

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

II. Proposal evaluation criteria in the PRELUDIUM call

▪ **Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner?**¹

- yes
- no

In the case of „no”, please justify:

▪ **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?**¹

- yes
- no

In the case of „no”, please justify:

▪ **Does the project meet the criteria of basic research?**^{2,1}

- yes
- no

In the case of „no”, please justify:

▪ **Does the proposal meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?**¹

- 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 75%)

A.1. ASSESSMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC LEVEL OF RESEARCH OR TASKS TO BE PERFORMED (WEIGHTING 60%)

- 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.

¹ This criterion is not subject to assessment by external reviewers.

² 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 or the project has been submitted to the wrong review panel.

Justification:

B. EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF TEAM MEMBERS (WEIGHTING 20%)

B1. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 10%)

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

- 5 Outstanding achievements of the principal investigator.
- 4 Very good achievements of the principal investigator.
- 3 Substantial achievements of the principal investigator.
- 2 Modest achievements of the principal investigator.
- 1 The principal investigator has no academic achievements.

Justification:

B2. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE MENTOR (WEIGHTING 10%)

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

-
- 5 Outstanding. The mentor is one of the world's top researchers in the field.
- 4 Very good. The mentor is an internationally recognized expert in the field.
- 3 Good. The mentor is internationally recognized in the field.
- 2 Moderate. The mentor has national recognition in the field.
- 1 Modest. The mentor lacks recognition in the field.

0 The mentor has no academic achievements.

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 regard to the subject and scope of the research?¹**

- yes
- no

In the case of „no”, please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet the criteria allowing for its re-submission in a subsequent edition of the OPUS and PRELUDIUM calls?³**

- yes
- no

- **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.

³ To be agreed by the expert team at stage I of merit-based evaluation.