


PHD FELLOWSHIP FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH EVALUATION/ score grid with scoring descriptors - INTERVIEW
PHD FELLOWSHIP: scoring descriptors criterion “Candidate” (interview)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/Reasonable	Good/very good		Excellent/outstanding				
<p><i>During the interview, candidates are assessed on their potential to develop towards an independent researcher with proper reasoning skills and a critical mindset. Scientific knowledge and project insight are also key elements in the evaluation. Descriptions in the score grid (“potential”, “competent”, “knowledge”, “skills”, “mindset”, ...) implicitly also take into account the evaluation findings of the preselection phase.</i></p>									
<p>1. Potential competence as an independent doctoral researcher (reasoning skills and critical mindset, scientific knowledge and project insight)</p>									
<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of the inherent qualities required of a doctoral researcher. Reasoning skills and critical scientific mindset are below par. Not even strict guidance or supervision would allow to adequately compensate for this; <input type="checkbox"/> clear gaps in basic knowledge of the research area. Virtually no insight into the aim and approach of the project. 	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Research skills are present: with close supervision, able to obtain a PhD. Reasoning skills and critical mindset below average and to be developed further; <input type="checkbox"/> (just) sufficient basic knowledge to undertake the PhD project. Limited insight into the relevance of the proposed research approach. 	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Research skills present, candidate is able to carry out research relatively independently. Lacks some maturity, but is motivated. Relatively good reasoning skills but less critical attitude. <input type="checkbox"/> The candidate has sufficient basic knowledge within the field of research. He/she has a rather good insight into the relevance of the proposed research approach. 	<p>ALL of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Motivated and (potentially) competent independent researcher. (Very) good reasoning skills and a good critical scientific attitude. Presents new concepts in a meaningful way. <input type="checkbox"/> Solid basic knowledge within own field of research, but less knowledgeable outside this field. Good insight into relevance of proposed research approach. 	<p>ALL of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Very convincing and driven candidate with great potential as researcher, very good reasoning skills and ditto critical scientific mindset. Presents innovative, original concepts in a convincing and substantiated fashion. <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent grasp of own field of research, knowledgeable in areas outside. Excellent insight into the relevance of the proposed research approach and positioning of project. 					



PHD FELLOWSHIP: scoring descriptors criterion “Project” (preselection + interview)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/Reasonable		Good/very good		Excellent/outstanding			
2.a Scientific quality, relevance and challenge, originality									
<i>A PhD project is scientifically challenging and relies on a proper and focused research question. It should significantly contribute to the current international state-of-the-art. To what extent is the proposal original and will it generate knowledge that goes beyond the state-of-the-art (e.g., novel theories, concepts or approaches, new methods, ...)?</i>									
<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The project is out of scope: it does not comply with the scope of the panel it was submitted to. (<i>preselection only</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Project lacks an intellectual (PhD-worthy) challenge: an in-depth research question is missing 	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Research question and challenge limited or less relevant, <input type="checkbox"/> the research objectives lack focus. PhD worthiness is on the low side, <input type="checkbox"/> the project is rather a catch-up effort relative to the state-of-the-art. 	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Scientifically relevant project, rather high quality, and sufficiently challenging as PhD-research. The research is less well focused. <input type="checkbox"/> The project brings less pronounced added value to international state-of-the-art. 	<p>ALL of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Original and significant contribution to the international state of the art. <input type="checkbox"/> High-quality basic research, with significant scientific challenges (doctoral level). 	<p>ALL of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Highly ambitious and original project of potentially groundbreaking nature and large scientific impact, <input type="checkbox"/> very high level of scientific risks. Clear inventive and challenging ideas, novel concepts and strategies. 					
2.b Quality of the research methodology and feasibility of the project									
<i>To what extent is the proposed research methodology appropriate to achieve the goals laid down in the research project? To what extent is the outlined scientific approach feasible, bearing in mind a personal grant with a duration of four years? Finally the fit in the research team may be of importance (guidance and access to expertise).</i>									
<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Quality of research approach and planning is below par; <input type="checkbox"/> Research activities are too limited for a four-year grant period; <input type="checkbox"/> Project not feasible because of too many planned activities. 	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Methodology and planning are flawed. Intrinsic feasibility is low, <u>or</u> the objectives are formulated too vaguely to evaluate feasibility. <input type="checkbox"/> Project does not fit to an individual PhD project. <input type="checkbox"/> Ties with/dependence of other researchers, groups or external partners may jeopardize feasibility. 	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Research methodology reasonably well elaborated, but less well substantiated. Given some adjustments and risk control, project implementation appears to be feasible.</p>	<p>ALL of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, substantiated research methodology to achieve targeted results, logical set-up and realistic planning: feasible within the four-year time frame. <input type="checkbox"/> Good fit of project in research group activities, giving candidate access to necessary expertise. 	<p>Requirements as in “very good”,</p> <p><u>AND</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and “fall back” research options. 					