

KUL Doctoral School - Detailed Assessment Criteria for 2021

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 journals. 4 Very good: research results are likely to be published by mainstream publishers or journals in the research field 3 Good: research results are likely to be published by specialist publishers or journals. 2 Average: research results are likely to be published only with 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 trends in the discipline. 3 Good: the method is appropriate for the research problem and it meets relevant standards, though not the highest standards. 2 Average: not in line with the standards accepted in a discipline. 1 Poor: not quite appropriate for the problem. 0 Very poor: poorly defined method.
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: knowledge in a limited scope 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. Chances 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	

	<p>5 Excellent: articles published in journals from the JCR and/or Scopus lists, and/or monographs, chapters in international publications.</p> <p>4 Very good: articles published in journals included on the list by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education which are mainstream in Poland, and /or monographs, and/or chapters published by mainstream Polish research publishers.</p> <p>3 Good: articles published in local journals and /or monographs, chapters published in local publications.</p> <p>2 Poor: popular science publications prevail over research publications</p> <p>1 Very poor: a single popular science or local research publication.</p> <p>0 No publications.</p>
<p>C. Participation in research grants 10% of final result, scale 0-7 points</p>	
	<p>7 Obtaining a research grant from a foreign grant-giving institution - project leader (principal researcher).</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 (principal researcher).</p> <p>5 Obtaining an internal research grant at a university - project leader.</p> <p>4 Participation in a team research program funded by a foreign grant-giving institution – 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) - researcher.</p> <p>2 Participation in a team research program funded by a university - researcher.</p> <p>1 Participation in a team research program as a collaborative researcher (under a specific contract).</p> <p>0 No participation in research grants.</p>
<p>D. Interview 20% of final result, scale 0-15 points</p>	
<p>Presentation of the research proposal 0-5 points</p>	<p>5 Excellent: very accurate and logical presentation of the proposal. 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 relatively inconsistent presentation of the proposal.</p> <p>1 Very poor: imprecise, inconsistent presentation of the proposal. 0 Insufficient: poor presentation performance or no presentation at all.</p>
<p>Discussion on the presented research proposal and research interests 0-5 points</p>	<p>5 Excellent: very precise and logical answers to the questions. 4 Very good: clear and consistent answers to the questions.</p> <p>3 Good: answers to the questions mostly logical, but not always precise.</p> <p>2 Poor: relatively imprecise and inconsistent answers to the questions.</p> <p>1 Very poor: imprecise and inconsistent answers to the questions. 0 No answers to the questions.</p>

<p>Assessment of the candidate's aptitude for research work 0-5 points</p>	<p>5 Excellent aptitude for research work. 4 Very good aptitude for research work. 3 Good aptitude for research work. 2 Poor aptitude for research work. 1 Very poor aptitude for research work. 0 No aptitude for research work.</p>
--	---