

**PHD FELLOWSHIP FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH: scoring descriptors criterion “Candidate” (interview)**

*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. SB candidates should as well reveal potential competences on strategic innovation oriented thinking, including some economic insight and positioning of their research.*

D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	Weak	Fair/reasonable		Good/very good		Excellent/outstanding	
<b>1. Potential competence as an independent doctoral researcher (reasoning skills and critical mindset, scientific knowledge and project insight)</b>							
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; <u>and/or</u> Clear gaps in basic knowledge of the research area. Virtually no insight into the aim and approach of the project.	Research skills are present: with close supervision, able to obtain a PhD. Reasoning skills and critical mindset below average and to be developed further, <u>and/or</u> (just) sufficient basic knowledge to undertake the PhD project. Limited insight into the relevance of the proposed research approach.	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. <u>and/or</u> 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.	Motivated and (potentially) competent independent researcher. (Very) good reasoning skills and a good critical scientific attitude. Presents new concepts in a meaningful way. <u>and</u> solid basic knowledge within own field of research, but less knowledgeable outside this field. Good insight into relevance of proposed research approach.	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. <u>and</u> 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)**

*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, ...)?*

*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) .*

D	C	B-	B	B+	A-	A	A+
				>30%	>20%	>10%	>5%
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>							
Project lacks an intellectual (PhD-worthy) challenge <u>and/or</u> an in-depth research question is missing.	Research question and challenge limited or less relevant, <u>and/or</u> the <u>research objectives</u> lack focus. PhD worthiness is on the low side, <u>and/or</u> the project is rather a catch-up effort relative to the state-of-the-art.	Scientifically relevant project, rather high quality, and sufficiently challenging as PhD-research. The research is less well focused <u>and/or</u> the project brings less pronounced added value to international state-of-the-art.	High-quality basic research, with significant scientific challenges (doctoral level). Original and significant contribution to the international state of the art.		Requirements as in “(very) good”, <u>and</u> Very original project with potential to significantly impact the scientific state-of-the-art (“ground-breaking”). Targeted research results are based on inventive and challenging ideas, concepts and research strategies.		
<b>2.b Quality of the research approach and feasibility of the project</b>							
Quality research approach and planning is below par; <u>and/or</u> Research activities are too limited for a four-year grant period; <u>and/or</u> Project not feasible because of too many planned activities.	Project approach and planning are flawed. Intrinsic feasibility is low <u>and/or</u> the objectives are formulated too vaguely to evaluate their feasibility. <u>and/or</u> Project does not fit to an individual PhD project. <u>and/or</u> Ties with/dependence of other researchers, groups or external partners may jeopardize feasibility.	Research methodology reasonable well elaborated, but less well substantiated. Given some adjustments and risk control, project implementation appears to be feasible.	Adequate, substantiated research approach to achieve targeted results, logical set-up and realistic planning: feasible within the four-year time frame. Good fit of project in research group activities, giving candidate access to necessary expertise.		Requirements as in “(very) good” <u>and</u> precise identification of the risks with alternative strategies and fallback research options.		