



INPUTDoc Project

Appendix No. 1 to "Mobility" competition Regulations

Evaluation of the applications in the STER INPUTDoc "Mobility" competition

Task 2. Foreign mobility of the best PhD students of PUT Doctoral School

This appendix is intended to be a guide for the international Qualification Committee on how to score applications in order to implement a transparent, fair and unbiased process of selection of beneficiaries in the STER INPUTDoc "Mobility" competition. The general rule is individual assessment of applications by all members of the Committee, while the final score is an arithmetic (non-weighted) average of the individual scores. Each of the elements of the application is scored individually, with each element using a specified scale of grades (thus evaluation process avoids weighing). The elements that undergo assessment are the following:

1. Scientific and professional achievements of the Applicant. (0-5 points)

Here the evaluator should focus on Applicant's potential to carry out scientific research and be innovative, which should be supported by their past achievements:

- publications in recognizable (within the discipline) venues, good journals, avoiding "predatory" open access,
- conference materials that have impact on the field/discipline,
- monographs or chapters in monographs,
- granted patents,
- artistic works (if applicable).

Moreover, the potential of the Applicant can be supported by her/his previous involvement in research or research and development projects, with the priority given to international (EC, CHIST-ERA, Norwegian Funds, etc.) collaboration. Also, their previous involvement in international activities like ERASMUS+ or other form of internships should be recognized.

An important aspect of assessment of this element of the application is understanding that different disciplines have different potential for high-impact publications (notice that according to Scopus journals from the "science" part of this database have, on average, CiteScore [impact] three times higher than those listed under the "engineering" part).

Obviously, there is also a difference between accumulated scientific assets among PhD students at different years of the PhD School. While for a first year student a single good publication (journal or CORE conference) can be enough, those in their third or fourth year should have at least 4-5 good publications.

2. Description of the host institution and the mentor. (0-5 points)

In this point, the evaluator should assess how good the chosen host institution is with respect to other choices possible in the discipline, and on the achievements of the prospective mentor and his/her team or lab. Important factors are documented achievements of the mentor's team concerning the scientific area directly relevant for the Applicant's doctoral dissertation, as the maximum of points should be allocated if the evaluator is convinced that the internship would bring new knowledge and skills to the Applicant, and make her/his dissertation better.

The INPUTDoc Project is co-financed by Polish National Agency for Academic Exchange NAWA within the STER Programme "Internationalisation of doctoral schools"



INPUTDoc Project

3. Description of the project proposed for the “*Mobility*” internship. (0-5 points)

This item is central to the whole application and should be evaluated carefully, taking into account all four aspects of the project proposal:

- *description of activities to be carried out in the project, which should list a **clear research plan** that can be implemented within three months considering the facilities available at the host institution;*
- *description of the problem to be solved, which should be a clear **description of the scientific** (not only engineering) **problem**, stating what aspects are still not solved, and why it is important to solve this problem;*
- ***novelty**, which puts the planned research in the context of the state of the art and declares the planned contribution(s) of the Applicant;*
- ***methodology**, which should convince the evaluator that the Applicant has enough knowledge and skills to implement her/his ideas using a solid scientific method (e.g. application of proper theoretical models, experimental methods, statistical evaluation, benchmarking).*

4. Description of the expected results of the “*Mobility*” internship. (0-3 points)

This element serves the evaluation of the prospective gains that both the beneficiary and Poznan University of Technology can get from the proposed internship. An obvious measure of excellence here is meeting all the requirements listed in the application form:

- *planning of good but realistic **publications**, perhaps a single one at a recognizable journal or CORE conference rather than several in low-grade conferences or local journals;*
- *having an idea how the gathered **experience, knowledge and skills** foster the development of the PhD and **further career** (not necessarily academic) of the Applicant;*
- *having a plan how the same experience, knowledge and skills can be **transferred to** others in the Applicant’s (and his/her supervisor’s) **research team and to a broader community** in the given discipline at PUT.*

5. Compliance with the assumptions/priorities of the project. (0-2 points)

This element is where two non-descriptive elements of the application should be taken into account:

- *the internship in one of the preferred entities: UTS (Australia), FIU (USA) or EUNICE (Europe),*
- *a PhD implemented under a joint/double degree or cotutelle agreement, or involving a foreign second supervisor.*

If any of these circumstances occur, the application should score a point.

Finally, the total score is a sum of the five scores listed above, and should be written down in the proper cell of the table in Part II of the evaluated application.