



Attachment no 2 to the POLONEZ 2 Call Text

POLONEZ 2

EVALUATION SHEET FOR REVIEWERS

I. Criteria for the assessment of proposals under the “POLONEZ 2” call for proposals

- **Does the research to be carried out during the fellowship meet the criteria of the scientific proposal?**

- Yes
- No

If “no,” please justify:

- **Does the proposal involve basic research¹?**

- Yes
- No

If “no,” please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?**

- Yes
- No

If “no,” please justify:

- **Has the proposal been written in a manner that allows for an accurate assessment?**

- Yes
- No

If “no,” please justify:

¹ Original experimental or theoretical work undertaken primarily to acquire new knowledge of the underlying foundations of phenomena and observable facts, without any direct commercial use.





A. EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF THE FELLOW (WEIGHTING 25%)

▪ **Research achievements of the fellow, including publications in renowned academic press/scientific journals:**

5 Excellent: the fellow is ranked among the world's top researchers in his/her field, he or she collaborates with top researchers from other research institutions, or is cited by them; the Fellow has a proven publication track record with publications in top academic press/journals.

4 Very good: the fellow is an internationally recognised specialist in his/her field, collaborates with accomplished researchers from other research institutions; the fellow has a proven publication track record with publications in renowned academic press/journals.

3 Good: the fellow enjoys international recognition in his/her field, collaborates with good researchers from other research institutions, has a proven publication track record with publications in good academic press/journals.

2 Moderate: the fellow is recognisable locally in his/her field, he or she has occasional collaboration with other research institutions, has a proven publication track record in local scientific press/journals.

1 Poor: the Fellow is not recognisable in his/her field, he or she has no scientific collaboration, his or her publications are limited to local scientific press/ journals.

0 The Fellow has no documented research achievements.

When assessing the quality of the Fellow, please also consider such factors as: his/her experience as a project/team manager, his/her international and intersectoral mobility (conducting research financed chiefly from public means but also activities/research activities in enterprises and non-profit organisations).

Justification:

B. QUALITY OF THE PLANNED RESEARCH (WEIGHTING 25%)

5	Excellent
4	Outstanding
3	Very good
2	Good
1	Average
0	Poor





Justification:

C. RELEVANCE OF THE FELLOWSHIP (WEIGHTING 20%)

▪ **Expected relevance of the fellowship for the development of the fellow's career**

3 The POLONEZ-supported fellowship will significantly contribute to the development of the fellow's career, thanks to raising the rank of his/her publications, collaboration with the host institution, boosting his/her chances of applying for the very best international grants (e.g. grants from the ERC) awarded on a competitive basis, development of his/her transferable skills.

1 The POLONEZ-supported fellowship will have some bearing on the development of the fellow's career.

0 The POLONEZ-supported fellowship will have no bearing on the development of the fellow's career.

▪ **The impact of the planned research on advances in the research discipline:**

3 The research will have a substantial impact on advances in the research discipline.

1 The research will have some impact on advances in the research discipline.

0 The research will have no impact on advances in the research discipline.

Justification:

D. DISSEMINATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE FELLOWSHIP (WEIGHTING 10%)

▪ **Dissemination of the results through publications in the scientific press**

3 Successful completion of the fellowship will enable the fellow to publish their results in world-class academic press/journals.

2 Successful completion of the fellowship will enable the fellow to publish their results in mainstream press journals in the given field.

1 Successful completion of the fellowship will enable the fellow to publish their results in local academic press/journals.

0 Completion of the fellowship will not enable publication of results.

▪ **Popularising the results**

3 The fellow is planning actions to popularise the results of the research on a wide scale.





- 2** The fellow is planning actions to popularise the results of the research on a significant scale.
- 1** The fellow is planning actions to popularise the results of the research on an average scale.
- 0** The fellow is not planning any actions aimed at popularising the results of the research.

Justification:

E. SELECTION OF THE PARTNER AND HOST INSTITUTION (WEIGHTING 20%)

- **Research achievements of the research partner at the host institution in the field of the research planned by the applicant**

5 The partner is excellent, e.g. is among the world's top researchers in the field related to the research planned by the applicant.

4 The partner is very good, e.g. his/her work in the field related to in the field related to the research planned by the applicant.

3 The partner is good, e.g. is internationally recognisable in the field related to the research planned by the applicant.

2 The partner represents an average level, e.g. is locally recognisable in the field related to the research planned by the applicant.

1 The partner is weak, e.g. is not recognisable in the field related to the research planned by the applicant.

0 The partner has no documented research achievements.

- **Opportunities for developing new competencies at the host institution of the fellowship**

2 The host institution offers the fellow a very good programme of training/visits/internships, etc., which may significantly help develop his/her competence.

1 The host institution offers the fellow a sufficient programme of training/visits/internships, etc., which may significantly help develop his/her competence.

0 The host institution cannot offer the fellow a proper programme of training/visits/internships.

Justification:

- **Are the planned costs justified with regard to the subject and scope of the research?**





- Yes
- No

If “no,” please justify:

JUSTIFICATION OF THE OVERALL EVALUATION

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

II. Note for the interview:

- **Note for the interview on the proposed research:**

- 5 Excellent
- 4 Very good
- 3 Good
- 2 Average
- 1 Below expectations

Justification:

- **Evaluation of the fellowship’s effect/resonance**

- 5 Excellent
- 4 Very good
- 3 Good
- 2 Average
- 1 Below expectations

Justification:

