Detailed criteria for evaluation of candidates

Criterion	Grading scale
A. Evaluation of the research project – the description of the research project includes the initial concept of the doctoral dissertation, specifying the research interests and sub-discipline; in particular, the aim of the proposed research, the research method, knowledge of the state of research and literature, originality of the project, and the feasibility of the project are evaluated **20%** of the final result, scale 0–17 points	
A1. Research objective of the project 0–4 points	4 Very Good, the findings of the project have a chance of being published in mainstream publications or journals for the discipline. 3 Good, the findings of the project have a chance of being published by specialist publishers or specialist journals. 2 Average, project results have a chance of being published only by publishers/journals of negligible scientific import. 1 Poor. 0 Very Poor.
A2. Research method 0–4 points	4 Very Good, well suited to the problem, using current requirements in the discipline. 3 Good, well suited to the problem, adhering to standards. 2 Average, not up to current standards in the discipline. 1 Poor, not fully matched to the problem. 0 Very poor, not made specific.
A3. Familiarity with the state of research and literature 0–4 points	4 Very good, familiarity with new theories and research published in mainstream publications for the field worldwide and in Poland. 3 Good, familiarity with theory and research. 2 Average, familiarity with a narrow range of theory and research. 1 Weak, insufficient for analysis of the problem. 0 Very poor.
A4. Originality of the project 0–3 points	3 Innovative design. 2 Project containing innovative elements. 1 Containing only a few innovative elements. 0 Project devoid of innovative elements.
A5. Feasibility of the project 0–2 points	2 Good. 1 Poor.

	0 The project is not feasible.

B. Evaluation of publication output – publication output to be evaluated: scientific articles, scientific monographs, chapters in multi-author monographs
20% of the final score, scale 0–4 points

	4 The candidate has a very good scientific output: articles in journals from JCR and/or Scopus lists, and/or scientific monographs, chapters in publications from level II of the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education. 3 Good academic achievements: articles in journals from the Ministry of Science and Higher Education and/or scientific monographs, chapters in publications from level I of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education. 2 The candidate has a poor academic record: rather popular science publications. 1 Very poor academic output: a single popular science publication. 0 The candidate has no academic output

C. Other significant activities indicating the candidate's readiness to undertake studies (e.g. participation in research or teaching projects, active participation in scientific conferences, documented activities in scientific organisations, including student organisations, and activities for the promotion of science
20% of the final mark, scale 0–5 points

	4 The candidate has documented a very high level of activity: active participation in a number of scientific conferences or involvement in scientific and student organisations, or participation in activities for the promotion of science, or participation in a research project. 3 The candidate has documented a high level of activity: active participation in a number of scientific conferences or involvement in scientific and student organisations, or participation in activities for the promotion of science. 2 The candidate has documented a satisfactory level of activity: active participation in scientific conferences or involvement in scientific organisations, including student organisations, or participation in activities for the promotion of science. 1 The candidate has documented a low level of activity: incidental participation in scientific conferences or low involvement in scientific organisations, including student organisations, or incidental participation in activities for the promotion of science. 0 The candidate has not documented their activity.

D. The interview includes a discussion with the candidate about the research project, research interests and aptitude for scientific work; the interview must not consist of a repetition of the content of the submitted project; the emphasis in the interview should be on the candidate's research competence, preparation for research work and plans for scientific career development
40% of the final mark, scale 0–17 points

D1. Discussion of the submitted project and research interests; 0–5 points	5 Excellent, very precise and logical answers to questions. 4 Very good, clear and coherent answers to questions. 3 Good, logical, not always precise answers to questions. 2 Poor, not very precise and coherent answers to questions. 1 Very poor, vague, inconsistent answers to questions. 0 No answers to questions.

D2. Assessment of knowledge in the scientific discipline 0–5 points	5 Excellent familiarity with contemporary problems of the selected scientific discipline. 4 Very good familiarity with contemporary problems of the selected scientific discipline. 3 Fairly good familiarity with contemporary problems of the selected scientific discipline. 2 Familiarity with some selected narrow problems of the selected scientific discipline. 1 Little familiarity with contemporary problems of the selected scientific discipline. 0 No familiarity with contemporary problems of the selected scientific discipline.
D3. Assessment of aptitude for scientific work 0–5 points	5 Excellent aptitude for scientific work. 4 Very good aptitude for scientific work. 3 Good aptitude for scientific work. 2 Poor aptitude for scientific work. 1 Very poor aptitude for scientific work. 0 No aptitude for scientific work.
D4. Assessment of academic career development plans 0–2 points	2 Clear, specified, well-argued academic career development plans. 1 Occurrence of some elements of an academic career development plan. 0 No specified, clear, coherent academic career development plans.