



PHD FELLOWSHIP: SCORING DESCRIPTORS CRITERION “CANDIDATE” (PRESELECTION)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/Reasonable		Good/Very good		Excellent/Outstanding	
1.a. Study results (academic education)							
<p>Depending on whether the master studies are already concluded, master or bachelor percentiles (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.) <P70 for relevant master diploma, and no other evidence of “standing out”;</p> <p>OR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> master students: (e.g.) <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 ≥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 c.q. 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,</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 STRATEGIC BASIC 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	
1.b. Motivation and substantiation of relevant competences of the candidate							
<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 (strategically thinking and innovation oriented) in general.</p> <p>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 training, internships, presentations, collaborations, international contacts, mobility. For PhD fellows strategic basic research (SB), intersectoral mobility (e.g. internships and/or research stays in an industrial R&D environment) and (development of) entrepreneurial and innovation skills are an asset as well. (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>							
No scoring possibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Expertise and skills apparently are not in line with what should be expected from a PhD student strategic basic research. Some crucial competences are missing and likely not to be acquired.	One or more of the following items apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. 	ALL of the following items apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. training, internships, presentations, collaborations, international contacts, mobility, ...). <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant scientific background and competences to carry out PhD research have been acquired or are being built up (including e.g. experimental skills, presentation or writing skills, commitment/perseverance, ...). 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. thesis awards, 	Requirements as in “good/very good”, AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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, including intersectoral mobility and entrepreneurial/innovation skills. Reveals clear motivation and drive. 			



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. (preselection only). <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 <u>objectives lack</u> 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. 					


PHD FELLOWSHIP SB: SCORING DESCRIPTORS CRITERION “APPLICATION POTENTIAL” (PRESELECTION + INTERVIEW)

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/Reasonable		Good/very good		Excellent/outstanding	
<p>Strategic basic research in the context of a PhD grant stands for challenging and innovative research (at PhD level), which, if successful, may in the longer term lead to innovative applications with economic added value (for specific companies, for a collective of companies, or a sector, or in line with the Flanders 2025 transition areas (socioeconomic benefits)). Societal impact should always be linked to a (in)direct (macro)economic benefit. E.g. cost reductions in health care, higher education level, environmental impact... should be positioned in an economic context.</p>							
<p>3.a Strategic importance of the research approach for the anticipated applications (= relevance)</p> <p>Does the research –if successful- contribute to the (on the long term) realization of the anticipated applications? Is the research approach the proper one to this purpose?</p>							
<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Strategic dimension is lacking, no orientation towards an economic finality; <input type="checkbox"/> apparent mismatch between application potential and project content. 	<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Strategic dimension is present, but project is not well adapted to the anticipated utilization. <input type="checkbox"/> Strategic dimension based on an assumption for which there is as yet little concrete evidence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The strategic focus of the project on economically relevant innovations is substantiated in rather broad terms. Research approach is reasonably or partially geared to the anticipated applications. 	<p>ALL of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The strategic focus on economically relevant innovations is clear, and well substantiated in the proposal. Suitable project approach to allow the anticipated utilization. 	<p>Requirements as in “very good”,</p> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Best possible approach to achieve the intended applications. The latter are clearly the driving force behind the implementation approach. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Project fits well in broader strategic basic research goals of the research group. 			
<p>3.b Strategic importance of the potential applications for possible users (= impact)</p> <p>Assuming the research approach is effectively geared towards applications: is there a significant impact for industry and economy, for possible (end-)users? Is the impact of the intended applications described in the project application credible and achievable?</p>							
<p>One or more of the following items apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The anticipated application is not relevant for possible users nor is the proposed impact realistic; <input type="checkbox"/> the project is too strongly embedded in the strategic R&D horizon of a single company (cfr. <i>Baekeland programme at Flanders Innovation & Entrepreneurship</i> - VLAIO). <input type="checkbox"/> (Frank De Winne SB only) out of scope: no strategic importance for users in the space economy value chain. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Application potential may be real but of less economic relevance and limited impact for the identified possible users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The anticipated applications are economically relevant, they have a potential impact on possible users. The proposal exhibits certain flaws or gaps in the identification and/or elaboration of the (potentially present) applications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> If successful, the project is very likely to effectively contribute to economically relevant innovations within the identified companies and/or sectors, or even new economic activities. These are clearly defined and interpreted. 	<p>Requirements as in “very good”,</p> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> If successful, project could play a key role to disruptive innovations, implying substantial economic added value. Moreover, this goal is realistic. <p>AND (score 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A successful project may lead to a substantial economic added value for Flanders 			