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

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)							
*In the '**Study narrative**' section in the application, candidates can refer to evidence of having distinguished themselves during their studies. One can refer to study results (grades, ranking, percentiles), upward trends during course of education, particular situations that can 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. Depending on whether the master studies are already concluded, the narrative should be supplemented with master or bachelor **percentiles** (referring to their university study group), provided by the candidates. Students from non-Flemish universities should provide either a percentile score (if available), or at least their rank within their study group (if available). In addition, detailed course scores should be added. Bachelor percentiles in particular should, if possible, be complemented by intermediate master study results. These quantitative indicators should be used to complement the assessment based on the study narrative.*							
No scoring possibility	The academic trajectory and study results do not stand out (maybe at the head of the pack within study group, but below average in the applicant population).	Rather good academic trajectory and study results, situated well above average and at the subtop in the study group, as evidenced by the study narrative and by specific grades, percentiles or ranking.		(Good to very good) academic trajectory and study results situated in the (broad) top of the study group, as evidenced by the study narrative and by specific grades, percentiles or ranking.		Top student with an excellent/ outstanding academic trajectory and study results, as evidenced by the study narrative and by specific grades, percentiles or ranking.	

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**	

1.b. Motivation and substantiation of relevant competences of the candidate

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).

The assessment should take into account what might be expected from a last year master student vs. from a candidate with some scientific seniority.

No scoring possibility	☐ 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.	**One or more of the following items apply:** ☐ The application reveals fair/reasonable motivation regarding development towards a researcher. Less convincing evidence of (past and planned) activities and experiences. ☐ 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:** ☐ 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, …)*. ☐ 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", AND ☐ 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**	

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, …)?				
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) .				
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 - PRESELECTION

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.	