

VIII. Principles of evaluating proposals submitted under the call for doctoral scholarships – “ETIUDA”:

- **Has the proposal been written with all due diligence?¹**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.

- **Is the research program of scientific nature?¹**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.

- **Does the project meet the criteria of basic research^{2?1}**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.

- **Does the project meet other criteria specified in the call for proposals?**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.

FIRST STAGE OF PROJECT EVALUATION

A. EVALUATION OF RESEARCH QUALITY (WEIGHTING 30%)

- **Level of expertise of the research**
- 4 Excellent. The project results are likely to be published in press/journals of the highest academic rank.
 - 3 Very good. The project results are likely to be published in mainstream academic press/journals for a given field.
 - 2 Good. The project results are likely to be published in international specialist academic press/journals.
 - 1 Average. The project results are likely to be published in minor academic press/ journals.
 - 0 Poor

Justification:

B. TRACK RECORD OF THE APPLICANT (WEIGHTING 40%)

- **Track record of the applicant, including publications in renowned academic press/journals:**
- 4 Distinguishing

¹ This question applies at the first stage of the merit-based evaluation.

² Pursuant to Article 4 (2) (1) of the Act on Higher Education and Science, basic research is defined as empirical or theoretical work undertaken primarily to gain new knowledge of the foundations of phenomena and observable facts, without concern for direct commercial use.

3 Very good

2 Good

1 Poor

0 No achievements

▪ **Awards related to research, scholarships and prizes as well as research experience gained in Poland and abroad, scientific workshops and training courses , participation in research projects:**

4 Outstanding (fellowships in leading foreign institutions, prestigious international prizes and awards, workshops or training courses in leading research institutions, participation in international or foreign project)

3 Significant (fellowships in good domestic and foreign institutions, awards, workshops or training courses, participation in research projects)

2 Average (awards, prizes, workshops or training courses, participation in research projects)

1 Poor

0 None

Justification:

C. JUSTIFICATION OF THE CHOICE OF FOREIGN FELLOWSHIP LOCATION (WEIGHTING 30%)

▪ **Academic rank of a foreign research institution hosting the foreign fellowship of the applicant:**

5 Outstanding research institution, i.e. one of world's leading institutions in its field

4 Very good research institution, i.e. internationally recognised in its field

3 Good research institution, i.e. internationally recognised in its field

2 Average research institution, i.e. domestically recognised in its field

1 Poor research institution

0 Research institution with no achievements

Appropriate choice of the research institution

1 Well chosen

0 Poorly chosen

▪ **Impact of the fellowship on the development of the applicant's career in research:**

2 The fellowship will have a significantly impact on the development of the applicant's career in research by increasing the importance of publications, developing cooperation and participating in research projects

1 The fellowship will have an impact on the development of the applicant's career in research

0 The fellowship will have no impact on the development of the applicant's career in research

Justification:

JUSTIFICATION FOR EVALUATION

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

II STAGE OF PROJECT EVALUATION

- **Interview with the applicant**

Following the interview, the Expert Team decides on the recommendation for the proposal:

- A** Proposal recommended for funding.
- B** Proposal recommended for funding as second choice.
- C** Proposal not recommended for funding.

JUSTIFICATION OF EVALUATION

prof. dr hab. Janusz Janeczek

Chair of the Council of the National Science Centre