

Evaluation Guide

Call for PhD Studentships – 2018

February 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
ABBREVIATIONS	3
1. CALL	4
2. ADMISSIBILITY	4
2.1. Applicant Admissibility Requirements	4
2.1.1. General Requirements	4
2.1.2. Specific requirements	4
2.2. Application Admissibility Requirements	5
2.3 Documents of Optional Submission in the Application Form	6
3. EVALUATION PROCESS	7
3.1. Guiding Principles of Peer review	7
3.2. Conflict of interests (Col)	7
3.3. Confidentiality	8
3.4 Establishment of Evaluation Panels	8
3.5. Coordination of Evaluation Panels – Roles and Responsibilities	9
3.6. Remote and Panel Meeting Evaluation	10
3.6.1 Remote Evaluation	10
3.6.1.1 Individual Evaluation	11
3.6.1.2 Pre-Consensus Evaluation	11
3.6.2 Panel meeting	11
3.7. Comments to be Transmitted to Applicants	12
3.8. Panel Meeting Report	13
4. EVALUATION CRITERIA	13
4.1. Criterion A – Merit of the Applicant	14
4.2. Criterion B – Merit of the Work Programme.....	18
4.3. Criterion C – Merit of Hosting Conditions	19
5. STRATEGIC COORDINATION OF THE CALL	20
6. PRELIMINARY HEARING	20
Annex I – Minute / Model of Capacity	21
Annex II – Scientific Fields, adapted from the FOS Classification of the Frascati Manual	22

ABBREVIATIONS

BD – PhD studentships

CoI – Conflict of Interests

FAF – Final Evaluation Form (*Ficha de Avaliação Final*)

FAI – Individual Evaluation Form (*Ficha de Avaliação Individual*)

FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P.

FCT-SIG – Information and Management System of FCT

FOS – Field of Science

FPC – Pre-Consensus Evaluation Form (*Ficha de Pré-Consenso*)

ORCID – *Open Researcher and Contributor Identifier*

1. CALL

In 2018, aiming to support advanced training, a single Call to grant PhD studentships (BD) will be launched for applicants that fulfil the requirements to join a study cycle that allows to obtain a PhD degree and that wish to develop research work to attain that degree. The studentship is, as a rule, annual, renewable up to four years, and may not be granted for a period less than three consecutive months.

The research activity may be developed in any intensive-knowledge environment, namely in collaboration with companies, so that the host institution(s) may be: R&D units, State Laboratories, Associated Laboratories, Collaborative Laboratories or Interface Centres.

The work programme may proceed fully or partially in a national institution (studentship in the country or mixed studentship, respectively), or proceed fully in a foreign institution (studentship abroad). In case of a **mixed BD**, the period of the work programme in a foreign institution cannot, in any case, exceed two years.

2. ADMISSIBILITY

2.1. Applicant Admissibility Requirements

2.1.1. General Requirements

- a) Be national citizens or citizens from another member-state of the European Union.
- b) Be citizens from third-party states, holders of a valid residence permit, up to the starting date of the studentship, or be a beneficiary of a long-term resident statute in the terms provided in Law No. 23/2007, of July 4th, ultimately altered and republished by Law No. 102/2017, of August 28th.
- c) Be citizens from third-party states with which Portugal has signed a reciprocity agreement.

2.1.2. Specific requirements

- a) Having completed, at the time of application submission, the master academic degree or, alternatively, fulfilling, on that time, the conditions provided in items b) or c) of article No. 30 of Decree-Law No. 74/2006, of March 24th, altered and republished by Decree-Law No. 63/2016, of September 13th, for access to the study cycle that allows obtaining the PhD degree.
- b) To be a citizen permanently and usually living in Portugal, in case the work programme of the requested studentship proceeds, wholly or partially, in foreign institutions (mixed or abroad studentships – applicable to national or foreign citizens).
- c) Not having benefited from a PhD or a PhD in industry studentship, BD and BDE, respectively, directly funded by FCT, regardless of its duration.

2.2. Application Admissibility Requirements

Procedures and Mandatory Submission Documents

It is imperative, under penalty of non-admission of the application, to complete the following procedures:

- a) Filling in and updating the applicant's Curriculum Vitae (CV) in the FCT-SIG or in the DeGóis platforms;
- b) Detailing the work programme to be developed (PhD programme lectures attendance is not considered for purposes of the work programme);
- c) Ensuring that the scientific supervisor is associated to the application and locks the attachment of her/his CV;
- d) Ensuring that the co-supervisor(s) is(are) associated to the application and lock(s) the attachment of the respective CV(s).

It is also imperative, under penalty of **non-admission of the application**, to upload in the Application Form the following documents:

- e) **Academic degree certificates** for all academic degrees obtained, specifying the final grade obtained and, preferably, the grades obtained in all subjects completed. Hence, in "post-Bologna" degrees, submission of the certificate for the 1st and 2nd study cycles or, if it is not a two-stage education, of the integrated master's certificate, is **mandatory**; in "pre-Bologna" degrees, submission of the graduate certificate and of the master's certificate is **mandatory**. The **omission of any degree certificate**, implies **exclusion** of the application from the Call.
- f) In case of foreign academic degrees, **records of acknowledgment of such degrees and conversion of the respective final grades to the Portuguese grading scale must be submitted** (whenever a final grade was awarded to the foreign degree), issued by the Directorate General for Higher Education or by a Portuguese public higher education establishment (regime governed by Decree-Law No. 341/2007, of October 12th) or, alternatively, the document of acknowledgment/equivalence of the foreign qualifications with the corresponding Portuguese qualifications, issued by a Portuguese public higher education establishment, must be submitted (process governed by Decree-Law No. 283/83, of June 21st). We suggest visiting the portal of the Directorate General for Higher Education (*Direção-Geral do Ensino Superior*, DGES): <http://www.dges.gov.pt/en>.

Please note that the submission of the record/acknowledgment/equivalence of foreign degrees to the corresponding Portuguese qualifications **may not be replaced** by the submission of a declaration of capacity to complete the PhD, even if issued by the competent statutory body of the entity that grants the degree (document mentioned in the next paragraph), given that this alternative applies only to applicants that do not hold the academic degree of master.

- g) Applicants that do not hold the academic degree of master must **mandatorily** submit a **declaration** issued by the legally and statutorily competent scientific body of the university where they intend to

be admitted for PhD, proving their capacity to attend this cycle of studies (declaration/deliberation adopted by the designated body in the university statutes and/or in the provisions of the PhD regulation of the university granting the degree, which is related to the PhD studentship application). This declaration will **only be accepted if** issued by:

- i. the **legally and statutorily competent scientific body**, and in conformity with the provisions of the PhD regulation of the university granting the degree, a regulation published under and in compliance with the provisions of art. 30 of Decree-Law No. 74/2006, of March 24th, altered by Decree-Law No. 63/2016, of September 13th.
- ii. in accordance with the Minute / Model provided in Annex I – *Declaração* included in this Evaluation Guide.

Applicants that are already attending doctoral degree studies and are enrolled in **the same doctoral programme for which they are applying for the studentship** in this call may, alternatively, submit the declaration/determination issued at the time of their acceptance in said study cycle, regardless of the issuing date, insofar as it was issued by the legally and statutorily competent scientific body of the university.

Proofs of enrolment, admission or attendance of PhD programmes **will not be accepted** in replacement of the abovementioned declarations/deliberations, even if they concern the PhD programme for which the studentship is being requested, nor will any other documents regardless of their form or nature.

- h) A **motivation letter**, in which the applicant explains the reasons for her/his application, presenting the achievement considered the most representative of her/his scientific/professional career.
- i) **Two** distinct and signed **recommendation letters**.

2.3 Documents of Optional Submission in the Application Form

The following are elements of optional submission in the application form:

- a) Applicant's ORCID code. The ORCID record is recommended but does not replace entering the updated CV in the FCT-SIG or DeGóis platforms.
- b) ORCID code of the scientific supervisor (and co-supervisor(s)', if applicable), which does not replace filling in and updating the CV in the FCT-SIG or in the DeGóis platforms.
- c) Document that better represents the applicant's scientific/professional career.
- d) Document of proof of permanent and usual residence in Portugal, if applicable. This document may be submitted only upon conditional granting of the studentship, for purposes of contracting thereof. Please note that, in the case of citizens from third-party states, studentship's contract is dependent on the presentation of a valid residence permit at the starting date of the studentship. In case the work plan of

the requested studentship is held, wholly or partially, in foreign institutions, candidates, independently of their nationality, will have to present, upon contracting, the document of proof of permanent and usual residence in Portugal. On this matter, please refer to chapter 3.10 of the Application Guide for the Call.

3. EVALUATION PROCESS

3.1. Guiding Principles of Peer review

It is the mission of FCT to ensure the global scientific quality of the peer review process. Therefore, evaluators shall give precedence to quality and originality over quantity, when analysing applicants' and supervisors' CVs. The number of publications and the cumulative computing of impact factors, for example, do not allow, by itself, the identification of the characteristics that define the quality and achievements of scientific careers. The scientific content represents the essential core of peer review, which requires an **integrated vision** of all components of a scientific career or a research work programme. The application must be evaluated taking into consideration its originality, consistency and coherence, and its contribution to the progress of knowledge in all of its components.

Impartiality and transparency are fundamental principles for evaluation decisions. All applications will be treated and assessed impartially, on the base of their merit, regardless of their origin or of the applicant's identity, safeguarding situations of conflict of interests (Col).

3.2. Conflict of interests (Col)

If the chair/co-chair or any other member of the evaluation panel is him/herself in a situation of Col concerning any of the applications submitted to the panel, he/she must declare to FCT as soon as the first contact with the application is made.

If any of the evaluators are in a situation of Col concerning any of the applications, the chair/co-chair of the evaluation panel must not assign the declared application(s) to that evaluator. The evaluator must also be prevented from contacting in any way with the application(s), or with the evaluations produced there on, throughout the evaluation process.

The Col declarations must mandatorily be included in the panel meeting report. The chair of the evaluation panel, in collaboration with FCT, is responsible for compiling the list of declared Col that include the application reference, as well as the name of the applicant and evaluator.

The situations of Col of the chair, co-chair or evaluator include, but are not limited to:

- a) Belonging to the same academic organizational unit¹ and/or the same research unit of the host institution of the work programme associated to the application;

¹ It is considered as academic organizational unit the Department, in case the faculty / school is structured by organizational units of a departmental nature, or the faculty / school itself, when this is not the case.

- b) Belonging to the same academic organizational unit and/or the same research unit of the supervisor and/or co-supervisor(s) associated to the application;
- c) Having published scientific work with the applicant or with the applicant's supervisor or co-supervisor(s) in the three years prior to the date of opening of the application period;
- d) Having ongoing scientific collaboration with the applicant, their supervisor or co-supervisor(s);
- e) Being related (family relationship) to the applicant, supervisor or co-supervisor(s);
- f) Having a scientific or personal conflict with the applicant supervisor or co-supervisor(s);
- g) Being in any other situation that may raise doubts to him/herself, to third parties, namely the applicant or an external entity, about their capacity to assess the application impartially.

The members of the Scientific Coordination Group, referred in Chapter 5 of this Guide, cannot be in any situation of conflict of interests related to any of the submitted applications to this call.

3.3. Confidentiality

The confidentiality of all applications must be protected and guaranteed at all moments of the process in order to ensure the independence of all analysis produced. All the evaluators, including chairs, co-chairs and external experts shall sign a confidentiality statement concerning the whole evaluation process, and the content of the applications that they had knowledge of; they may not copy, quote or use any type of information contained therein.

The members of the Scientific Coordination Group will also have to sign a confidentiality statement.

3.4 Establishment of Evaluation Panels

Evaluation panels are formed by experts with renowned scientific merit and experience. In establishing the Evaluation Panels, the following criteria are also followed: coverage of scientific fields and sub-fields, gender balance, institutional and geographical diversity.

All the evaluators, including the chair and co-chair, **may never be a supervisor or co-supervisor** of applicants with applications submitted under the evaluation panel where they participate, but may, nevertheless, be the supervisor or co-supervisor of applicants of other evaluation panels.

The assessment work developed by each panel is coordinated, under FCT's invitation, by one of its members, who has the responsibility for assuring that the evaluation exercise is carried out with transparency, independence and equality.

The chair should not assess any applications, but may exceptionally do so, under particular circumstances, namely lack of scientific coverage in the panel or Col of the remaining members.

The chair shall appoint, among the members of the respective panel, a co-chair to assist her/him in their coordination tasks. In particular, the co-chair must verify all evaluation forms produced during the evaluation process.

The evaluator appointed as co-chair, accumulates the tasks of co-coordination with those of evaluator of the applications that are distributed to him/her.

Evaluation panels will be formed based on the adaptation of the FOS Classification of the Frascati Manual (*OECD's Revised Field of Science and Technology Classification in the Frascati Manual* – see Annex II).

Applications are assigned to the different panels according to the main scientific field, secondary scientific field and scientific subfield stated by the applicant, in accordance with the table included in Annex II. The scientific fields and subfields identified by the applicant **may not be altered by the evaluation panel, and therefore the applications cannot be transferred to another evaluation panel**

The constitution of the Evaluation Panels is made public in the FCT's webpage. The list of panel chairs will be disclosed during the application submission period and the list of co-chairs and evaluators that will participate in the evaluation process will be published before the beginning of the evaluation period.

3.5. Coordination of Evaluation Panels – Roles and Responsibilities

In collaboration with FCT, the chair is responsible for:

- a) Ensuring that the evaluation exercise is carried out with transparency, independence and equality;
- b) Appointing one co-chair to support them in their functions;
- c) Delegating on the co-chair the tasks considered necessary to the proper management of the panel work;
- d) Allocating to each application two evaluators, appointing them as 1st and 2nd readers, taking into account their fields of expertise/specialisation and the application's subfield;
- e) Identifying applications that may need external experts;
- f) Managing the identified CoIs;
- g) Ensuring that all panel members follow the guidelines and clarifications provided by FCT throughout the process;
- h) Verifying, along with the other panel members, the adequacy of applications to the panel;
- i) Ensuring that all members of the panel know and apply the criteria and sub-criteria established and the respective weighing of such criteria/sub-criteria, when filling in the Individual Evaluation Forms (FAI, *Ficha de Avaliação Individual*);

- j) Assuring the compliance of the deadlines granted to evaluators to prepare the FAI and Pre-consensus Evaluation Forms (FPC, *Ficha de pré-consenso*);
- k) Ensuring that, when filling in the FAI and FPC, evaluators justify their grading with clear and substantive arguments that allow understanding the assessment and grade attributed to each applicant;
- l) Moderating the panel meeting and ensuring a collegial process of decision;
- m) Assuring that the Final Evaluation Form (FAF, *Ficha de Avaliação Final*) is prepared until the end of the panel meeting;
- n) Guaranteeing that all FAF produced by the panel are consistent and coherent with each other and that the comments are in accordance with the provisions of this guide, the applicable legislation and with the respective scores;
- o) Preparing the panel report, together with all the panel members;
- p) Collaborating with FCT to solve problems and/or pitfalls that may occur before, during and/or after the panel meeting;
- q) Coordinating the preliminary hearing process (see chapter 6).

3.6. Remote and Panel Meeting Evaluation

3.6.1 Remote Evaluation

Before the evaluation process begins, all evaluators (as well as the chair and co-chair) should produce and deliver to the chair and to FCT a Col declaration relative to the respective applications submitted to the panel. These Col declarations will be included in the panel meeting report, which will be made available to the applicants.

The remote evaluation is divided into two stages: i) individual evaluation and ii) pre-consensus evaluation, both of which are carried out at FCT's online evaluation platform. In the first stage, each evaluator must complete their individual evaluation forms as 1st and 2nd readers, and in the second stage, the 1st reader will be responsible for the production of the FPC that should reflect the analysis of both readers allocated to the application.

3.6.1.1 Individual Evaluation

- a) Each application is assessed individually and remotely by two panel members who are not in a situation of Col with the applicant and respective supervisors/co-supervisors.
- b) If eventually any of the evaluators identifies an additional situation of Col concerning any application(s) attributed to them, they must so declare immediately and formally to FCT and to the panel chair, who is responsible for the reallocation of the application(s).
- c) Whenever justified, for example in the case of interdisciplinary applications, the chair may, during the individual remote evaluation period, request to FCT the opinion of an external expert.
- d) An application shall be considered non-assessable when it strays considerably from the scientific field in which it was submitted and if there exists another panel where it would better suit. The evaluation panel must jointly validate this decision during the panel meeting and that must be made explicit in the final evaluation form and justified in the panel meeting report.
- e) An application shall also be considered non-assessable when a violation of at least one of the mandatory admissibility requirements of the applicant or application is identified, whenever it has not been identified in the prior stage of administrative review of admissibility.
- f) Each evaluator must fill in a FAI for each of the applications that they are assigned to, score the three evaluation criteria separately (see section 4. Evaluation Criteria) and prepare the respective comments in order to clearly justify the score awarded.

3.6.1.2 Pre-Consensus Evaluation

- a) At the end of the individual evaluation period, the 1st reader is responsible for preparing a FPC within the pre-established deadline that takes place before the panel meeting.
- b) When preparing the FPC, the 1st reader must take into consideration the two individual evaluations (and the external expert's assessment, if applicable).

3.6.2 Panel meeting

The panel meeting consists on the reunion of all panel members where the collegial discussion of all applications submitted to the panel is promoted. This meeting comprises the following:

- a) Analysis and joint discussion of all applications, taking into consideration the FAI and FPC previously produced which constitute the working documents for the panel;
- b) During the meeting, the 1st readers must be prepared to present a summary of strengths and eventual weaknesses of each application that has been assigned to them. During the discussion, the participation of all panel members should be encouraged;

- c) The final evaluation of the applications of each panel is performed by discussing the relative merit of the applications, after which the final score for each application is established. If any member of the panel is in a situation of conflict of interests with any application, he/she will not be able to participate in the discussion and must leave the meeting. If this situation applies to the chair and the co-chair, another member of the panel should be assigned to moderate the meeting;
- d) The 1st reader is responsible for preparing the FPC, taking into consideration the discussion and the collegial decision of the panel;
- e) All FAFs produced must be consistent and coherent with each other, which means that there should be an uniform match between the scores and respective comments, for all applications in the same panel;
- f) All panel members are responsible for the discussion of the relative merit of each application, resulting in a single provisional ranked list of applicants, per panel.

3.7. Comments to be Transmitted to Applicants

Each panel should bear in mind the need to present, in a clear, consistent and coherent manner, the arguments that led to the scores awarded. It is the responsibility of the chair and co-chair of the panel to ensure that, in completing the FAFs, the panel justifies the scores with substantive arguments that allow the understanding of the meaning of the evaluation, identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each application for each evaluation criteria (see section 4. Evaluation Criteria).

In addition to the comments justifying the scores attributed to each of the three evaluation criteria, in criterion A - Merit of the Applicant of the FAF, there **must** be the indication of the **scores** attributed to the **academic career** and the **personal curriculum**, as well as the explanation of possible disability bonuses according to their respective degrees. In cases where the applicant presents more than a graduate and/or master's degree, the panel must indicate which of the course have selected for the calculation of the academic career score.

In the FAF comments, the evaluation panel must also observe the following general recommendations:

- a) Do not use the 1st person; alternatively, as an example, use "The panel considers that (...)";
- b) Avoid comments that describe or are a mere summary of elements included in the application;
- c) Avoid general and/or vague comments, such as "very weak work programme", "adequate CV", "excellent hosting conditions", etc.;
- d) Use analytic and impartial language, avoiding depreciative comments about the applicant, the work programme proposed, the supervisors, etc.;
- e) Avoid making questions since the applicant cannot reply.

3.8. Panel Meeting Report

The panel meeting report is a responsibility of all members and must be signed by all, being the chair responsible for writing it down.

The panel meeting report must include:

- a) The name of all panel members;
- b) The Col declarations of all panel members;
- c) The identification of all applications considered not assessable;
- d) The methodology adopted by the panel for particular cases;
- e) The provisional ranked list of applicants, in descending order of the final score, of all applications evaluated by the panel;
- f) Eventual vote and competence delegations for justified absence reasons.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

All applications admitted to be evaluated must be graded from 1.000 (minimum) to 5.000 (maximum) in each of the three evaluation criteria:

- A. Merit of the Applicant;
- B. Merit of the Work Programme;
- C. Merit of Hosting Conditions.

In order to decide on the concessional granting of the PhD studentships, applicants will be ranked according to the weighted average of the score obtained in the three criteria, according to the following relative weighting: 50% Merit of the Applicant (A); 25% Merit of the Work Programme (B); 25% Merit of the Hosting Conditions (C), converted into the following formula:

$$\text{Final Score} = (0.5 * A) + (0.25 * B) + (0.25 * C)$$

For purposes of tiebreak, the final ranking will be based on the scores assigned to each of the evaluation criteria in the following order: 1st criterion A (merit of the applicant), 2nd criterion B (merit of the work programme) and 3rd criterion C (merit of the hosting conditions).

Grades in any of the evaluation criteria shall be awarded with three decimal digits. Values resulting from the application of formulas shall be rounded to the third decimal digit using the following rule: when the fourth decimal digit is equal to or greater than 5 (five) it shall be rounded in excess; if lesser, the value of the third decimal digit shall be upheld.

Applicants whose application is scored with a final grade lower than 3.000 are not eligible for studentship granting.

4.1. Criterion A – Merit of the Applicant

The A criterion – Merit of the Applicant, which has a 50% relative weight to the final score, is evaluated based on two sub-criteria:

A1. **Academic career**, with a relative weight of **60%** in the Merit of the Applicant.

A2. **Personal curriculum** (reflecting the scientific and professional career), with a relative weight of **40%** in the Merit of the Applicant.

The score of criterion A – Merit of the Applicant shall be obtained by applying the following formula:

$$Criterion A = (A1 \times 0.6) + (A2 \times 0.4)$$

4.1.1 Sub-criterion A1 - Academic Career

- a. The applicant’s score in this sub-criterion directly results from the final grades of the degrees, according to the following reference table (Table 1):

Table 1: Reference table to score sub-criterion A1 – Academic Career

Final Grade Average <u>Graduate + Master degrees</u> (Pre- or Post-Bologna) or <u>Integrated Master degree</u>	Final Grade Graduate degree Pre- or Post-Bologna	Sub-criterion A1 Score Academic Career
≥ 17	-	5.0
16	-	4.0
-	≥ 17	3.5
15	-	3.5
-	16	3.0
14	-	2.5
-	15	2.5
< 14	-	1.5
-	14	1.5
-	< 14	1.0

Note: to calculate the score of sub-criterion A1 the prevailing grade is the one stated in the degree certificates.

To apply Table 1, consider the following:

- b. The final grade average of the “graduate degree + master degree” (first column of Table 1) in a pre- or post-Bologna career is a result of the simple arithmetic average of the final grade obtained in the 1st cycle/graduate degree and the final grade obtained in the 2nd cycle/master degree, by applying the following formula:

$$\text{Final Score Average (graduate degree +master)} = \frac{\text{1st cycle final grade (graduate degree)} + \text{2nd cycle final grade (master)}}{2}$$

- c. In the case of Integrated Master degrees whose institutions do not issue certificates discriminating the 1st and 2nd cycles’ final grades, consider the final grade listed in the degree certificate after conclusion of the study cycle (300 to 360 ECTS).
- d. Cases not included in any of the situations defined in Table 1, **and only those cases**, namely master degrees obtained after non-academic careers (pre-Bologna masters or 2nd cycle post-Bologna degrees not preceded by a pre-Bologna graduate degree or a 1st cycle of post-Bologna education), the reference table used to score the applicant’s academic career (A1) will be the following:

Table 2: Reference table to score the sub-criterion A1 in case of applicants holding only the master academic degree (non-academic careers)

Final Grade Master (90-120 credit points (ECTS))	Sub-criterion A1 score Academic career
≥ 18	3.5
17	3.0
16	2.5
15	1.5
≤14	1.0

Note: to calculate the score of sub-criterion A1 the prevailing grade is the one stated in the degree certificates.

- e. In case the applicant presents both an integrated master's degree certificate and a pre-Bologna or 2nd cycle master's degree, the grade obtained in the **integrated master's degree is the one to be considered**, applying therefore Table 1.
- f. To calculate the sub-criterion A1 score, in case of certificates that specify a qualitative grade only (for example, pre-Bologna master degrees), it will be converted in the terms expressed in Table 3, to calculate the final grade average (graduate degree + master degree) and consequently to ascertain the score of the academic career (by applying Table 1).
- g. To calculate sub-criterion A1, certificates that do not specify the final grade, neither quantitative nor qualitative, and certificates of foreign degrees that do not specify the converted grades to the Portuguese scale, will be equated to the minimum score (sub-criterion A1 = 1).

When applicants state more than one equivalent graduate and/or master degree, the evaluation panel has to decide which academic degrees are more adequate to the work programme and must thus be taken into account to calculate the score of the academic career. For instance, if an applicant submits a degree certificate

and more than a master's certificate, the panel should consider the master's degree that is most suitable for the development of the work programme. However, if an applicant presents both integrated master and 2nd cycle master degree certificates (without a graduate degree or a 1st cycle of studies), the panel must consider the integrated master's degree when calculating the score of the academic career, thus applying Table 1.

Table 3: Table for conversion of qualitative grades

Qualitative Grade	Converted Grade
Very good with Distinction Praise and Distinction <i>Magna Cum Laude</i> <i>Summa Cum Laude</i>	18
Very Good Approved with Distinction Good with Distinction <i>Cum Laude</i>	16
Good Approved Approved by Unanimity	14

The evaluation panel may also consider the other degrees stated by the applicant in the assessment of sub-criterion A2, therefore valuing the personal curriculum. In any case, the criteria used as decided by the panel must be fully explained in the FAF and in the panel meeting report. In order to enable the identification of the methodology to ascertain the score of the academic career sub-criterion it is suggested to consult Table 4.

Table 4: Methodology to calculate the academic career score (sub-criterion A1)

	Certificates/Declarations attached to the application ⁽¹⁾	Calculation of the academic career score (sub-criterion A1)
1	Graduate certificate + master's certificate, both with final grade ⁽²⁾	Consider the 1 st column of Table 1
2	Integrated master's certificate with single final grade (1 st +2 nd cycles)	
3	National graduate certificate, pre- or post-Bologna, with final grade ⁽²⁾ and declaration issued by the competent scientific body of the university awarding the PhD degree, proving their capacity to attend this study cycle	Consider the 2 nd column of Table 1
4	Foreign graduate certificate with grade converted to the Portuguese scale and declaration issued by the competent scientific body of the university awarding the PhD degree, proving their capacity to attend this study cycle	
5	National graduate certificate, pre- or post-Bologna, with final grade ⁽²⁾ and Master's certificate (national or foreign) without final grade (neither qualitative nor quantitative) OR , in case of foreign certificate, without grade converted to the Portuguese scale	
6	Foreign graduate certificate with grade converted to the Portuguese scale and Master's certificate (national or foreign) without final grade (neither qualitative nor quantitative) OR , in case of foreign certificate, without grade converted to the Portuguese scale	Consider a grade of 12 for the graduate degree and apply the 1 st column of Table 1
7	Graduate certificate (national or foreign) without final grade (neither qualitative nor quantitative) and national master degree certificate with final grade ⁽²⁾ OR foreign master's certificate with grade converted to the national scale	
8	Foreign graduate certificate, without grade converted to the Portuguese scale and national master degree certificate with final grade ⁽²⁾ OR master's foreign certificate with grade converted to the national scale	
9	Without graduate degree , but with one or more national master's degree certificate(s) with final grade ⁽²⁾ OR foreign master's certificate with grade converted to the national scale	Consider Table 2. In case more than one master's degree certificate is presented, select the most suitable relatively to the work programme
10	Submission of more than one graduate degree and/or master's degree (pre-Bologna or 2 nd cycle) with final grade ⁽²⁾ OR foreign certificate with grade converted to the national scale	Consider Table 1. Select the most suitable graduate degree and/or master, relatively to the work programme ⁽³⁾
11	Without graduate degree and without master degree , but with declaration issued by the competent scientific body of the university awarding the PhD degree, proving their capacity to attend this study cycle	Equivalence to the minimum grade (sub-criterion A1 = 1)
12	Graduate certificate (national or foreign) without final grade (neither qualitative nor quantitative), but with declaration issued by the competent scientific body of the university awarding the PhD degree, proving their capacity to attend this study cycle	
13	Foreign graduate certificate, without grade converted to the Portuguese scale, without master degree, but with declaration issued by the competent scientific body of the university awarding the PhD degree, proving their capacity to attend this study cycle	
14	Graduate and master's certificates (national or foreign), both without final grade (neither qualitative nor quantitative) OR without grade converted to the Portuguese scale	

⁽¹⁾ Foreign certificates may only be considered valid when their acknowledgment record is submitted, or alternatively, when a document of acknowledgment/equivalence of foreign qualifications with the corresponding Portuguese qualifications is submitted. The respective classifications may be used, only if officially converted to the Portuguese grading scale (by DGES or by a public higher education establishment), even if the classification scale used is from 1 to 20.

⁽²⁾ In case the final grade is qualitative, and before Table 1 is applied, it must be converted to a quantitative grade by applying Table 3.

⁽³⁾ In case the applicant holds both an integrated master's degree and a pre-Bologna or 2nd cycle master's degree, the grade obtained in the integrated master's degree is the one to be considered, applying therefore Table 1.

Disability Bonuses

Applicants that state a degree of disability, duly proven and equal to or above 90%, shall have a bonus of 10% on sub-criterion A1 – academic career. Applicants that state a degree of disability, duly proven, equal to or above 60% and under 90%, shall have a bonus of 5%.

Whenever there is an entitlement to a bonus, the calculation of the sub-criterion A1 – academic career score shall be obtained by applying the following formula:

$$A1 = (\text{Sub - criterion A1 Score}) \times (B) \times 0.6$$

whereby:

B= 1.1, if the disability degree is $\geq 90\%$

or

B= 1.05, if the disability degree is $\geq 60\%$ and $< 90\%$

4.1.2 Sub-criterion Personal curriculum

When assessing this sub-criterion the evaluators must review the curriculum of the applicant in an integrated way, from a global vision of the merit of their scientific and professional career. In this analysis, the evaluators may include academic results that were not included in the calculation of the "academic career" sub-criterion. It is important to consider the motivation letter and letters of recommendation (documents of mandatory submission) and the different dimensions of the curriculum that may demonstrate a relevant scientific and professional career. In particular, the quality and justification of the document or artistic achievement presented in the applicant's motivation letter as being the most representative or explicative of their scientific/professional career, must be assessed.

The score awarded shall translate the evaluator's conclusion about the whole curriculum and must be justified with the greatest detail possible, clearly and consistently, and applying the following formula:

$$\text{Personal Curriculum Score} = \text{Classification awarded to personal curriculum} \times 0.4$$

4.2. Criterion B – Merit of the Work Programme

The merit of the work programme criterion has a relative weight of 25% and takes into account three parameters:

- B1 – Justified relevance of the study object;
- B2 – Scientific quality (state of the art, methodology);
- B3 – Feasibility of the work programme.

For parameter B1, the evaluation must be based on the clear definition of aims and research questions, the potential contribution of the research project to the knowledge and advancement of science and technology.

For parameter B2, the evaluation must be based on the state of the art and on the research

methodology proposed, taking into account their clarity, consistency and coherence, in accordance with internationally accepted standards.

For parameter B3, the assessment must be based on the adequacy of the methodologies and of the supervising team relative to the tasks and aims provided in the work programme, and respective deadlines. If applicable, analysis of the risks inherent to the different stages that it integrates will also be assessed, eventually with a preliminary identification of the most critical points and the corresponding contingency measures to be adopted.

Evaluators should validate the alignment of the work programme to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development goals, identified by candidates in the application form.

4.3. Criterion C – Merit of Hosting Conditions

The merit of the hosting conditions criterion has a relative weight of 25% and takes into account two parameters:

C1 – The scientific merit, probity and experience of the supervisor in the scientific field at stake (and, if applicable, the co-supervisor(s)) and suitability with regard to the applicant's supervision;

C2 – Quality and adequacy of the host institution(s) conditions.

The evaluation of these two parameters is based on the applicant's demonstration of the supervising team suitability and of the means provided by the host institution for the full implementation of the proposed work programme. The supervisors (and co-supervisors, if they exist) must be PhD researchers in full exercise of their activity

Applications that present more than one host institution should clearly indicate the tasks to be performed in each institution, both in the merit of the hosting conditions field and in the respective timeline.

In case the application proposes one or more co-supervisors, the role of each one should be explained in order to indicate the relevance of their participation in the development and feasibility of the work programme.

When applying to a mixed BD (BD whose work programme is partially carried out in a foreign institution), it is **mandatory** to identify the foreign host institution(s), as well as to associate and lock the CV of the supervisor/co-supervisor affiliated to the foreign host institution indicated. The lack of indication of the foreign host institution and supervisor/co-supervisor in the foreign host institution implies the automatic conversion of the application to a PhD studentship in the country, being evaluated and financed accordingly.

5. STRATEGIC COORDINATION OF THE CALL

FCT will designate a Scientific Coordination Group to the Call, composed by three to five members of renowned international scientific merit, in distinct fields of knowledge. The work developed by this Group is coordinated by one of its members, by FCT invitation.

The Scientific Coordination Group will analyse the global results of all the evaluation panels, proposing to FCT a cut-off line for each panel. In this process, the Group will consider the policy guidelines for Portugal in the European context («Higher Education, Research and Innovation in Portugal – Perspectives for 2030», available at: <https://www.portugal.gov.pt/download-ficheiros/ficheiro.aspx?v=6ac404ca-9f41-4d83-ae70-6ffff158803b>), as well as the need to guarantee a highly qualified human resources framework, recognizing the disciplinary, multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary nature of scientific knowledge. The Scientific Coordination Group should also consider the need to ensure the alignment of the doctoral research to the major objectives of sustainable development at the global level, as defined in the United Nations Sustainable Development Agenda 2030, available at:

http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E.

6. PRELIMINARY HEARING

Once the provisional ranked list of the evaluation results has been communicated, applicants may use their right to dispute the proposed decision during the preliminary hearing phase, which takes place 10 working days after the communication of results.

Applicants must present the arguments they consider relevant to substantiate their dispute, which will then be examined by the panel, responsible for rectifying possible lapses or clarifying inaccuracies that may have occurred in the evaluation. This period ends with a panel meeting to discuss and analyse the statements presented at the preliminary hearing, where a new ranked list, for each evaluation panel, of applicants will be produced, translating the final results of the call.

Annex I – Minute / Model of Capacity

DECLARAÇÃO

Em conformidade com o disposto no artigo 38.º do Decreto-Lei n.º 74/2006, de 24 de março, alterado e republicado por último pelo Decreto-Lei n.º 63/2016, de 13 de setembro, e da *alínea X, do n.º X, do artigo X, do Regulamento / Despacho / Despacho Normativo / Portaria n.º X publicado(a) em Diário da República, 1.ª/2.ª série, N.º X a (dia) de (mês) de (ano)*², compete ao Conselho Científico / à Comissão Científica³ a aprovação das regras sobre a admissão / ingresso dos candidatos no ciclo de estudos conducente ao grau de doutor da Faculdade X da Universidade X.

Assim, nos termos do disposto no artigo 30.º do Decreto-Lei n.º 74/2006, de 24 de março, alterado e republicado por último pelo Decreto-Lei n.º 63/2016, de 13 de setembro, e da *alínea X, do n.º X, do artigo X, do Regulamento / Despacho n.º X publicado em Diário da República, 2.ª série, N.º X a (dia) de (mês) de (ano)*⁴, atesta-se que [nome do(a) candidato(a)] é detentor(a) de um *currículo escolar ou científico / currículo escolar, científico ou profissional*⁵ que lhe confere capacidade para a realização do ciclo de estudos conducente ao grau de doutor em [Curso de Doutoramento].

[(Local), (data)]

[assinatura do representante do órgão legal e estatutariamente competente]

² Mencionar a alínea, n.º, artigo, dos Estatutos da Universidade e/ou do Regulamento do Ciclo de Estudos ao abrigo do qual a competência de admissão ao ciclo de estudos lhe é atribuída.

³ Designar qual é o órgão legal e estatutariamente competente na instituição de ensino superior.

⁴ Mencionar a alínea, n.º, artigo, do Regulamento ou Despacho onde constam as Condições/Habilitações de acesso ao ciclo de estudos conducente ao grau de doutor na instituição de ensino superior.

⁵ Selecionar a opção correta conforme o acesso ao ciclo de estudos conducente ao grau de doutor seja feito, respetivamente, nos termos da alínea b) ou da alínea c) do n.º 1 do artigo 30.º do Decreto-Lei n.º 74/2006, de 24 de março, alterado e republicado por último pelo Decreto-Lei n.º 63/2016, de 13 de setembro.

Annex II – Scientific Fields, adapted from the FOS Classification of the Frascati Manual

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
1a Exact Sciences	1.1 Mathematics	Pure Mathematics	Mathematics
		Applied Mathematics	
		Statistics and Probability	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	1.2 Computer and Information Sciences	Computation Sciences	Computation and Information Sciences
		Information Sciences	
		Bioinformatics	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	1.3 Physical Sciences	Atomic Physics	Physics
		Molecular Physics	
		Chemical Physics	
		Condensed Matter Physics	
		Particles Physics	
		Nuclear Physics	
		Fluids and Plasma Physics	
		Optics	
		Acoustics	
		Astronomy	
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
	1.4 Chemical Sciences	Organic Chemistry	Chemistry
Inorganic Chemistry			
Nuclear Chemistry			
Physical Chemistry			
Polymer Science			
Electrochemistry			
Colloid Chemistry			
Analytical Chemistry			
Medicinal Chemistry			
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
1b Natural Sciences	1.5 Earth and related Environmental Sciences	Geosciences and Multidisciplinary Studies	Earth Sciences
		Mineralogy	
		Palaeontology	
		Geochemistry	
		Geophysics	
		Physic Geography	
		Geology	
		Volcanology	
		Meteorology	
		Atmospheric Sciences	
		Climate Research	
		Oceanography	
		Hydrology	
		Water Resources	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Natural Resources and Sustainability	Environmental Sciences	Monitoring and Environmental Impact
			Environmental Management
			Ecotoxicology
			Waste Management and Recovery
			Climate Change
			Atmosphere and Pollution
			Water and Pollution
			<i>Other, please specify:</i>
	1.6 Biological Sciences	Experimental Biology and Biochemistry	Cellular Biology
			Microbiology
			Virology
			Biochemistry
Molecular Biology			
Biochemical Research Methods			
Biophysics			
Genetics and Heredity			
Reproductive Biology			
Developmental Biology			
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			
Botany		Biological Sciences	Zoology
			Mammalogy
			Herpetology
			Ichthyology
			Ornithology
			Entomology
			Mycology
			Behavioural Biology
Marine Biology			
Aquaculture			
Freshwater Biology			
Limnology			
Ecology			
Biodiversity Conservation			
Evolutionary Biology			
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			
1.7 Other Natural Sciences	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		Environmental Sciences

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
2 Engineering and Technology	2.1 Civil Engineering	Civil Engineering	Civil Engineering
		Architecture Engineering	
		Construction Engineering	
		Municipal Engineering	
		Structural Engineering	
		Transport Engineering	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	2.2 Electrical, Electronic and Information Engineering	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	Electrical, Electronic and Information Engineering
		Robotics	
		Automation and Control Systems	
		Communication Engineering and Systems	
		Telecommunications	
		Computer Hardware and Architecture	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Informatics	Computation and Information Sciences	
	2.3 Mechanical Engineering	Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Systems	Mechanical Engineering
		Applied Mechanics	
		Thermodynamics	
		Aerospace Engineering	
		Nuclear Engineering	
		Manufacturing Processes	
Audio Engineering and Reliability Analysis			
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			
2.4 Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering	
	Chemical Process Engineering		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
2.5 Materials Engineering	Materials Engineering	Materials Engineering and Nano-technologies	
	Ceramics		
	Coating and Films		
	Composites		
	Paper and Wood		
	Textiles		
	Nano-materials		
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			
2.6 Medical Engineering	Medical Engineering and Biomedical Engineering	Bioengineering and Biotechnology	
	Laboratory Technology		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
2.7 Environmental Engineering	Environmental Engineering	Environmental Engineering	
	Geologic Engineering		
	Geotechnics		
	Petroleum engineering, Energy and Fuels		
	Remote Sensing		
	Mining and Mineral Processes		
	Maritime Engineering		
	Naval Engineering		
	Ocean Engineering		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
2 Sciences of Engineering and Technology	2.8 Environmental Biotechnology	Bioremediation	Bioengineering and Biotechnology
		Diagnostic Biotechnologies in Environmental Management;	
		Environmental Biotechnology Related Ethics	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	2.9 Industrial Biotechnology	Industrial Biotechnology	
		Bioprocessing Technologies	
		Biocatalysis	
		Fermentation	
		Bioproducts	
		Biomaterials	
		Bioplastics	
		Biofuels	
		Bio-Derived Novel Materials	
		Bio-Derived Chemicals	
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			
2.10 Nano-technology	Nano-devices	Materials Engineering and Nano-technologies	
	Nano-processes		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
2.11 Other Engineering and Technologies	Food Engineering and Technology	Agricultural and Food Technologies	
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
3 Medical and Health Sciences	3.1 Basic Medicine	Biomedicine Anatomy and Histology Human Genetics Immunology Neurosciences Pharmacology Biopharmaceuticals Toxicology Physiology Pathology <i>Other, please specify:</i>	Biomedicine
	3.2 Clinical Medicine	Andrology Obstetrics and Gynaecology Paediatrics Cardiac and Cardiovascular System Haematology Respiratory System Intensive Care Medicine and Emergency Medicine Anaesthesiology Orthopaedics Surgery Radiology, Nuclear Medicine and Medical Imaging Transplants Stomatology Oral Medicine and Surgery Dermatology Infectious Diseases Allergology Rheumatology Endocrinology and Metabolism Gastroenterology and Hepatology Urology and Nephrology Oncology Ophthalmology Otolaryngology Psychiatry Clinical Neurology Geriatrics and Gerontology General and Family Medicine Internal Medicine Integrative and Complementary Medicine <i>Other, please specify:</i>	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
3 Medical and Health Sciences	3.3 Health Sciences	Health Care and Services	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences
		Health Services and Policies	
		Nursing	
		Nutrition and Dietetics	
		Public Health and Environmental Health	
		Tropical Medicine	
		Parasitology	
		Epidemiology	
		Work Medicine	
		Occupational Health	
		Sports Sciences	
		Social Biomedical Sciences	
		Bioethics and History and Philosophy of Medicine	
		Addiction	
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
3.4 Medical Biotechnology	Biotechnology Applied to Health	Bioengineering and Biotechnology	
	Technologies involving the manipulation of Cells, Tissues, Organs or the whole Body		
	Gene-based Diagnose and Therapies		
	Medical Biotechnology Related Ethics		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
3.5 Other Medical Sciences	Forensic Chemistry and Biochemistry	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences	
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
4 Agricultural Sciences	4.1 Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Agriculture	Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
		Forestry	
		Fishery	
		Science of Soils	
		Horticulture	
		Viticulture	
		Agronomy	
		Plant Production	
		Plant Protection	
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
	4.2 Animal and Dairy Science	Zootechnical and Dairy Science	Science Animal and Veterinary Sciences
		Livestock Breeding	
		Pets	
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			
4.3 Veterinary Sciences	Veterinary Sciences		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
4.4 Agricultural and Food Biotechnology	Agricultural Biotechnology and Food Biotechnology	Agricultural and Food Technologies	
	Genetic Manipulation Technology		
	Domestic Animal Cloning		
	Selection Based on Molecular Markers		
	Diagnostics		
	Biomass Production Technologies		
	Agricultural Biotechnology Related Ethics		
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			
4.5 Other Agricultural Sciences	<i>Other, please specify:</i>	Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
5 Social Sciences	5.1 Psychology	Criminal Psychology	Psychology
		Social and Organizational Psychology	
		Cognitive Psychology and Neuropsychology	
		Clinical Psychology	
		Psychology of Development and Learning	
		Educational Psychology	
		Community and Health Psychology	
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
	5.2 Economics and Management	Economics	Economics and Management
		Management	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	5.3 Educational Sciences	General Education	Educational Sciences
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	5.4 Sociology	Sociology	Sociology
Sociologic Criminology			
Social Service			
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			
	Anthropology	Anthropology	
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
5.5 Law	Public Law	Law	
	Criminal Law		
	Private Law		
	European and International Law		
	Human Rights		
	Law, Social Sciences and Humanities		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
5.6 Political Sciences	Political Science	Political Sciences	
	Military Science		
	Compared Politics		
	Political Theory		
	International Relations		
	Public Policy		
	European Studies		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
5.7 Social and Economic Geography	Economic and Social Geography	Economic and Social Geography	
	Geographic Urbanism		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
5.8 Media and Communications	Documental and Information Sciences	Communication and Information Sciences	
	Journalism and Media		
	Science Communication and Management		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
5.9 Other Social Sciences	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		

Main Scientific Field	Secondary Scientific Field	Subfield	Evaluation Panel
6 Humanities	6.1 History and Archaeology	Prehistory and Archaeology	History and Archaeology
		Ancient History	
		Medieval History	
		Modern History	
		Contemporary History	
		History of Science and Technology	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	6.2 Languages and Literature	Literature	Literature Studies and Culture Studies
		Portuguese Studies	
		Romantic Studies	
		Anglophone Studies	
		Classical Studies	
		Asian and African Studies	
		Germanic Studies	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
		Linguistics	Linguistics
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
	6.3 Philosophy, Ethics and Religion	Epistemology and Philosophy of Science	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion
		Metaphysics and Philosophical Anthropology	
		Philosophy of Art	
Logic			
History of Philosophy			
Ethics and Political Philosophy			
Theology and Religion Philosophy			
<i>Other, please specify:</i>			
6.4 Arts	Fine Arts	Arts	
	Musicology		
	Visual Performative Arts (Cinema, Television, Drama, Dance, etc.)		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
	Art History	Museology and Art History	
	Conservation and Restoration		
	Museology		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
	Architecture and Urbanism	Design, Architecture and Urbanism	
	Land Use Planning		
	Design		
	<i>Other, please specify:</i>		
	6.5 Other Humanities	<i>Other, please specify:</i>	History and Archaeology