Criteria for evaluating a PhD in Engineering Sciences

a. Getting permission for the public PhD defence
1. The research performed should be of sufficiently high quality and the amount of work should be sufficiently large.
2. The candidate should have an adequate understanding of the topic and, hence, answer well the questions asked by the members of the jury.
3. The candidate should have an appropriate critical attitude with respect to her/his own research results and those described in the literature.
4. The contribution of the PhD research should be clearly situated with respect to the existing literature.
5. Well written PhD text.

b. Grading of the PhD
6. How well the criteria 1–5 are met.
7. Quality of the presentation at both the private (technical) and public (accessible for a broad audience) defence,
8. Quality of the short summary in layman terms.
9. If applicable, the PhD text has been adequately revised according to the comments of the members of the jury, and a written and motivated reply to the comments and questions has been submitted, along with a detailed list of the changes made.
10. Quality of research indicators: publications in renowned international journals with peer review, patent applications.
Criteria for evaluating a PhD in Engineering Sciences – Architecture

a. Getting permission for the public PhD defence
1. The research performed should be of sufficiently high quality and the amount of work should be sufficiently large.
2. The candidate should have an adequate understanding of the topic and, hence, answer well the questions asked by the members of the jury.
3. The candidate should have an appropriate critical attitude with respect to her/his own research results and those described in the literature.
4. The contribution of the PhD research should be clearly situated with respect to the existing literature.
5. Well written PhD text.

b. Grading of the PhD
6. How well the criteria 1–5 are met.
7. Quality of the presentation at both the private (technical) and public (accessible for a broad audience) defence,
8. Quality of the short summary in layman terms.
9. If applicable, the PhD text has been adequately revised according to the comments of the members of the jury, and a written and motivated reply to the comments and questions has been submitted, along with a detailed list of the changes made.
10. Quality of research indicators: publications in renowned international journals with peer review, realisations (prototypes), patent applications, the risks taken in the problem statement (classical research question or questions/problems that nobody dares to tackle; penetration into another world of thought or culture), the retrieval and completeness of the relevant sources (e.g., discovering new sources).
Criteria for evaluating a PhD in Engineering Technology

a. Getting permission for the public PhD defence
1. The research performed should be of sufficiently high quality and the amount of work should be sufficiently large.
2. The candidate should have an adequate understanding of the topic and, hence, answer well the questions asked by the members of the jury.
3. The candidate should have an appropriate critical attitude with respect to her/his own research results and those described in the (patent) literature.
4. The output of the PhD research
   It is likely that the research results of the PhD can be valorised economically or societally in a relative short period. The PhD has contributed or has great potential to contribute to one or more of the following IOF-parameters of the university: patents, industrial contract research, spinoffs.
5. Well written PhD text.

b. Grading of the PhD
6. How well the criteria 1–5 are met.
7. Quality of the presentation at both the private (technical) and public (accessible for a broad audience) defence,
8. Quality of the short summary in layman terms.
9. If applicable, the PhD text has been adequately revised according to the comments of the members of the jury, and a written and motivated reply to the comments and questions has been submitted, along with a detailed list of the changes made.
10. Quality of research indicators: practical realisations (proof-of-concepts, prototypes), contract research reports with peer review, patent applications, industrial adoption of the research results (spinoff, licenses) and/or insight and vision on the valorization procedure, and publications (renowned international journals with peer review).