

KUL Doctoral School - Detailed Assessment Criteria for 2019

Criterion	Grading scale
A. Assessment of the research proposal	
50% of final result, 0-20 points	
1. Aim/Objectives of the research proposal 0-5 points	5 Excellent; research results are likely to be published by the highest-ranking publishers or in highest-ranking journals. 4 Very good; research results are likely to be published by mainstream publishers or in mainstream journals. 3 Good; research results are likely to be published by specialist publishers or in specialist journals. 2 Average; research results are likely to be published only by low-ranked publishers or journals. 1 Poor. 0 Very poor.
2. Research method 0-4 points	4 Very good; the method is appropriate for the research problem and it is in line with the current requirements in the discipline. 3 Good; the method is appropriate for the research problem and it meets relevant standards, though not the highest level standards. 2 Average, not in line with the standards accepted in a discipline. 1 Poor, not quite appropriate for the problem. 0 Very poor, undefined.
3. Knowledge of the state of research and literature 0-5 points	5 Excellent knowledge of the latest theories and research published in high ranking Polish and international journals. 4 Very good knowledge of new theories and research published by mainstream Polish and international publishers. 3 Good knowledge of theory and research published in Poland. 2 Average; limited knowledge of theory and research. 1 Poor; knowledge insufficient for problem analysis. 0 Very poor.
4. Originality of the research proposal 0-4 points	4 Unique proposal 3 Innovative proposal 2 Proposal with some innovative elements. 1 Proposal with few innovative elements. 0 Proposal with no innovative elements.
5. Possibility of implementing the proposal 0-2 points	2 Good. 1 Poor. 0 The proposal can not be implemented.
B. Assessment of publications	
20% of final result, scale 0-5 points	
	5 Outstanding; articles published in journals from the JCR and/or Scopus lists, and/or monographs, chapters in international publications. 4 Very good: articles published in journals from the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, and /or monographs, chapters published in nationwide publications. 3 good: articles published in local journals and /or monographs, chapters published in local publications. 2 poor: popular science publications. 1 very poor: a single popular science publication. 0 no publications.

C. Participation in research grants 10% of final result, scale 0-7 points	
	<p>7 Obtaining a research grant from a foreign grant-giving institution - project leader.</p> <p>6 Obtaining a research grant from a national grant-giving institution (e.g. from the National Science Centre or the National Centre for Research and Development) - project leader.</p> <p>5 Obtaining an internal research grant at university - project leader.</p> <p>4 Participation in a team research program funded by a foreign grant-giving institution - as a researcher.</p> <p>3 Participation in a team research program funded by a national grant-giving institution (e.g. the National Science Centre or the National Centre for Research and Development) - as a researcher.</p> <p>2 Participation in a team research program funded by the university - as a researcher.</p> <p>1 Participation in a team research program as a collective contractor (under a contract of mandate or contract for specific work).</p> <p>0 No participation in research grants.</p>
D. Interview 20% of final result, scale 0-15 points	
Presentation of the research proposal 0-5 points	<p>5 Excellent, very accurate and logical presentation of the proposal.</p> <p>4 Very good, clear and consistent presentation of the proposal.</p> <p>3 Good presentation of the proposal, mostly logical but not always precise.</p> <p>2 Poor, imprecise, and not very consistent presentation of the proposal.</p> <p>1 Very poor, not precise, inconsistent presentation of the proposal.</p> <p>0 Insufficient presentation or no presentation at all.</p>
Discussion on the presented research proposal and research interests 0-5 points	<p>5 Excellent, very precise and logical answers to the questions.</p> <p>4 Very good, clear and consistent answers to the questions.</p> <p>3 Good answers to the questions, mostly logical, but not always accurate.</p> <p>2 Poor, too general and not consistent answers to the questions.</p> <p>1 Very poor, imprecise and inconsistent answers to the questions.</p> <p>0 No answers to the questions.</p>
Assessment of the candidate's aptitude for research work 0-5 points	<p>5 Excellent aptitude for research work.</p> <p>4 Very good aptitude for research work.</p> <p>3 Good aptitude for research work.</p> <p>2 Poor aptitude for research work.</p> <p>1 Very poor aptitude for research work.</p> <p>0 No aptitude for research work.</p>