



INPUTDoc Project

Appendix No. 1 to "Scholarships" competition Regulations

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

Task 1. Scholarships for the best PhD students of PUT Doctoral School implementing doctoral projects in international cooperation

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 "Scholarships" 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 the evaluation process avoids weighing). The elements that undergo assessment are the following:

1. Scientific and professional achievements of the Applicant being results of international cooperation. (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 international research or international research and development projects.

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.

2. Description of previous and ongoing scientific activities in cooperation with a selected foreign research team (in case of joint or double degree doctoral projects, the foreign research team has to come from the partner institution), current cooperation and the main activities taken with international research teams. (0-5 points)

In this point, the evaluator should assess how good the foreign research team chosen by the Applicant for cooperation is and compare the achievements of this team to other groups recognized within the specified discipline focusing on good publications and international projects. The maximum score should be given if the evaluator is convinced that the scholarship would bring new knowledge and skills to the Applicant, and make her/his dissertation better and internationally recognizable.



INPUTDoc Project

3. Description of the agreed joint research project, proposed for the scholarship, leading to the completion of a doctoral dissertation (in particular to obtaining a joint degree or a double degree). (0-5 points)

This item is focal 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 during the scholarship, which should list a **clear research plan** that can be implemented within six months considering the involvement of the foreign research team;
- 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 scholarship (benefits from international cooperation as well as the progress in doctoral project implementation and dissemination of its results). (0-5 points)

This element serves the evaluation of the prospective gains that both the beneficiary and Poznań University of Technology can get from the proposed scholarship. 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 of 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.

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