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**	

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.

1. Potential competence as an independent doctoral researcher (reasoning skills and critical mindset, scientific knowledge and project insight)

One or more of the following items apply:	**One or more of the following items apply:**	**One or more of the following items apply:**	**ALL of the following items apply:**	**ALL of the following items apply:**
☐ 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; ☐ 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; ☐ (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. ☐ 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. ☐ 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. ☐ 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 FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH EVALUATION/ score grid with scoring descriptors - INTERVIEW

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

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, …)?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
One or more of the following items apply: ☐ The project is **out of scope**: it does not comply with the scope of the panel it was submitted to. (preselection only) ☐ Project lacks an intellectual (PhD-worthy) challenge: an in-depth research question is missing	**One or more of the following items apply:** ☐ Research question and challenge limited or less relevant, ☐ the research objectives lack focus. PhD worthiness is on the low side, ☐ the project is rather a catch-up effort relative to the state-of-the-art.	**One or more of the following items apply:** ☐ Scientifically relevant project, rather high quality, and sufficiently challenging as PhD-research. The research is less well focused. ☐ The project brings less pronounced added value to international state-of-the-art.		**ALL of the following items apply:** ☐ Original and significant contribution to the international state of the art. ☐ High-quality basic research, with significant scientific challenges (doctoral level).		**ALL of the following items apply:** ☐ Highly ambitious and original project of potentially groundbreaking nature and large scientific impact, ☐ 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

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) .

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
One or more of the following items apply: ☐ Quality of research approach and planning is below par; ☐ Research activities are too limited for a four-year grant period; ☐ Project not feasible because of too many planned activities.	**One or more of the following items apply:** ☐ Methodology and planning are flawed. Intrinsic feasibility is low , or the objectives are formulated too vaguely to evaluate feasibility. ☐ Project does not fit to an individual PhD project. ☐ Ties with/dependence of other researchers, groups or external partners may jeopardize feasibility.	☐ Research methodology reasonably well elaborated, but less well substantiated. Given some adjustments and risk control, project implementation appears to be feasible.		**ALL of the following items apply:** ☐ Adequate, substantiated research methodology 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", AND ☐ thorough identification of the research risks, with alternative research strategies and "fall back" research options.	

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

PHD FELLOWSHIP: scoring descriptors criterion "Interdisciplinarity" (preselection + interview)

Specific Interdisciplinary Panel only

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unacceptable	**Weak**	**Fair/Reasonable**		**Good/Very good**		**Excellent/Outstanding**	

3. Level of interdisciplinarity

This criterion, only used in the Specific Interdisciplinary panel, invites you to assess to what extent the application is interdisciplinary. You may take both the project proposal, the profile of the candidate and the research group(s) in which they will be working into account in applying this criterion.

A minimum score of 4 on the aspect 'Interdisciplinarity' is necessary in order to be able to receive funding from the Specific Interdisciplinary Panel.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
☐ The project is not interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary at all. The proposed research is focused within one discipline.	☐ The project is multidisciplinary instead of interdisciplinary in nature. Although the research covers at least two different disciplines, the expertise, methods, tools, data, … of one discipline are merely used as an 'instrument' for the other domain. The various domains do not offer benefits to one another nor do they mutually influence each other. Instead they are juxtaposed. The outcomes of the project are not likely to impact all involved disciplines.	**One or more of the following items apply:** ☐ Some characteristics of interdisciplinarity are present, but not all requirements for the category "good/very good" are met. While there is more than one discipline involved in the proposed project, these disciplines are not sufficiently distinct. This is for example the case if these disciplines are located in the same FWO panel. ☐ Although mutual interactive input is necessary from at least two distinct disciplines to address the research question(s) under investigation, the level of coordination and integration is insufficiently extensive/profound. ☐ The involved disciplines do not sufficiently influence one another and as a result they do not benefit to the same extent from the project.		**All of the following items apply:** ☐ There is more than one discipline involved in the proposed project, and these disciplines are sufficiently distinct. ☐ The disciplines are at a similar coordinated level and each discipline is essential to achieve the expected outcome. ☐ The state of the art is advanced in all involved disciplines and/or in a shared area.		Requirements as in "good/very good", AND ☐ There is a pronounced synergy between all involved disciplines, that strongly benefit from and mutually influence each other in an integrated and well-designed way. AND ☐ The outcomes will clearly impact all involved disciplines and as such there is substantial added value for each involved discipline and/or new bridges between previously rarely related fields are built or new subdisciplines could result from this project.	