

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 126/2019 of 12 December 2019

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

Proposal evaluation criteria in the SONATINA 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 research?<sup>2</sup><sup>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:

### **STAGE I OF PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT**

#### **A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT (WEIGHTING 55%)**

##### **A.1. ASSESSMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC LEVEL OF RESEARCH OR TASKS TO BE PERFORMED (WEIGHTING 40%)**

- 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) of the Act on Higher Education and Science of 20 July 2018, research covers: a) basic research understood as experimental or theoretical work undertaken primarily to acquire new knowledge of the underlying foundations of phenomena and observable facts, without any direct commercial application or use in view; b) applied research understood as an investigation undertaken in order to acquire new knowledge and skills, directed primarily towards developing new products, processes or services or introducing significant improvements thereto.

- 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 30%)**

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

- 5 Outstanding academic achievements
- 4 Significant academic achievements
- 3 Very good academic achievements
- 2 Good academic achievements
- 1 Poor academic achievements
- 0 No academic 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, the structure of the research team, research facilities, etc.**

3 Very good.

2 Good.

1 Poor.

0 The project is not feasible.

Justification:

**D. JUSTIFICATION OF THE CHOICE OF FOREIGN FELLOWSHIP LOCATION (WEIGHTING 10%)**

- **Academic rank of a foreign research institution hosting the foreign fellowship of the principal investigator:**

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

4 Very good research institution, i.e. internationally acknowledged 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 on the development of principal investigator's research career:**

2 The fellowship will have a significant impact on the development of the PI's scientific career 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 PI's scientific career.

0 The fellowship will have no impact on the development of the PI's scientific career.

Justification:

- **Are the costs to be incurred well justified with regard to the subject and scope of the research?** Błąd! Nie zdefiniowano zakładek.

- 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:**

**STAGE II OF PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT**

▪ **External reviews (in line with the criteria in stage I)**

▪ **Interview with the principal investigator**

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.