



## PHD FELLOWSHIP: SCORING DESCRIPTORS CRITERION "CANDIDATE" (PRESELECTION)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
<b>1.a. Study results (academic education)</b>							
<p>Depending on whether the master studies are already concluded, master or bachelor <b>percentiles</b> (referring to their university study group) are to be provided by the candidates. In addition, detailed course scores should be added. Bachelor percentiles in particular should, if possible, be complemented by intermediate master study results. Students from non-Flemish universities should provide either a percentile score (if available), or at least their rank within their study group (if available). Also, percentiles referring to small study groups should carefully be dealt with.</p> <p>In the 'Study results narrative' section in the application, though, candidates may refer to other evidence of having distinguished themselves during their studies. One may refer to upward trends during course of education, particular situations that may have (positively/negatively) influenced the study trajectory; also to results of additional studies/diplomas, (bachelor or) master thesis score, specific classes successfully attended, or other specific assets.</p>							
<p><i>No scoring possibility</i></p>	<p>The study results do not stand out (may be at the head of the pack within study group, but below average in the applicants population).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> (e.g.) &lt;P70 for relevant master diploma, and no other evidence of "standing out";</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> master students: (e.g.) &lt;P80 for bachelor, and lack of other evidence of distinguishing elements, such as partial master results.</p>	<p>Rather good study results, situated well above average and at the subtop in the study group, as evidenced by:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> (e.g.) : ≥P70 for relevant master diploma;</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> master students: e.g. bachelor (e.g.) ≥P80 (and e.g. confirmed by intermediate master study results);</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> other evidence that would categorize the candidate as equivalent to this group, e.g. a reasonable upward trend in academic results or other specific assets, as substantiated in the application.</p>	<p>(Very) good academic education record situated in the (broad) top of the study group, as evidenced by:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> (e.g.) P85 for relevant master diploma, or even P90 (score 5);</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> master students: (e.g.) bachelor ≥P90 (confirmed by intermediate master study results);</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> other evidence that would categorize the candidate as equivalent to this group, e.g. a strong upward trend in academic results or other specific assets, as substantiated in the application.</p>	<p>Top student with an excellent/ outstanding academic education record, as evidenced by:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> (e.g.) P95, or even top 1% (score 7), for relevant master diploma;</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> master students: (e.g.) P95 bachelor with proven top start of master studies, or other evidence;</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> other evidence that would categorize the candidate as equivalent to this group, as substantiated in the application.</p>			



## PHD FELLOWSHIP FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH EVALUATION/ score grid with scoring descriptors - PRESELECTION

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/Reasonable	Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding		
<b>1.b. Motivation and substantiation of relevant competences of the candidate</b>							
<p>Does the application ("motivation statement") reveal a proper motivation and research interests? Assess the candidate's (present as well as developing) scientific background and competences (including e.g. experimental skills, presentation or writing skills, commitment/perseverance, ...) in relation to the proposed project and to the requirements for a PhD researcher in general. Assess further evidence in terms of a range of (passed as well as planned) scientific activities, experiences and (where applicable) achievements that may be relevant for this application. These may relate to the academic education or extracurricular activities, (ongoing or finished) thesis (master or advanced master) , or (PhD) research already started. Assess –passed or planned- activities and experiences such as (e.g.) dedicated courses, internships, presentations, collaborations, international contacts, mobility. (Intermediate) scientific results, publications, software, data, prototypes and any other meaningful scientific output and achievements may also be taken into account, as well as scientific recognition (e.g. thesis awards).</p> <p><i>The assessment should take into account what might be expected from a last year master student vs. from a candidate with some scientific seniority.</i></p>							
<p><i>No scoring possibility</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Expertise and skills apparently are not in line with what should be expected from a PhD student. Some crucial competences are missing and likely not to be acquired.	<p><b>One or more of the following items apply:</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/> The application reveals fair/reasonable motivation regarding development towards a researcher. Less convincing evidence of (past and planned) activities and experiences. <input type="checkbox"/> Scientific background and competences to carry out PhD research may be less present, and how they will be acquired is less well substantiated.	<p><b>ALL of the following items apply:</b></p> <input type="checkbox"/> The application reveals a proper/strong motivation and research interests. This is evidenced by relevant (past/planned) activities and experiences (e.g. <i>training, internships, presentations, collaborations, international contacts, mobility, ...</i> ). <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant scientific background and competences to carry out PhD research have been acquired or are being built up (including e.g. <i>experimental skills, presentation or writing skills, commitment/perseverance, ...</i> ). Some first achievements (of master thesis/started PhD research...) may be an asset, e.g. (intermediate) results, publications, software, data, prototypes or other output, scientific recognition as by e.g. <i>thesis awards, ...</i>	Requirements as in "good", <u>AND</u> <input type="checkbox"/> the candidate has substantiated to have actively acquired all proper competences to successfully conduct PhD research. Clear plan to further enhance these capacities. Reveals clear motivation and drive.			


**PHD FELLOWSHIP FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH EVALUATION/ score grid with scoring descriptors - PRESELECTION**
**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			
<b>2.a Scientific quality, relevance and challenge, originality</b>									
<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><b>One or more of the following items apply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The project is <b>out of scope</b>: it does not comply with the scope of the panel it was submitted to. (preselection only)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Project lacks an intellectual (PhD-worthy) challenge: an in-depth research question is missing.</li> </ul>	<p><b>One or more of the following items apply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Research question and challenge limited or less relevant;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the research objectives lack focus. PhD worthiness is on the low side;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the project is rather a catch-up effort relative to the state-of-the-art.</li> </ul>	<p><b>One or more of the following items apply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Scientifically relevant project, rather high quality, and sufficiently challenging as PhD-research. The research is less well focused;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the project brings less pronounced added value to international state-of-the-art.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ALL of the following items apply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Original and significant contribution to the international state of the art;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> high-quality basic research, with significant scientific challenges (doctoral level).</li> </ul>	<p><b>ALL of the following items apply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Highly ambitious and original project of potentially groundbreaking nature and large scientific impact;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> very high level of scientific risks. Clear inventive and challenging ideas, novel concepts and strategies.</li> </ul>					
<b>2.b Quality of the research methodology and feasibility of the project</b>									
<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><b>One or more of the following items apply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Quality of research approach and planning is below par;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Research activities are too limited for a four-year grant period;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Project not feasible because of too many planned activities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>One or more of the following items apply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Methodology and planning are flawed. Intrinsic feasibility is low, <u>or</u> the objectives are formulated too vaguely to evaluate feasibility.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Project does not fit to an individual PhD project.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Ties with/dependence of other researchers, groups or external partners may jeopardize feasibility.</li> </ul>	<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><b>All of the following items apply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, substantiated research methodology to achieve targeted results, logical set-up and realistic planning: feasible within the four-year time frame.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Good fit of project in research group activities, giving candidate access to necessary expertise.</li> </ul>	<p>Requirements as in “very good”,</p> <p><u>AND</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and “fall back” research options.</li> </ul>					