

Evaluation Guide

Call for PhD studentships and Post-doctoral fellowships – 2016

May 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
ABBREVIATIONS	4
1. Call	5
PhD Studentships (BD)	5
Post-doctoral fellowship (BPD)	5
2. ELEGIBILITY	5
2.1. Eligibility Requirements of Applicants	5
General Requirements	5
Specific Requirements for BD Applicants.....	6
Specific Requirements for BPD Applicants.....	6
2.2. Application Eligibility Requirements	6
Mandatory Documents	6
Optional Documents to submit with the Application Form.....	8
3. PANEL EVALUATION PROCESS	8
Guiding principles for Peer review	8
3.1. Formation of the Evaluation Panel	9
3.2. Chairing the evaluation process	9
3.3. Remote and panel meeting evaluation	10
Initial procedure: Remote evaluation of each application	10
Subsequent procedure: Meeting of the Evaluation Panel	11
3.4. Comments to be conveyed to Applicants	12
3.5. Final Minutes of the Meeting of the Evaluation Panel	12
3.6. Conflict of Interest (CDI)	13
3.7. Confidentiality	14
4. EVALUATION CRITERIA	14
4.1. Merit of the Applicant	14
4.1.1. Evaluation of the Merit of the Applicants in BD Applications	14
Bonuses and specific cases for the sub-criterion “academic path” (BD).....	16
4.1.2. Evaluation of the Merit of the Applicants in BPD applications	17
Bonuses, penalties and specific cases in the personal curriculum criteria (BPD).....	18
4.2. Merit of the Work Plan (BD and BPD applications)	19
4.3. Merit of Host conditions (BD and BPD applications).....	20
Annex I – Scientific Areas, adapted from the FOS Classification in the Frascati Manual	21

ABBREVIATIONS

BD – PhD studentship

BPD – Post-doctoral fellowship

CDI – Conflict of Interest

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

FAI – Individual Evaluation Report

FPC – Pre-consensus Report

FAF – Final Evaluation Report

ORCID – Open Researcher and Contributor Identifier

1. Call

In 2016 there will be a single call for applications, for: PhD studentships and Post-doctoral fellowships.

PhD Studentships (BD)

Are aimed at applicants seeking to develop research work leading to the academic degree of Doctor and who satisfy the necessary enrolment conditions for the corresponding cycle of studies.

As a rule, the studentship is annual, renewable up to a maximum of four years. The work plan may be carried out fully or partially at a Portuguese institution (with studentships held in Portugal or mixed studentships), or fully at a foreign institution (studentships held abroad).

Post-doctoral fellowship (BPD)

Are intended for PhD holders, preferably those who obtained the degree less than six years prior to the call, to carry out advanced research at Portuguese scientific institutions of renowned competence.

As a rule, the duration of the fellowship is annual, renewable up to a maximum of six years, pending favourable evaluation at the end of the first three years. Exceptionally, and depending on budget availability of the funding agency, a BPD may include periods abroad, up to a maximum of one year for PhDs awarded in Portugal and six months for PhDs awarded abroad.

2. ELEGIBILITY

2.1. Eligibility Requirements of Applicants

General Requirements

- To be a Portuguese citizen or a citizen of another European Member State.
- To be a citizen of a third-country, holding a valid residence permit, or to have acquired long-term resident status, in accordance with the terms set out in Law no. 23/2007 of 4 July, amended by Law no. 29/2012 of 9 August.
- To be a citizen of third-countries with which Portugal has reciprocity agreements.
- In the case of BPD, foreign citizens who are non-residents in Portugal may also apply, as long as the application is underwritten by an institution of the Portuguese science and technology system, and the work plan takes place entirely in Portugal;
- Only citizens (Portuguese or foreign) who are able to provide proof of permanent and regular

residence in Portugal may apply to studentships/fellowships with work plans taking place totally or partially in foreign institutions.

Specific Requirements for BD Applicants

- To have finished, at the time of application submission, a Masters degree, or alternatively, to comply, at that date, with the conditions for access to the cycle of studies leading to the PhD degree, specified in sub-paragraph a) or c) of article no. 30 of Decree-Law no.74/2006 of 24 March, amended by Decree-Law no.115/2013 of 7 August.
- Not have been selected for a studentship within any FCT PhD programme, irrespective of type (research fellowship, PhD studentship or PhD studentship in industry) or duration.
- Not have benefited from a PhD studentship or PhD studentship in industry directly financed by FCT, irrespective of its duration.

Specific Requirements for BPD Applicants

- To have concluded a PhD degree at time of application submission.
- Not have benefited from a BPD directly funded by FCT, irrespective of its duration.

2.2. Application Eligibility Requirements

Mandatory Documents

It is absolutely required, under penalty of the application not being accepted, to follow the procedures described below and to upload the following documents to the application form (applicable to BD and BPDs).

- To update the applicant's Curriculum Vitae (CV) on the FCT-SIG or DeGóis platforms.
- To ensure that the scientific supervisor associates him/herself to the application and that he/she locks his/her CV to the application.
- To ensure that the co-supervisor(s) associate themselves to the application and lock their CVs (this procedure is only applicable if the applicant opts to indicate a co-supervisor(s)).
- The work plan to be developed (note that attendance of lectures of a doctoral programme may not be considered to be part of a work plan)
- A motivation letter.
- Two reference letters.

It is also absolutely required, under penalty of the application not being accepted, to submit the following documents, for each type of studentship/fellowship.

PhD studentships:

- Certificates of all the academic degrees obtained, specifying the final grade, and preferably, the grades obtained in all subjects. Thus, for post-Bologna degrees a certificate for the first and second cycle of studies should be submitted, or in case the degree is not two-stage, an integrated Masters certificate; for “pre-Bologna” degrees both the first degree (Bachelors) and Masters certificates should be submitted.
- Applicants that do not hold a Masters degree will have to provide a statement attesting to their capacity to carry out the cycle of studies, issued by the legally binding scientific body of the university they wish to attend for their PhD. If applicants have already been accepted in the PhD Programme for which they are applying for a studentship, proof of admission to the programme is sufficient. Proof of enrolment in ongoing or completed PhD programmes, where the institutions that award the degree/ or run the PhD programme are different to the one shown in the application for the studentship, will not be accepted.
- In the case of academic degrees awarded by foreign institutions, registration of recognition of such degrees and the respective conversions of the final scores (if applicable) to the Portuguese grade scale, issued by the Direção-Geral do Ensino Superior or by a Portuguese public higher education institution should be submitted (as regulated by Decree-Law no.341/2007 of 12 October). Alternatively, proof of recognition/equivalence of foreign qualifications to the corresponding Portuguese qualifications, provided by a Portuguese public higher education institution should be submitted (as regulated by Decree-Law no.283/83 of 21 June). Applicants are advised to visit the website of the Direção-Geral do Ensino Superior (DGES) for more information: <http://www.dges.mctes.pt>.
- A document that the applicant considers to be as the most representative of his/her scientific/professional path (see evaluation criteria below).

Post-doctoral fellowships:

- PhD certificate.
- For PhD degrees obtained at a foreign institution, proof of registration/equivalence of the foreign qualification to the corresponding Portuguese qualification is mandatory. However, this may occur upon provisional granting of the fellowship during the contracting stage.

- Therefore, either at the application stage, or, later, during the contracting stage, it is necessary to submit either proof of recognition of the PhD degree, issued by the Direção-Geral do Ensino Superior or by a Portuguese public higher education institution (as regulated by Decree-Law no.341/2007 of 12 October), or, alternatively, proof of recognition/equivalence of foreign qualifications to the corresponding Portuguese qualifications, provided by a Portuguese public higher education institution should be submitted (as regulated by Decree-Law no.283/83 of 21 June).

Applicants are advised to visit the website of the Direção-Geral do Ensino Superior (DGES) to obtain the registration/equivalence of the foreign PhD degree: <http://www.dges.mctes.pt>.

If registry/proof of equivalence is provided after application, it is necessary to attach the PhD certificate to the application form, in one of the following languages: Portuguese, Spanish, English, or French.

- One or two documents that the applicant considers to be as the most representative of his/her scientific/professional path (see evaluation criteria below).

Optional Documents to submit with the Application Form

It is optional to submit the following documents:

- The applicant's ORCID code. ORCID registration is recommended but does not substitute submission of the up-to-date CV on the FCT-SIG or DeGóis platform.
- The ORCID code of the scientific supervisor (and co-supervisor(s), if any).
- Proof of permanent or long-term resident status in Portugal, when necessary. This document may be submitted upon provisional awarding of the fellowship, during the contracting stage, as long as the date of emission is equal to or previous to the application deadline, and if it is still valid at the time the contract is signed. Applicants are advised to read the Application Guide.

3. PANEL EVALUATION PROCESS

Guiding principles for Peer review

It is FCT's mission to assure the overall scientific quality of the peer review process:

- The evaluators will give precedence to quality and originality over quantity. This principle applies irrespectively of what is at stake, be it academic degrees, CVs, career progression or work plans. The scientific content represents the core of peer review, thus requiring an **integrated view** of all

the components of a scientific career, or of a research work plan. Counts of scientific papers and the cumulative impact factor, for example, do not in themselves or on their own allow the identification of the characteristics that define the quality of scientific accomplishments and career paths, namely, “originality”, “consistency and coherence”, and “contribution to the advancement of knowledge”.

- Impartiality and transparency are the fundamental principles of evaluation decisions. All applications are treated and evaluated in an impartial manner, grounded on their merit and independently of origin or the applicant’s identity.

3.1. Formation of the Evaluation Panel

The evaluation panels are constituted by experts of renowned scientific merit and experience, selected to undertake evaluation of the submitted applications. The following criteria are applied in setting up the panel, whenever possible: broad subject and multidisciplinary range, gender balance and institutional diversity.

Each panel is chaired, on invitation by FCT, by one of its members, who has the responsibility to assure that the evaluation exercise is undertaken with transparency, impartiality and equity. The chair of each panel will be a researcher of renowned scientific merit. The chair may never be a supervisor or co-supervisor of applicants in the evaluation exercise, even if the applications have been submitted in different scientific areas to that of the panel; the chair should not evaluate any application.

The evaluation panels will be formed according to the adapted *OECD’s Revised Field of Science and Technology Classification in the Frascati Manual* (see Annex I). Depending on the number of applications received in each panel, these may be subdivided by type of studentship/fellowship (BD/BPD).

Applications will be automatically attributed to different panels according to the main scientific area, secondary scientific area and sub-areas indicated by the applicant, in compliance with Annex I. The scientific areas and sub-areas identified by the applicant **cannot be changed by the evaluation panel**.

The evaluation guide and constitution of the panel are made public on the FCT website. The chairs will be known when the call for applications opens; the remaining panel members will be known when applications close and before the panel meeting.

3.2. Chairing the evaluation process

The chair of each evaluation panel receives from FCT a set of access codes that will allow online access to all the applications submitted to his/her evaluation panel.

In collaboration with FCT the chair is responsible for:

- Assuring that the evaluation exercise is transparent, impartial and fair.
- Verifying that the applications match the panel.
- Allocating the applications for remote evaluation and indicating the first reader of each application.
- Identifying and solving possible conflicts of interest.
- Ensuring that all panel members know and apply the criteria and sub-criteria established, and respective weighting.
- Ensure that evaluators comply with deadlines for writing individual evaluation reports and pre-consensus reports (if applicable).
- Ensuring that in the individual and pre-consensus evaluation reports, evaluators justify their classifications substantially and clearly, allowing full understanding of the evaluation and score assigned to each applicant.
- Chairing the panel meetings and ensuring a collegial consensus and decision process.
- Ensuring that the final evaluation report is completed by the end of the panel meeting.
- Ensuring that the comments underpinning the decisions are made following what is established in this guide, in accordance with the applicable legislation, that they are consistent and coherent.
- Naming a substitute chairperson if needed.
- Producing the panel meeting minutes with all panel members.
- Cooperating with FCT in solving problems and/or unforeseen events that may happen before, during and/or after a panel meeting.
- Coordinating the process of the appeals.

3.3. Remote and panel meeting evaluation

Initial procedure: Remote evaluation of each application

- Each application is individually evaluated by at least two members of the evaluation panel.
- If any of the evaluators has a conflict of interest with any of the applications, he/she should declare it formally to the chair and to the evaluation panel. In this case, the application may not be assigned to that evaluator. Any statement of conflict of interest should be included in the

meeting report.

- Whenever deemed necessary, the chair may, during the remote evaluation period, ask FCT for the opinion of an external expert or, if necessary, for an additional evaluator to join the panel.
- An application may be deemed non-assessable if it is considered to move substantially away from the panel's scientific area of expertise (a final classification equivalent to zero is awarded). The evaluation panel shall, as a whole, validate this decision during the evaluation panel meeting; the decision should be clearly stated and justified in the panel meeting minutes.
- The individual evaluation is carried out online, in writing; the evaluators should remotely fill in an individual evaluation form, for each application that is assigned to him/her.
- In the individual evaluation report, evaluators should separately classify the three evaluation criteria (see below) and write the respective comments justifying the grade given.
- For each application, one of the evaluators will be the first reader.
- When the individual evaluation reports are finished it is the first reader's task to write the pre-consensus report (FPC), in a timescale defined by FCT and always before the panel meeting, where all the reports are considered and validated. The pre-consensus report implies an agreement between evaluators regarding the comments and the provisional final grade.
- In the event that it is not possible for the two evaluators to come to an agreement, the pre-consensus report should not be completed. It shall be the chair's task to ensure the final consensus on evaluation for that application, based on the individual evaluation reports and on the pre-consensus report, during the panel meeting, resorting, if necessary, to the opinion of a further evaluator or of an external reviewer.

Subsequent procedure: Meeting of the Evaluation Panel

The objectives of the meeting of the evaluation panel are:

- To analyse the merit of the applications submitted to the panel, based on the individual evaluation reports and the pre-consensus report (if any) and on the provisional ranking proposed, which comes out of the classifications in the two individual evaluation reports.
- To provide a collective and collegial dialogue on the merit of each application. During the meeting the evaluators, the first readers in particular should be prepared to briefly present the strengths and weaknesses of each of the applications assigned to them. Any panel member, irrespectively of his/her area of expertise, may question and comment the information supplied

or the opinion of any other member.

When discussing the relative merit of the applications, if an evaluator or the chair has a conflict of interest, he/she shall have to leave the room and shall appoint someone from among the remaining panel members to replace him/her while absent from the meeting.

- To proceed to the completion and validation of the final evaluation report (FAF). The elaboration of the final evaluation report is the first reader's responsibility, and should take into account the individual evaluation reports and the pre-consensus report, as well as the discussion and collegial panel opinion.
- To produce the final ranked list of all applications. All panel members are responsible for the discussion of the relative merit of each application, and for the production of a single ranked list of applicants, per panel and per type of studentship/fellowship.

3.4. Comments to be conveyed to Applicants

- Evaluators should pay attention to the requirement of giving clear, coherent and solid justification for the scores awarded. It is the responsibility of the chair to ensure that in the completion of the final evaluation report the evaluators justify their score with substantive arguments that allow understanding of the evaluation carried out, identifying the strong and weak points, under each criterion. Thus comments of a generic nature will not be accepted, namely "the work plan is very weak", "adequate CV", etc.
- Besides the comments qualifying the score awarded for each of the three evaluation criteria, the final evaluation report to the applicants shall give an explanation for any bonuses (e.g., disabilitybonus) or penalties awarded, as well as for non-awarding of the bonuses.

Furthermore, the evaluation panel shall follow the general recommendations below about the comments justifying the scores:

- Avoid comments which describe or are a summary of items contained in the application;
- Do not use the first person.
- Use an analytical and impartial language, avoiding derogatory comments on the applicant, the work plan, the supervisor, etc.
- Avoid asking questions, given that the applicant is unable to respond.

3.5. Final Minutes of the Meeting of the Evaluation Panel

The minutes of the meeting of the panel are the responsibility of all panel members and should be

signed by all; its writing up the coordinator's responsibility.

The report should include:

- The name of all those participating in the Evaluation Panel meeting;
- A list of any conflicts of interest;
- The identification of the applications considered to be non-assessable.
- The ranking of the applicants.
- Any proxy voting that may have occurred, for duly justified reasons of absence.

3.6. Conflict of Interest (CDI)

If the evaluation panel chair has a conflict of interest with an application submitted to the panel, this should be declared to FCT at the beginning of the process of allocating the applications to evaluators.

If an evaluator has a conflict of interest with any of the applications, he/she should declare it formally to the chair of his/her panel with the maximum advance. In this case the panel chair should not allocate the given application(s) to this evaluator.

Declarations of conflicts of interest are required to be included in the panel meeting minutes. The chair of the evaluation panel, in collaboration with FCT, has the responsibility to compile a list mentioning the reference of the application, as well as the name of the applicant and of the evaluator in conflict of interest.

Conflicts of interest of a chair or evaluators include but are not limited to:

- Belonging to the host institution specified in the application (Department or Research Unit);
- Having published articles with the applicant or with supervisor(s), co-supervisor(s) of the applicant up to three years before the application deadline;
- Having ongoing, or planned, scientific cooperation with the applicant, supervisor(s) or co-supervisor(s);
- Having a family relationship with the applicant, supervisor(s) or co-supervisor(s);
- Having any scientific or personal conflict with the applicant, supervisor(s) or co-supervisor(s);
- Any other situation which may raise reservations, either on the part of the applicant or of an external body, regarding their capacity to impartially assess the application.

3.7. Confidentiality

Confidentiality of all applications should be assured and protected, at all times. All reviewers shall sign a confidentiality agreement regarding the content of the applications, as well as events occurring during the evaluation process, so that they are not allowed to copy, quote or use any form of material contained within the applications.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

All applications should be scored from 1,000 (minimum) to 5,000 (maximum) on the three evaluation criteria:

- i) Merit of the applicant.
- ii) Merit of the Work plan
- iii) Merit of the Host institution

For subsequent decision making about the granting of a studentship/fellowship, applicants will be ranked according to the weighted average of the scores of the three criteria. The three evaluation criteria, i) to iii) will have relative weights of, respectively, 40%, 30%, 30% for BD, and 40%, 40%, 20% for BPD.

In case of a tie, the score awarded to the merit of the applicant will be considered, and if the tie persists, the score awarded to the work plan. The score awarded to the merit of the host institution will be the third criterion used in case of a tie.

The scores of any of the evaluation criteria include three decimal places. The values resulting from the application of the algorithm will be rounded to the third decimal place, according to the following criteria: when the fourth decimal place is equal to or above five it will be rounded up; if below five, the value of the third decimal place will be kept.

4.1. Merit of the Applicant

4.1.1. Evaluation of the Merit of the Applicants in BD Applications

The merit of the applicant to a PhD studentship is evaluated by two sub-criteria:

- i) Academic path (from a baseline score), with a 60% weight on the applicant's merit.
- ii) Personal curriculum (which reflects the applicant's scientific and professional path), with a 40% weight on the applicants merit.

a) Academic Path subcriterion in BD applications

The applicant’s classification for the sub-criterion “Academic Path” results from the final classification of the first and second cycles of studies (or only from the first cycle, when applicable), in accordance with the reference table for the definition of the baseline score (Table 1).

Table 1: Reference table for the definition of the baseline score

Final Average First (Bachelors) + Masters or Integrated Masters	Final Classification Pre or Post-Bologna First Degree (Bachelors)	Baseline Score
≥ 17	-	5,000
16	-	4,000
-	≥ 17	3,500
15	-	3,500
-	16	3,000
14	-	2,500
-	15	2,500
<14	-	1,500
-	14	1,500
-	<14	1,000

The following applies for Table 1:

- The final average of “Bachelors+Masters” (first column in Table 1) in a post or pre-Bologna path, results from the arithmetic average of the final score attained in the first study cycle/Bachelors and the final score attained in the second study cycle/Masters, by applying the following algorithm:

$$\text{Final Average (Bachelors +Masters)} = \frac{\text{final score 1st cycle (Bachelors)} + \text{final score 2nd cycle (Masters)}}{2}$$

The average score resulting from application of the algorithm will be rounded to units, according to the following criteria: when the first decimal place is equal to or above five it will be rounded up; when it is below five the unit value will be kept.

- In the event of Integrated Masters whose institutions do not issue certificates with the 1st and 2nd cycle final scores, the final grade registered on the degree certificate after completion of the cycle of studies (300 to 360 ECTS) will be considered.
- The cases which do not fall within any of the situations in Table 1, namely Masters obtained after non-academic paths, e.g., Masters that are not preceded either by a post-Bologna 1st

cycle of studies or by a pre-Bologna Bachelors, will be specifically analysed and resolved by the evaluators.

- The certificates that do not specify the final grade (either quantitative or qualitative) will be equated to the minimum grade (baseline score = 1), for the purpose of scoring the “merit of the applicant” in the sub-criteria “academic path”.

Bonuses and specific cases for the sub-criterion “academic path” (BD)

- In the case of certificates that specify only one qualitative classification (for example pre-Bologna Masters), this will be converted as defined in Table 2, for the purpose of calculation of the final average (Bachelors+Masters) and the subsequent calculation of the baseline score (third column in Table 1).

Table 2: Table for qualitative to quantitative grade conversion

Qualitative Grade	Quantitative Conversion
Very Good with Distinction / with Distinction and Honours	18
Very Good /Approved with Distinction	16
Good/Approved/Approved by Unanimity	14

- Applicants that show duly proven incapacity equal to or higher than 90% will have a bonus equivalent to 10% of the baseline score. Applicants that show a duly proven incapacity equal to or higher than 60% will have a bonus equivalent to 5% of the baseline score.
- When applicants provide proof of more than one Bachelors or Masters degree, it is up to the evaluation panel to decide which academic degrees are the most adequate for the work plan and should therefore be considered for the baseline score in the sub-criterion “academic path”. The evaluation panel may also consider all the degrees shown by the applicant in evaluating the personal curriculum. In either case, the criteria applied should be made clear in the minutes and in the final evaluation report.

The score for the sub-criterion “academic path” shall be obtained using the following algorithm:

$$Academic\ path\ score = (baseline\ score) \times \left(1 + \frac{bonus\ \%}{100}\right) \times 0,6$$

b) **“Personal curriculum” sub-criterion in BD applications**

In the assessment of this sub-criterion the evaluators should analyse the curriculum of the applicant in an integrated way, starting from a global overview of the applicant’s scientific and professional path. It is important to consider the motivation and reference letters (mandatory documents) and the several dimensions of the curriculum that may demonstrate relevant scientific and professional career paths. In particular the document that the applicant submits as the most representative of his/her scientific/professional path should be assessed for its quality. This document may be:

- a scientific publication (paper in a national or international peer-review journal, book, a book chapter, a paper or a communication at a national or international conference, a report, Bachelor or Masters thesis, etc.);

or,

- proof of scientific or professional achievement (a *performance*, an artistic work, etc.).

The score should convey the evaluator’s conclusion on the global curriculum and should be justified in as much detail as possible, and in a clear and consistent way, identifying the strong and the weak points.

The score of the “personal curriculum” sub-criterion will be calculated by the following algorithm:

$$\text{Personal curriculum score} = \text{personal curriculum score} \times 0,4$$

c) **Total score for the merit of the applicants in BD applications**

In compliance with the aforementioned paragraphs, the total score for the merit of the applicants to a PhD studentship is obtained by the following algorithm:

Total Merit of the Applicant score

$$= (\text{baseline score}) \times \left(1 + \frac{\text{bonus \%}}{100}\right) \times 0,6 + (\text{personal curriculum score} \times 0,4)$$

4.1.2. Evaluation of the Merit of the Applicants in BPD applications

The merit of the applicant to a post-doctoral fellowship is evaluated on a single criterion: the personal curriculum (which reflects the applicant’s scientific and professional path).

Personal curriculum criterion in BPD applications

In the assessment of this criterion the evaluators should analyse the curriculum of the applicant in an integrated way, starting from a global overview of the applicant's scientific and professional career path. It is important to consider the motivation and reference letters (mandatory documents) and the several dimensions of the curriculum that may demonstrate relevant scientific and professional career paths. In particular, the quality of the one or two documents that the applicant submits as the most representative of his/her scientific/professional path should be assessed for its quality. These documents may be:

- A scientific publication, such as papers in national or international peer-review journals, books, chapters of books, papers or communications at national or international conferences, scientific reports, PhD thesis, among others;

or,

- Proof of scientific and professional achievements, such as a *performance* or an artistic work.

The score will convey the evaluator's conclusion on the global curriculum and should be justified in as much detail as possible, and in a clear and consistent way, identifying the strong and the weak points.

Bonuses, penalties and specific cases in the personal curriculum criteria (BPD)

A bonus equivalent to 20% of the "personal curriculum" score will be awarded to applicants that obtained their PhD in a Portuguese university, and that concomitantly intend to do a post-doc:

- At a different host institution to the one that awarded their degree

or,

- In a different region of Portugal to the one where the PhD host institution is located, even if the host institution belongs to the same university as the one that awarded the degree;

or,

- At the same institution where they obtained their PhD degree, after a two-year (at least) professional or scientific path away from the institution.

- A penalty will be applied to applicants that have obtained the doctorate degree more than 72 months prior to application. The penalty will be, equivalent to 20% of the score awarded to the "personal curriculum" criterion. This procedure values applicants who have finished their PhD more recently and looks to allow academic/professional paths to be more comparable, since these usually improve with elapsed time.

To assess time elapsed after the PhD degree, the number of months between the PhD degree

award and the application deadline will be counted. This period of time will be reduced by 12 months for each duly proven maternity/paternity leave taken **after** the PhD degree. After this assessment, applicants having obtained a PhD degree more 72 months prior to application will be penalised.

- Applicants that show duly proven incapacity equal to or higher than 90% will have a bonus equivalent to 10% of the score awarded to the “personal curriculum” criterion. Applicants that show duly proven incapacity equal to or higher than 60% and lower than 90% will have a bonus of 5%.
- Whenever applicants show proof of more than one PhD, it will be up to the evaluation panel to decide which of the academic degrees is the most adequate for the work plan and should therefore be considered. The evaluation panel may also consider all the degrees indicated by the applicant for the evaluation of the personal curriculum; for the purposes of bonuses and/or penalties the longest-held degree will be considered. Whichever the case, the criteria that are applied should be clearly described in the minutes and in the final evaluation report.

The final total score for the merit of the applicant to a post-doctoral fellowship is calculated by the following algorithm:

$$\text{Total Merit of the Applicant Score}(a) = CP \times \left(1 + \frac{B1}{100} + \frac{B2}{100} - \frac{P1}{100} \right)$$

where:

CP = Personal curriculum score

B1 = 20(%), in the event of entitlement to a bonus for change of institution/region for the post-doc relative to the PhD degree

B2 = 10(%) or 5(%), in the event of entitlement to a bonus due to proven disability

P1 = 20(%), in the event of application of a penalty due to more than 72 months elapsing since award of PhD degree

4.2. Merit of the Work Plan (BD and BPD applications)

For applicants to a BD this criterion has a 30% weight. For applicants to a BPD, who should have a more consolidated work plan, this criterion carries a 40% weight.

The evaluator shall assess the merit of the work plan based on the following three main quality criteria of a research plan:

- Substantiated relevance of the object of study;
- Scientific approach (state of the art, methodology);

- Viability of the work plan.

As regards the relevance of the object of study the following should be considered: a clear definition of the goals and research questions; the potential contribution of the project to the existing body of knowledge and to the advancement of science and technology; if relevant, its possible socioeconomic impact.

Regarding the scientific approach the merit of the state of the art that is described, and of the proposed methodology should be considered, underlined by their clearness, consistency and coherence, in accordance with internationally accepted standards.

As regards the viability of the work plan, the suitability of human resources and the proposed methodologies to the tasks and predicted goals in the work plan and respective deadlines should be assessed. If applicable, a analyses of inherent risks to the different stages that make up the work plan should be analysed, potentially with preliminary identification of critical points and the contingency measures to be adopted.

The score translates the evaluator's conclusion about the three dimensions, in an integrated way, and should be justified in as much detail as possible, in a clear and consistent way.

4.3. Merit of Host conditions (BD and BPD applications)

For applicants to a BD this criterion will have a 30% weight. For BPD this criterion will have a 20% weight.

The evaluators will assess the merit of the conditions offered by the host institution based on two main dimensions that underpin the quality of supervision and the framework of institutional and research team support for a PhD student or post-doctoral fellow:

- The scientific merit, and the established competencies and experience of the supervisor (and co-supervisors if any) in the relevant scientific area;
- The quality of the working conditions and of supervision of the applicant, as assessed by the adequacy of the research team and of the means made available by the research unit for the full accomplishment of the proposed work plan. This evaluation is based on the applicant's description of the suitability of the means available at the institution where the work plan will take place.

The score reflects the evaluator's conclusion about the two dimensions considered, in an integrated way; it should be justified in as much detail as possible, and in a clear and consistent way.

Annex I – Scientific Areas, adapted from the FOS Classification in the Frascati Manual

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Sub-area	Evaluation Panel (BD and BDP)
1a Exact Sciences	1.1 Mathematics	Pure Mathematics	Mathematics
		Applied Mathematics	
		Statistics and Probability	
		Other, please specify:	
	1.2 Computer and Information Sciences	Computer Sciences	Computer and Information Sciences
		Information Sciences	
		Bioinformatics	
		Other, please specify:	
	1.3 Physical Sciences	Atomic Physics	Physics
		Molecular Physics	
		Chemical Physics	
		Condensed Matter Physics	
		Particle Physics	
		Nuclear Physics	
		Fluids and Plasma Physics	
		Optics	
		Acoustics	
		Astronomy	
	Other (please specify):		
	1.4 Chemical Sciences	Organic Chemistry	Chemistry
		Inorganic Chemistry	
		Nuclear Chemistry	
		Physical Chemistry	
		Polymer Science	
Electrochemistry			
Colloid Chemistry			
Analytical Chemistry			
Other (please specify)			

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Sub-aarea	Evaluation Panel (BD and BDP)	
1b Natural Sciences	1.5 Earth Sciences and Environmental Sciences	Geosciences and Multidisciplinary Studies	Earth Sciences	
		Mineralogy		
		Palaeontology		
		Geochemistry		
		Geophysics		
		Physical Geography		
		Geology		
		Volcanology		
		Meteorology		
		Atmospheric Sciences		
		Climatic Research		
		Oceanography		
		Hydrology		
		Water Resources		
		Other (please specify)		
	Environmental Sciences	Environmental Sciences and Other Natural Sciences		
	1.6. Biological Sciences	Cell biology	Cell biology	Experimental Biology and Biochemistry
			Microbiology	
			Virology	
			Biochemistry	
			Molecular Biology	
			Biochemical Research Methods	
			Mycology	
			Biophysics	
			Genetics and Heredity	
			Reproductive Biology	
			Developmental Biology	
		Botany	Botany	Biological Sciences
			Zoology	
			Mammalogy	
Herpetology				
Ichthyology				
Ornithology				
Entomology				
Behavioural Sciences				
Biology				
Marine Biology				
Aquaculture				
Freshwater Biology				
Limnology				
Ecology				
Biodiversity Conservation				
Evolutionary Biology				
Other (please specify)				
1.7 Other Natural Sciences	Other (please specify)	Environmental Sciences and Other Natural Sciences		

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Sub-area	Evaluation Panel (BD and BDP)
2 Engineering Sciences and Technology	2.1 Civil Engineering	Civil Engineering	Civil Engineering
		Architecture Engineering	
		Construction Engineering	
		Municipal Engineering	
		Structural Engineering	
		Transport Engineering	
	Other (please specify):		
	2.2 Electrical Engineering, Electronic Engineering and Information Engineering	Electrical and Electronic Engineering	Electrical Engineering, Electronic Engineering and Information Engineering
		Robotics	
		Automation and control systems	
		Communication Engineering and Systems	
		Telecommunications	
		Computer Hardware and Architecture	
	Other (please specify):		
	2.3 Mechanical Engineering	Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Systems	Mechanical Engineering
		Applied Mechanics	
		Thermodynamics	
		Aerospace Engineering	
		Nuclear Related Engineering	
		Manufacturing Processes	
		Audio Engineering and Reliability Analysis	
	Other (please specify):		
	2.4 Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering	Chemical Engineering
		Chemical Process Engineering	
		Other (please specify):	
	2.5 Material Engineering	Materials Engineering	Materials Engineering
		Ceramics	
		Coatings and Films	
Composites			
Paper and Wood			
Textiles			
Other (please specify):			
2.6 Medical Engineering	Medical and Biomedical Engineering	Bioengineering and Biotechnology	
	Laboratory Technology		
	Other (please specify):		
2.7 Environmental Engineering	Environmental Engineering	Environmental Engineering and Environmental Biotechnology	
	Geological Engineering		
	Geotechnics		
	Petroleum Engineering, Energy and Fuels		
	Remote Sensing		
	Mining and Mineral Processing		
	Marine Engineering		
	Sea Vessels		
	Ocean Engineering		
Other (please specify):			

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Sub-area	Evaluation Panel (BD and BDP)
2 Engineering Sciences and Technology	2.8 Environmental Biotechnology	Environmental Biotechnology	Environmental Engineering and Environmental Biotechnology
		Bioremediation	
		Diagnostic Biotechnologies in Environmental Management	
		Environmental Biotechnology Related Ethics	
		Other (please specify)	
	2.9 Industrial Biotechnology	Industrial Biotechnology	Bioengineering and Biotechnology
		Bioprocessing Technologies	
		Biocatalysis	
		Fermentation	
		Bioproducts	
		Biomaterials	
		Bioplastics	
		Biofuels	
		Bio-derived New Materials	
		Bio-derived Chemicals	
	Other (please specify)		
	2.1 Nanotechnology	Nanomaterials	Nanotechnologies
Nanoprocesses			
Other (please specify)			
2.11 Other Engineering Sciences and Technologies	Food Engineering and Technologies	Agricultural and Food Technologies and Other Engineering Sciences and Technologies	
	Other (please specify)		

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Sub-area	Evaluation Panel (BD and BDP)
3 Medical and Health sciences	3.1 Basic Medicine	Biomedicine	Biomedicine and Basic Medicine
		Anatomy and Histology	
		Human Genetics	
		Immunology	
		Neurosciences	
		Pharmacology	
		Medicinal Chemistry	
		Toxicology	
		Physiology	
		Pathology	
		Other (please specify):	
	3.2 Clinical Medicine	Andrology	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences
		Obstetrics and Gynaecology	
		Paediatrics	
		Cardiac and Cardiovascular Systems	
		Haematology	
		Respiratory System	
		Critical Care Medicine and Emergency Medicine	
		Anaesthesiology	
		Orthopaedics	
		Surgery	
		Radiology, Nuclear Medicine and Medical Imaging	
		Transplantation	
		Stomatology	
		Oral Surgery and Medicine	
		Dermatology	
		Infectious Diseases	
		Allergology	
		Rheumatology	
		Endocrinology and Metabolism	
		Gastroenterology and Hepatology	
		Urology and Nephrology	
		Oncology	
Ophthalmology			
Otorhinolaryngology			
Psychiatry			
Clinical Neurology			
Geriatrics and Gerontology			
General and Family Medicine			
Internal Medicine			
Other Clinical Medicine Areas			
Integrative and Complementary Medicine			
Other (please specify):			

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Subarea	Evaluation Panel (BD and BDP)
3 Medical and Health sciences	3.3 Health Sciences	Health Care and Services	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences
		Health Policy and Services	
		Nursing	
		Nutrition and Dietetics	
		Public and Environmental Health	
		Tropical Medicine	
		Parasitology	
		Infectious Diseases	
		Epidemiology	
		Occupational Medicine	
		Occupational Health	
		Sports Sciences	
		Social Biomedical Sciences	
		Bioethics and History and Philosophy of Medicine	
	Other		
	Other (please specify)		
	3.4 Medical Biotechnology	Health-related Biotechnology	Bioengineering and Biotechnology
		Technologies involving the manipulation of Cells, Tissues, Organs or the whole Organism	
		Gene-based Diagnostics and Therapeutic Interventions	
		Biomaterials	
Medical Biotechnology Related Ethics			
Other (please specify)			
3.5 Other Natural Sciences	Forensic Science	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences	
	Other (please specify)		

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Sub-area	Evaluation Panel (BD and BDP)
4 Agricultural Sciences	4.1 Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Agriculture	Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and other Agricultural Sciences
		Forestry	
		Fisheries	
		Soil Science	
		Horticulture	
		Viticulture	
		Agronomy	
		Plants Breeding and Plant Protection	
	Other (please specify):		
	4.2 Animal and Dairy Science	Animal and Dairy Science	Animal and Veterinary Sciences
		Cattle Farming / Husbandry	
		Pets	
	4.3 Veterinary Science	Other (please specify)	
		Veterinary Science	
	4.4 Agricultural Biotechnology and Food Biotechnology	Other (please specify):	Agricultural and Food Technologies and Other Engineering Sciences and Technologies
		Agricultural Biotechnology and Food Biotechnology	
		Genetic Manipulation Technology	
		Livestock Cloning	
		Marker assisted selection	
		Diagnostics	
Biomass feedstock Manufacturing Technologies			
Transgenic Biopharming			
Ethics Related to Agricultural Biotechnology			
Other (please specify)			
4.5 Other Agricultural Sciences	Other (please specify)	Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and other Agricultural Sciences	

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Sub-area	Evaluation Panel (BD and BPD)
5 Social Sciences	5.1 Psychology	Psychology	Psychology
		Other (please specify)	
	5.2 Economics and Management	Economics	Economics and Management
		Management	
		Other (please specify)	
	5.3 Educational Sciences	General Education	Educational Sciences
		Other (please specify)	
	5.4 Sociology	Sociology	Sociology
		Social Work	
		Anthropology	Anthropology
		Other (please specify)	Sociology
	5.5 Law	Law	Law
		Other (please specify)	
	5.6 Political Science	Political Science	Political Sciences
		Military Sciences	
		Other (please specify)	
	5.7 Social and Economic Geography	Social and Economic Geography	Social and Economic Geography
Other (please specify)			
5.8 Media and Communications	Documental and Information Sciences	Media and Communication Sciences	
	Journalism and Media Studies		
	Other (please specify)		
5.9 Other Social Sciences	Science Communication and Management	Science Communication and Management and Other Social Sciences	
	Other (please specify)		

Main Scientific Area	Secondary Scientific Area	Sub-area	Evaluation Panel (BD and BPD)
6. Humanities	6.1 History and Archaeology	History	History and Archaeology
		Archaeology and Conservation	
		Other (please specify)	
	6.2 Languages and Literature	Literature	Literary Studies
		Portuguese Studies	
		Romance Studies	
		English Studies	
		Classical Studies	
		African and Asian Studies	
		German Studies	
		Other (please specify)	
	Linguistics	Linguistics	
	6.3 Philosophy, Ethics and Religion	Philosophy	Philosophy, Ethics and Religion
		Theology and Religious Studies	
		Other (please specify)	
	6.4 Arts	Fine arts	Arts
		Musicology	
		Performing Arts Studies (Film, Television, Theatre, Dance, etc.)	
		Other (please specify)	
		History of Art	Museology and History of Art
		Architecture and Design	Design, Architecture and Town
	6.5 Other humanities	History of Science and Technology	History of Science and Technology and Other Humanities
		Other (please specify)	