

### KUL Doctoral School - Detailed Assessment Criteria

| Criterion   | Grading scale  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>A. Assessment of the research</b> – The description of the research proposal contains the initial concept of the PhD dissertation, with the definition of the research interests and the sub-discipline. In particular: the purpose of the designed research, research method, knowledge of the state of research and the originality of the project, the possibility of project implementation proposal<br/> <b>50%</b> of final result, 0-20 points</p> |  |
| 1. Aim/Objectives of the research proposal 0-5 points   | <p>5 Excellent: research results are likely to be published by the highest- ranking publishers or journals.<br/>           4 Very good: research results are likely to be published by mainstream publishers or journals in the research field<br/>           3 Good: research results are likely to be published by specialist publishers or journals.<br/>           2 Average: research results are likely to be published only with low- ranked publishers or journals.<br/>           1 Poor.<br/>           0 Very poor.</p> |
| 2. Research method 0-4 points   | <p>4 Very good: the method is appropriate for the research problem and it is in line with the current trends in the discipline.<br/>           3 Good: the method is appropriate for the research problem and it meets relevant standards, though not the highest standards.<br/>           2 Average: not in line with the standards accepted in a discipline.<br/>           1 Poor: not quite appropriate for the problem.<br/>           0 Very poor: poorly defined method.</p>   |
| 3. Knowledge of the state of research and literature 0-5 points   | <p>5 Excellent: knowledge of the latest theories and research published in high ranking Polish and international journals.<br/>           4 Very good: knowledge of new theories and research published by mainstream Polish and international publishers.<br/>           3 Good: knowledge of theory and research published in Poland.<br/>           2 Average: knowledge in a limited scope of theory and research.<br/>           1 Poor: knowledge insufficient for problem analysis.<br/>           0 Very poor.</p>         |
| 4. Originality of the research proposal 0-4 points  | <p>4 Unique proposal<br/>           3 Innovative proposal<br/>           2 Proposal with some innovative elements.<br/>           1 Proposal with few innovative elements.<br/>           0 Proposal with no innovative elements.</p>  |
| 5. Chances of implementing the proposal 0-2 points  | <p>2 Good.<br/>           1 Poor.<br/>           0 The proposal can not be implemented.</p>  |
| <p><b>B. Assessment of publications</b> – The publication output which is evaluated includes research papers, research monographs, chapters in multi-author monographs.<br/> <b>20%</b> of final result, scale 0-5 points</p>   |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <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><b>C. Participation in research</b> - Participation in research grants is understood as obtaining a research grant in competitions organised by a domestic or a foreign grant institutions, obtaining an internal research grant at a university or participation in a team research programme grants<br/> <b>10%</b> 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><b>D. Interview</b> - The interview includes a presentation of the research project and a discussion about it, research interests, predispositions to conduct academic work<br/> <b>20%</b> of final result, scale 0-15 points</p>  |  |
| <p>Presentation of the research proposal<br/> 0-5 points</p>   | <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 relatively inconsistent presentation of the proposal.</p> <p>1 Very poor: imprecise, inconsistent presentation of the proposal.</p> <p>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.<br/> 4 Very good: clear and consistent answers to the questions.<br/> 3 Good: answers to the questions mostly logical, but not always precise.<br/> 2 Poor: relatively imprecise and inconsistent answers to the questions.<br/> 1 Very poor: imprecise and inconsistent answers to the questions.<br/> 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<br/> 4 Very good aptitude for research work.<br/> 3 Good aptitude for research work.<br/> 2 Poor aptitude for research work.<br/> 1 Very poor aptitude for research work<br/> 0 No aptitude for research work</p> |
|--|---|