

Excerpt from: Annex 1 to the Regulations on awarding funding for research tasks funded by the National Science Centre as regards research projects, set forth in NCN Council Resolution No 90/2019 of 12 September 2019

## EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED IN THE CALLS FOR RESEARCH PROJECTS

### III. Proposal evaluation criteria in the PRELUDIUM BIS call

- **Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner?**<sup>1</sup>

- yes  
- no

In the case of „no”, please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?**<sup>1</sup>

- yes  
- no

In the case of „no”, please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criteria of basic research?**<sup>2,1</sup>

- yes  
- no

In the case of „no”, please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?**<sup>1</sup>

- yes  
- no

In the case of „no”, please justify:

- **Have the ethics issues been duly addressed?**

- yes  
- no  
- does not apply

In the case of „no”, please justify:

#### A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT (WEIGHTING 35%)

##### A.1. ASSESSMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC LEVEL OF RESEARCH OR TASKS TO BE PERFORMED (WEIGHTING 20%)

- 5 Excellent. The project results are likely to be published in press/ journals of the highest academic rank.
- 4 Very good. The project results are likely to be published in mainstream academic press/ journals for a given field.
- 3 Good. The project results are likely to be published in international specialist academic press/ journals

---

<sup>1</sup> This criterion is not subject to assessment by external reviewers.

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to Article 4 (2) (1) of the Act on Higher Education and Science of 20 July 2018, basic research shall mean experimental or theoretical work undertaken primarily to acquire new knowledge of the underlying foundations of phenomena and observable facts, without any particular commercial application or use in view.

- 2 Average. The project results are likely to be published in minor academic press/ journals.
- 1 Poor.
- 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/ the project has been submitted to the wrong review panel.

Justification:

#### **B. ASSESSMENT OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 60%)**

▪ **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 the field
- 4 Very good. The principal investigator is an internationally recognised expert in the 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 field.
- 0 The principal investigator has no scientific achievements.

▪ **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 the field.
- 4 Very good. The principal investigator is an internationally recognised expert in the 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 field.
- 0 The principal investigator has no scientific achievements.

- **Assessment 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 mainstream academic press/ journals in a given field of research
- 3** The results of the completed projects have been published in international specialist academic press/journals
- 2** The results of the completed projects have been published in specialist academic press/journals
- 1** The results of the completed projects have been published in minor 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, research facilities, justification of the choice of foreign fellowship location, 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?** Błąd! Nie zdefiniowano zakładki.

- yes
- no

In the case of „no”, please justify:

- **Data management has been:**

- duly planned
- unduly planned
- does not apply

In the case of “no”, please justify:

**Strengths of the proposal:**

**Weaknesses of the proposal:**

*The English version of this Resolution does not constitute a sworn translation and has been prepared as an auxiliary document for your convenience. In case of any doubts as to the interpretation of its provisions, the Polish version shall prevail.*