



Annex no 1 to the Regulations on the mode of granting financial resources for the completion of tasks funded by the National Science Centre (Narodowe Centrum Nauki, NCN) as regards research projects, post-doctoral fellowships and doctoral scholarships

**EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS,
APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING OF POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS
AND DOCTORAL SCHOLARSHIPS IN THE CALLS
OPERATED BY THE NATIONAL SCIENCE CENTRE**

I. Principles of evaluating proposals submitted under the call for proposals, including purchase or construction of research equipment necessary for their completion – “OPUS.”

▪ **Has the proposal been written with all due diligence?**¹

- yes
- no

In the case of “no” please justify.

▪ **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?**⁴

- yes
- no

In the case of “no” please justify.

▪ **Does the project meet the criteria of basic research?**^{2,4}

- yes
- no

In the case of “no” please justify.

▪ **Does the project meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?**⁴

- yes
- no

In the case of “no” please justify.

A. EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT (WEIGHTING 55%)

A.1. EVALUATION OF RESEARCH (WEIGHTING 40%)

- 5** Excellent. Upon its completion, the project results are likely to be published in academic press/journals of the highest global rank.
- 4** Very good. Upon its completion the project results are likely to be published in mainstream academic press/journals for a given field.
- 3** Good. Upon its completion the project results are likely to be published in specialist academic press/ journals.

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

² Basic research is experimental or theoretical endeavours undertaken primarily to gain new knowledge of the foundations of phenomena and observable facts, without concern for direct commercial use (art. 2 point 3a of the act of 30th April 2010 on the principles of funding science (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 87).



- 2 Average. Upon its completion the project results are likely to be published in local academic press/ journals.
- 1 Poor. There is a small chance of publishing the project results.
- 0 Very poor.

Justification:

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND IMPACT ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC FIELD/DISCIPLINE (WEIGHTING 15%)

▪ **Innovative nature of the proposed research:**

- 3 The project is innovative.
- 1 The project has innovative elements.
- 0 The project has no innovative elements.

▪ **Impact of the research project on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline:**

- 3 The project will have a substantial impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
- 1 The project will have some impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline.
- 0 The project will have no impact on the advancement of the scientific field/discipline or the project has been submitted to the wrong review panel.

Justification:

B. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 40%)

▪ **scientific achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in academic press/journals:**

- 5 Outstanding. The Principal Investigator is one of the world's top researchers in their particular field.
- 4 Very good. The Principal Investigator is an internationally recognised expert in their particular field.
- 3 Good. The Principal Investigator is internationally recognised in the field.
- 2 Moderate. The Principal Investigator has national recognition in the field.
- 1 Modest. The Principal Investigator lacks recognition in the fieldp.
- 0 The Principal Investigator has no scientific achievements.



- **Evaluation of the results of research projects conducted by the principal investigator, funded from the budget for science; in the event of no previous projects, the mark from the section above should be applied in this section.**
- 5 The results of the completed projects have been published in academic press/journals of the highest rank.
 - 4 The results of the completed projects have been published in academic press/journals of the highest rank in a given field of research.
 - 3 The results of the completed projects have been published in specialist academic press/journals.
 - 2 The results of the completed projects have been published in national academic press/journals.
 - 1 The results of the completed projects have been published in local academic press/journals.
 - 0 The results of the completed projects have not been published.

Justification:

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT FEASIBILITY (WEIGHTING 5%)

- **Assessment of the feasibility of the proposed project, including the principal investigator's qualifications, the structure of the research team, research facilities etc.:**
- 3 Very good.
 - 2 Good.
 - 1 Poor.
 - 0 The project is not feasible.

Justification:

- **Are the costs to be incurred well justified with regards to the subject and scope of the research?⁴**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of "no" please justify.
- **Does the proposal meet the criteria allowing for its re-submission in a subsequent edition of the PRELUDIUM and OPUS calls?³**
 - yes
 - no

³ Settled by the Expert Team at the first stage of the merit-based evaluation.



JUSTIFICATION FOR EVALUATION

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal: