

Evaluation Guide

Call for PhD Studentships – 2019

January 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
ABBREVIATIONS	3
1. CALL	4
2. ADMISSIBILITY.....	4
2.1 Applicant Admissibility Requirements.....	4
2.2 Application Admissibility Requirements.....	5
2.3 Studentship Granting Requirements	5
2.4 Information of Optional Submission in the Application Form	6
3. EVALUATION CRITERIA	6
3.1 Criterion A – Merit of the Applicant	7
3.2 Criterion B – Merit of the Work Programme	10
3.3 Criterion C – Merit of the Hosting Conditions	11
4. EVALUATION PROCESS	12
4.1 Guiding Principles of Peer Review	12
4.2 Conflict of de Interests (Col)	12
4.3 Confidentiality	13
4.4 Constitution of the Evaluation Panels	13
4.5 Roles and responsibilities of the Panel Chair	14
4.6 Remote and Panel Meeting Evaluation.....	15
4.6.1 Remote evaluation	15
4.6.1.1 Individual evaluation.....	15
4.6.1.2 Pre-Consensus Evaluation	16
4.6.2 Panel Meeting	16
4.7 Comments to be transmitted to Applicants	16
4.8. Panel Meeting Report	17
5. STRATEGIC COORDINATION OF THE CALL.....	18
6. PRELIMINARY HEARING	18
Annex I – Scientific Fields, adapted from the FOS Classification of the Frascati Manual ..	19

ABBREVIATIONS

BD – PhD studentships

CoI – Conflict of Interests

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

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

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

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

FOS – *Field of Science*

ORCID – *Open Researcher and Contributor Identifier*

FCT-SIG – Information and Management System of FCT

RBI – FCT Regulation for Research Studentships and Fellowships

1. CALL

In 2019, 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 the number of months requested in the application form, and cannot be granted for a period less than three consecutive months neither more than forty-eight months.

The research activity may be developed in any intensive-knowledge environment, namely in collaboration with companies, and therefore 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

The applicant admissibility requirements are the following:

- a) Be national citizen or citizen from another member-state of the European Union;
- b) Be citizen from third-party states, holder of a valid residence permits, 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 citizen from third-party states with which Portugal has signed a reciprocity agreement;
- d) 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), to be demonstrated upon conditional granting of the studentship for purposes of contracting thereof.
- e) Not having benefited from a PhD or a PhD in industry studentship, BD and BDE, respectively, funded by FCT, regardless its duration.

2.2 Application Admissibility Requirements

It is mandatory, 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 **CIÊNCIAVITAE** or **FCT-SIG** platforms; **the DeGóis platform will no longer be available**;
- 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) **Presenting 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;
- e) **Presenting two distinct and signed recommendation letters**. These letters should include the context/academic and/or professional relationship of the candidate with its referee and should also specify that are related with this call; supervising acceptance letters should not be used as recommendation letters
- f) Presenting the application as well as the other necessary documents, including the motivation and recommendation letters, in **Portuguese or in English**.

2.3 Studentship Granting Requirements

The following documents are required, upon **eventual granting of the studentship for purposes of contracting thereof**:

- a) **Academic degree certificates** for the academic degrees obtained;
- b) **Document proving the acceptance of the candidate in the institution that grants the academic degree**, through the registration proof from the higher education institution where the candidate was accepted to pursue this study cycle;
- c) **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.

If any document necessary to complete the process of contracting the studentship, within six months from the date of the conditional granting of the studentship award decision, is missing implies the expiration of the referred granting and the closing of the process (No. 10 of article 16.º of the RBI).

2.4 Information of Optional Submission in the Application Form

The following elements are relevant, however optional in the application form:

- a) **Applicant's ORCID code.** The ORCID record is recommended but does not replace entering the updated CV in the **CIÊNCIAVITAE** or FCT-SIG platforms;
- b) **ORCID code of the scientific supervisor and co-supervisor(s)**, if applicable), which does not replace filling in and updating the CVs in the **CIÊNCIAVITAE** or FCT-SIG platforms;
- c) **Academic degree certificates**, although if not presented cannot be considered for the calculation of the Merit of the Applicant (see sub-criterion A1 – Academic career);
- d) **Document that better represents the applicant's scientific/professional career.** For example, scientific publications, communications in conferences, scientific reports or master thesis; proof of scientific or professional achievements, as well as artistic creations or performances. In this field should not be submitted academic degree certificates or CVs;
- a) **Timeline**, a diagram specifying the milestones to perform the several tasks proposed in the work programme.

3. 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 the conditional 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: **40%** Merit of the Applicant (A); **40%** Merit of the Work Programme (B); **20%** Merit of the Hosting Conditions (C), converted into the following formula:

$$\textit{Final Score} = (0.4 \times A) + (0.4 \times B) + (0.2 \times C)$$

For purposes of tiebreak, the final ranking list will be based on the scores assigned to each of the evaluation criteria in the following order: criterion A (Merit of the Applicant), criterion B (Merit of the Work Programme) and 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.

3.1 Criterion A – Merit of the Applicant

The criterion A, Merit of the Applicant, which has a 40% relative weight to the final score, is evaluated based on three sub-criteria:

- A1. **Academic career**(reflecting the academic degree grades), with a relative weight of **50%** in the Merit of the Applicant.
- A2. **Personal curriculum** (reflecting the scientific and professional career, and academic career, when applicable), with a relative weight of **40%** in the Merit of the Applicant;
- A3. **Motivation letter**, with a relative weight of **10%** in the Merit of the Applicant.

The score awarded is calculated applying the following formula:

$$Criterion A = (A1 \times 0.5) + (A2 \times 0.4) + (A3 \times 0.1)$$

3.1.1 Criterion A1 – Academic Career

The academic career sub-criterion is calculated according to the **final classification indicated in the academic degree certificate(s)**, submitted by the applicant in the application form (Graduate + Master degrees/Integrated Master degree, Graduate degree only or Master degree only), following Table 1.

Table 1. Reference table to score the sub-criterion A1 – Academic career

<u>Graduate + Master degrees</u> (pre- or post-Bologna) or <u>Integrated Master degree</u>		<u>Graduate degree</u> (pre- or post-Bologna)		<u>Master degree</u> (pre- ou post-Bologna)	
Final Grade	A1 Score	Final Grade	A1 Score	Final Grade	A1 Score
≥ 18	5.0	≥ 17	3.5	≥ 17	3.0
17	4.5	16	3.0	16	2.5
16	4.0	15	2.5	15	2.0
15	3.5	14	2.0	14	1.5
14	3.0	<14	1.5	< 14	1.0
<14	2.5				

Note: to calculate the score of sub-criterion A1, the prevailing grade is the one stated in the respective degree certificate(s). Certificate final grades presented with decimal digits 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. To calculate

the arithmetic average between the graduate and master degrees' grades, the original grades indicated in the certificates (even if presented with decimal digits) shall be considered, rounding only the final grade average.

In order to apply the scoring system presented in Table 1 **is mandatory to submit**, in the application form, the following documents:

- a) **Academic degree certificates**, indicating the final grade and, if possible, the final classification of all the disciplines completed. Applicants with post-Bologna education shall present both 1st and 2nd study cycles academic degree certificates or an integrated master certificate, while applicants with pre-Bologna education should present the graduate and/or master certificates.
- b) In case of **foreign academic degrees**, and to guarantee the application of the principle of equal treatment to applicants with national or foreign academic degrees, it is **mandatory** to submit the **recognition of such degrees** and the **conversion of the respective final grades to the Portuguese grading scale**.

The recognition of foreign academic degrees and diplomas of, as well as the conversion of the respective final grade to the Portuguese grading scale, can be issued by a Portuguese public higher education establishment, or by the Directorate General for Higher Education (*Direção Geral do Ensino Superior*, DGES) in cases of automatic recognition.

The legal regime applicable to the recognition of foreign academic degrees submitted after 1 January 2019 is governed by the Decree-Law no. 66/2018, of 16 August, while requests submitted before 1 January 2019 are governed by Decree-Law no. 341/2007, of 12 October, and the Decree no. 227/2017, of 25 July. Alternatively, for equivalence to Portuguese qualifications processes, the request is governed by the Decree-Law no. 283/83, of 21 June.

FCT suggests further reading of the Decree-Law no. 66/2018, of 16 August, and visiting the portal of DGES at <http://www.dges.gov.pt/en>.

For the application of **Table 1**, the following must be considered:

- a) The final grade average of “graduate + master” degrees, in a pre- or post-Bologna academic path is the result of the simple arithmetic average of the final grade obtained in the 1st cycle (180 ECTS)/graduate degree and the final grade obtained in the 2nd cycle (90-120 ECTS)/master degree, by applying the following formula:

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

- b) In the case of integrated master degrees whose institutions do not issue certificates discriminating the 1st and 2nd cycles' final grades, the final grade indicated in the degree certificate should be considered (conclusion of the study cycle, 300-360 ECTS).

- c) When both an i) integrated master degree certificate (300-360 ECTS) and a ii) pre-Bologna or 2nd cycle degree certificate are presented, the final grade of the **integrated master degree is the one to be considered**.
- d) If only a graduate or master degree certificate is submitted, the corresponding scoring system should be applied (respective column of Table 1).
- e) When applicants submit **more than one equivalent graduate and/or master degree certificate** (with equivalent number of ECTS), the evaluation panel has to decide which of the equivalent academic degree is 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 graduate degree certificate and more than one master 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, as stated in the previous point. The panel should consider the alternative submitted degree(s) in the assessment of sub-criterion A2, valuing the applicant's personal curriculum. In any case, the criteria used by the panel must be explained in the respective final evaluation report and in the panel meeting report.
- f) To calculate sub-criterion A1 score, in cases of certificates stating qualitative grades only (as pre-Bologna degree certificates, for example), the respective grade should be converted according to Table 2. The calculation of the final grade average (graduate + master) should then be used to determine A1 final score through the application of Table 1.

Table 2: Table for conversion of qualitative grades

Qualitative grade	Converted grade
Excellent Very Good with Distinction Praise and Distinction <i>Magna Cum Laude / Summa Cum Laude</i>	18
Very Good Approved with Distinction Good with Distinction <i>Cum Laude</i>	16
Good Approved / Approved by Unanimity	14
Sufficient	12

The **minimum grade of 1 (A1=1) will be scored in any case that is not included in Table 1**. Some examples are described below:

- a) When no certificate is submitted, neither graduate nor master's degree certificate (national or foreign);

- b) When both graduate and master national degree certificates **do not state the respective final grade** (neither qualitative nor quantitative);
- c) When both graduate and master foreign degree certificates **are not recognized nor the respective final grades converted to the Portuguese grading scale.**

3.1.2 Sub-criterion A2 – Personal Curriculum

The assessment of applicants' personal curriculum should be performed in an integrated way, from a global vision of the merit of their scientific and professional career. In this analysis, the panel should consider the academic results **that were not included in the calculation of the sub-criterion A1**, the Academic Career sub-criterion (only if the respective degree certificates were submitted in the application form) and the different dimensions of the curriculum that may demonstrate a relevant personal, scientific and professional career. Recommendation letters (documents of mandatory submission) should also be considered. The panel should also evaluate the quality of the document or artistic achievement presented by the applicant as being the most representative or explicative of her/his scientific or professional career, and that should be justified in the applicant's motivation letter.

The grade scored to this sub-criterion should therefore translate a global view of the applicant's personal curriculum and should be justified in a clear, detailed and consistent way.

3.1.3 Sub-criterion A3 – Motivation Letter

The classification of this sub-criterion should consider the clear identification of the applicant's motifs to submit the application, the maturity to develop the proposed scientific work programme and to obtain the PhD academic degree, as the choice of the most representative document to explain her/his personal and professional path.

3.1.4 Disability Bonuses

Applicants that state a degree of disability, duly proven and equal to or above 90%, shall have a bonus of 20% on criterion A – Merit of the Applicant. Applicants that state a degree of disability, duly proven, equal to or above 60% and under 90%, shall have a bonus of 10% on this criterion.

3.2 Criterion B – Merit of the Work Programme

The merit of the work programme criterion has a relative weight of 40% and takes into account the following three parameters:

- B1 – Justified relevance of the study object;
- B2 – Scientific quality of the state of the art and the methodology of the work programme;
- 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 progress 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 the clarity, consistency and coherence, in accordance with internationally accepted standards.

For parameter B3, the assessment must be based on the adequacy of the methodologies 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.

The presentation of a timeline should also be considered as well as other enclosed documents related to the work programme (schemes, formulas or figures, for example).

3.3 Criterion C – Merit of the Hosting Conditions

The merit of the hosting conditions criterion has a relative weight of 20% and takes into account two parameters:

C1 – The scientific merit and experience of the supervisor in the scientific field of the application [and, if applicable, the co-supervisor(s)] and suitability with regard to the applicant's supervision and the PhD academic degree achievement;

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, in the respective field of the application form. Supervisors must be PhD researchers in full exercise of their activity. In case of a discrepancy between the applicant's indicated supervisor and co-supervisor, if applicable, and the associated supervisors, **the panel should only consider the supervisor(s) associated and locked to the application.**

Applications that present more than one host institution should clearly indicate the tasks to be performed in each institution. Similarly, in case of applications proposing 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.

4. EVALUATION PROCESS

4.1 Guiding Principles of Peer Review

The mission of FCT is to ensure the 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 scientific content represents the essential core of peer review, which requires an integrated vision of all components of the applicant's scientific and professional career and the 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 (CoI).

4.2 Conflict of de Interests (CoI)

If the chair or any other member of the evaluation panel is in a situation of CoI regarding any of the applications submitted to the panel, he/she must declare it to FCT as soon as the first contact with the application is made.

Evaluators in any declared CoI situation cannot be assigned by the chair, or co-chair, if applicable, as readers of the respective applications, and must also be prevented from contacting in any way with the applications or their evaluation, throughout the evaluation process.

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

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

- a) Belonging to the same academic organizational unit and/or the same research unit of the host institution of the work programme associated to the application;
- b) Belonging to the same academic organizational unit and/or the same research unit of the higher education institution 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 on-going 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 her/himself, 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.

4.3 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.

4.4 Constitution of the Evaluation Panels

Evaluation panels are formed by experts with renowned scientific merit and experience. Evaluation panels are established also according to the following criteria: 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 candidates applying to 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 equity.

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

According to the number of submitted applications, the chair may appoint, among the members of the respective panel, a co-chair to assist her/him in the coordination tasks, as the management of applicants with which has declared CoI, for example. The evaluator nominated as co-chair accumulates the tasks of co-coordination with those of evaluator of the applications assigned to her/him.

Evaluation panels will be composed 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 I).

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 I. 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 evaluators that will participate in the evaluation process will be published before the beginning of the evaluation period.

4.5 Roles and responsibilities of the Panel Chair

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 a co-chair, when the number of submitted applications so justifies, to support her/him in the panel management activities and delegating the tasks considered necessary to the proper management of the panel work;
- c) Allocating to each application two evaluators, appointing them as 1st and 2nd readers, considering their fields of expertise/specialisation and the application's subfield;
- d) Identifying applications that may need external experts;
- e) Managing the identified Cols;
- f) Ensuring that all panel members follow the guidelines and clarifications provided by FCT throughout the process;
- g) Verifying, along with the other panel members, the adequacy of applications to the panel;
- h) 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*);
- i) Assuring the compliance of the deadlines granted to evaluators to prepare the FAI and Pre-consensus Evaluation Forms (FPC, *Ficha de pré-consenso*);
- j) Ensuring that, when filling in the FAI and FPC, evaluators justify their grading with clear and substantive arguments that allow understanding the assessment and classification attributed to each applicant;
- k) Moderating the panel meeting and ensuring a collegial process of decision;
- l) Assuring that the Final Evaluation Form (FAF, *Ficha de Avaliação Final*) is prepared until the end of the panel meeting;
- m) 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;

- n) Preparing the panel meeting report, together with all the panel members;
- o) Collaborating with FCT to solve problems and/or pitfalls that may occur before, during and/or after the panel meeting;
- p) Coordinating the preliminary hearing process (see chapter 6).

4.6 Remote and Panel Meeting Evaluation

4.6.1 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 CoI declaration relative to the respective applications submitted to the panel. These CoI 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 reader, 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.

4.6.1.1 Individual evaluation

- a) Each application is assessed individually by two panel members who are not in a situation of CoI with the applicant and respective supervisor/co-supervisor(s).
- b) If any of the evaluators identifies an additional situation of CoI concerning any application(s) attributed to her/him, it must be immediately and formally declared to FCT and to the panel chair, who is responsible for the reallocation of the application(s).
- c) Whenever justified, as 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 3. Evaluation Criteria) and prepare the respective comments in order to clearly justify the score awarded.

4.6.1.2 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).

4.6.2 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 (if applicable), 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.

4.7 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 when applicable, 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 3. Evaluation Criteria).

In addition to the comments justifying the scores attributed to each of the three evaluation criteria, FAF **must indicate**, in criterion A - the Merit of the Applicant, **the scores of each sub-criterion: A1 –**

Academic Career, A2 – Personal Curriculum and A3 – Motivation Letter, as well as the explanation of a possible bonus according to its respective degree. 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 sub-criterion A1 – Academic Career.

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.

4.8. Panel Meeting Report

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

The panel meeting report must include:

- a) The name and affiliation of all panel members;
- b) The identification of all applications considered not assessable;
- c) The methodology adopted by the panel for particular cases;
- d) The provisional ranked list of applicants, in descending order of the final score, of all applications evaluated by the panel.

In addition, the panel meeting report must include the following annexes:

- e) The report of the preparatory panel meeting for the establishment of harmonized and densified evaluation parameters;
- f) The Col declarations of all the panel members;
- g) Eventual vote and competence delegations for the justified absence reasons.

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 constitution of the Scientific Coordination Group composition will be made available at FCT's webpage.

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 will meet after the evaluation process and ranking of all applications by the respective evaluation panels are completed, proposing to FCT the cut-off line in each panel and, consequently, the final provisional list of applications to fund. A panel meeting report will be prepared, describing the methodology used for the decision-making.

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, that will take place by videoconference, 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 – 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	Computer Sciences and Informatics
		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	Cellular Biology	Microbiology	Experimental Biology and Biochemistry
			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 and Electronic Engineering
		Robotics	
		Automation and Control Systems	
		Communication Engineering and Systems	
		Telecommunications	
		Computer Hardware and Architecture	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Informatics	Computer Sciences and Informatics	
	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	Biomedicine
		Anatomy and Histology	
		Human Genetics	
		Immunology	
		Neurosciences	
		Pharmacology	
		Biopharmaceuticals	
		Toxicology	
		Physiology	
		Pathology	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	3.2 Clinical Medicine	Andrology	Clinical Medicine and Health Sciences
		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>			

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	Livestock Breeding	Science Animal and Veterinary Sciences
			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	Genetic Manipulation Technology	Agricultural and Food Technologies
			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	
		Romanic Studies	
		Anglophone Studies	
		Classical Studies	
		Asian and African Studies	
		Germanic Studies	
		<i>Other, please specify:</i>	
	Linguistics	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	