefois, un membre du jury a l'obligation de s'abstenir de participer aux interrogations et délibérations relatives à un candidat avec lequel il a des liens, du fait de la vie personnelle, de nature à influencer sur son appréciation, voir par exemple : ancien mari d'une candidate (CE 10 févr. 1995, n° 109204, Mme Perrin).

Lien professionnels

En ce qui concerne l'existence de liens professionnels entre un membre du jury et un candidat, il conviendra de se livrer à une appréciation in concreto de la situation.

Au regard des candidatures reçues, il convient d'analyser la nature des liens éventuels avec les candidats et les candidates dans une démarche d'auto-évaluation	
A - Liens familiaux	
Avoir un lien proche de parenté avec un candidat ou une candidate	<input type="checkbox"/>
B- Liens professionnels	
Avoir été directeur/directrice du mémoire de master	<input type="checkbox"/>
Etre le directeur de thèse	<input type="checkbox"/>
Etre responsable du laboratoire	<input type="checkbox"/>
Etre responsable ou membre de l'équipe Interne, d'un projet collaboratif ou d'un axe de recherche	<input type="checkbox"/>
C - Liens affectifs/intimes	
Avoir ou avoir eu dans une période récente des liens Intimes, affectifs et/ou personnels avec un candidat ou une candidate	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation grid

The jury members complete the first 2 sections before the auditions.
The third section is completed during the hearings.

The EDSP2 does not collect ratings.
For each member, the ratings serve as the basis for the first vote and for discussions/deliberations.

passage	Name Surname	Student pathway A+, A, B, C,D	Written draft A+, A, B, C, D	Oral presentation A+, A, B, C, D	Overall assessment				
					Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Insufficient
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20	...								