DOCTORAL PROGRAMME IN HEALTH AND PSYCHOLOGY: ADMISSION ASSESSMENT SHEET

Student's name

Item	Description of the system for calculating the score	Average mark from 0 to 4	Maximum	Criteria				Candidate rapporteur	Supervisor rapporteur	Rapporteur's remarks	Supervisor's remarks
Academic record for the bachelor's degree or equivalent (max. 25 points)	A maximum of 25 points for the bachelor's degree's academic record (or equivalent). The academic record's weighted average mark is calculated (using the number of credits in each course as the weight for each mark) and graded on the usual scale: 0 for fail, 1 for pass, 2 for merit, 3 for excellent and 4 for excellent with honours. Finally, the 25 points are awarded as follows: - 0 points if 1 ≤ average mark < 1.5 - 5 points if 1.5 ≤ average mark < 2 - 10 points if 2 ≤ average mark < 2.5 - 15 points if 2.5 ≤ average mark < 3 - 20 points if 3 ≤ average mark < 3.5 - 25 points if average mark ≥ 3.5		25/100	The teaching staff endorsing the students are responsible for certifying that the average mark has been calculated correctly. Any error could mean that the applicant is rejected. Check the help document.							
Academic record for the master's degree or equivalent (max. 15 points)	A maximum of 15 points for the master's degree's academic record (or equivalent). The academic record's weighted average mark is calculated again, using the usual scale (see previous point) and the points are awarded as follows: - 0 points if 1 ≤ average mark < 1.5 - 3 points if 1.5 ≤ average mark < 2 - 6 points if 2 ≤ average mark < 2.5 - 9 points if 2.5 ≤ average mark < 3 - 12 points if 3 ≤ average mark < 3.5 - 15 points if average mark ≥ 3.5		15/100	The teaching staff endorsing the students are responsible for certifying that the average mark has been calculated correctly. Any error could mean that the applicant is rejected. Check the help document.							
Prior scientific output (max. 10 points)	A maximum of 10 points for the candidate's prior scientific output, with the following weighting (only one item will be considered): - 10 points if the candidate furnishes proof of a paper published or accepted in a JCR-indexed journal (or any other reference index considered valid by the Academic Committee). - 8 points for a paper published or accepted in a non JCR-indexed journal (or any other reference index considered valid by the Academic Committee), provided that the journal's publication process includes a peer review. - 6 points for a paper published or accepted at an international congress with peer review. - 4 points for a paper published or accepted at a national congress with peer review. - 2 points for a final master's degree project involving research.		10/100	Only papers submitted up until closure of the application period are considered.							
						Average score	**Low score**				
Letter of presentation (max. 10 points)	4 points are given for a well-written letter and 6 points for adequately reasoning the fit of the candidate's proposal or research interest with any of the research lines listed in the programme call.		10/100	The following are assessed: 1) Well written: no spelling mistakes, style matched to the context and well-argued; 2) The candidate's motivation and commitment shown in the tasks begun. Based on the motivation letter and the interview (if necessary).	**Score between 7.5 and 10:** the letter is very well-written, with no mistakes, in an appropriate style, and well-argued. The candidate shows considerable interest in the tasks and ability to achieve the expected results.	Score between 5 and 7.4: the letter is correctly written and the motivations are well-argued, but it does not achieve a level of excellence.	**Score below 4.9:** the writing is sloppy or there are spelling or style errors.				

Criterion	Description	Weight	Assessment	Score (highest)	Score (middle-high)	Score (middle-low)	Score (low)				
The candidate's match in terms of training, experience and the research interests' fit with the programme, the research groups and the research lines (max. 20 points)	The candidate's match in terms of training, experience and fit of research interests with the programme and with any of its research groups and research lines. These points are given for the letter of presentation, the personal interview (if it is considered appropriate) and the documentation provided by the candidate.	20/100	The following are assessed: 1) The project's fit in the line and the programme: the extent to which the proposal is aligned with the line and the programme's interests. 2) Interest of the research proposal (relevance in the field, and also innovation and potential). 3) Knowledge of the field of research and experience in the area: relevant bachelor's degree and master's degree training and previous professional or scientific experience. Based on the project, the CV and the interview (if necessary).	Score between 15 and 20: the project fits perfectly and very clearly, but it also proposes an aspect that is relevant for the research area and a good methodology is inferred. In addition, the candidate shows a high level of knowledge of the area and highly congruent training.	**Score between 10 and 14.9: in general, the project fits but not perfectly, or it does fit but perhaps it is not particularly innovative or does not have a high impact. It maybe does fit and it is innovative, but the candidate does not show a sufficient level of knowledge of the area or the candidate's training is not congruent with the doctoral degree. It may also happen that the level of knowledge is very high, with adequate training, but the project's fit is not clear or not quite relevant to the area.**	**Score less than 9.9:** this score is given to candidates who do not show a clear fit, whose project is not seen as particularly relevant and, in addition, they do not show any command of the research area and their training is not fully congruent.				
Letter of endorsement (max. 15 points)	The candidate's suitability for continuing doctoral studies and the thesis proposal's match with the programme line in which it is included.	15/100	The following are assessed: (1) justification by the supervisor of the candidate's suitability in terms of experience and fit with the line; and (2) presentation of letters of recommendation from other researchers. Based on the supervisor's letter of endorsement. Note: letters of recommendation from other researchers are welcomed and may increase the mark within one of the three brackets.	**Score between 11 and 15:** in the letter of endorsement, the potential supervisor shows that the student has a very good fit, considering experience, interests and the project itself. Specifically: (a) the supervisor clearly supports the student; (b) reasons positively the student's fit in the research line, and (c) outlines the student's personal and professional abilities in positive terms.	**Score between 7 and 10.9:** the letter of endorsement does not clearly show the student's or project's fit (b), or the student's abilities are not clear (c). In any case, the supervisor clearly supports the candidate's approval (a).	**Score less than 6.9:** the letter of endorsement shows a low fit both of the candidate and of the research project (b) and, in addition, the supervisor does not wholeheartedly support the student's approval (a). Neither does the supervisor argue in favour of the student's abilities (c).				
Other merits: (max. 5 points)	Other merits that the candidate mentions, such as awards, patents, grants, research stays in reference centres or previous professional experience.	5/100	**The following are assessed**: 1) Stays in research centres. 2) At least one year's professional experience in the field. 3) Formal collaborations with research groups. 4) Previous research contracts (e. g. as research assistant). 5) Postgraduate training at a high-impact or excellence centre. A maximum of one point is awarded to each merit. Based on the CV and the interview (if necessary).							

0   0