

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 60/2019 of 13 June 2019

Proposal assessment criteria in the SONATA BIS call

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

- yes

- no

if no, please justify:

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

- yes

- no

if no, please justify:

- **Does the project meet the criterion of basic research?²¹**

- yes

- no

if no, please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet the other requirements of the call announcement?¹**

- yes

- no

if no, please justify:

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

- yes

- no

- does not apply

if no, please justify:

STAGE I OF PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT 45%

A.1. ASSESSMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC LEVEL OF RESEARCH OR TASKS TO BE PERFORMED 35%

- 5** Outstanding, project results may be published in top scientific papers/magazines.
- 4** Very good, project results may be published in core scientific papers/magazines of the area.
- 3** Good, project results may be published in specialist international papers/magazines.

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, project results may be published in papers/magazines with little scientific significance.
- 1 Poor.
- 0 Very poor:

Justification:

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE INNOVATIVE NATURE OF THE PROJECT AND IMPACT OF THE PROJECT ON DEVELOPMENT OF THE ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE 10%

▪ **project nature:**

- 3 Innovative project.
- 1 Project with innovative elements.
- 0 Project without innovative elements.

▪ **the impact of the research project on development of the academic discipline:**

- 3 Project with major impact on development of the academic discipline.
- 1 Project with moderate impact on development of the academic discipline.
- 0 Project without impact on development of the academic discipline/submitted to a wrong review panel.

Justification:

B. ASSESSMENT OF ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR 40%

▪ **research achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in renowned scientific papers/ magazines:**

- 5 Outstanding, the principal investigator is among world leaders in his/her area.
- 4 Very good, the principal investigator is an internationally renowned expert in his/her area.
- 3 Good, the principal investigator is internationally recognised in his/her area.
- 2 Average, the principal investigator is domestically recognised in his/her area.
- 1 Poor, no recognition in the area.
- 0 No research achievements.

▪ **assessment of performance by the principal investigator of other projects that were funded from the budget for science. If the principal investigator has not managed projects so far, transfer the assessment from the above item:**

- 5 Effects of completed projects published in top scientific papers/magazines.

- 4 Effects of completed projects published in core scientific papers/magazines of the area.
- 3 Effects of completed projects published in specialist international papers/magazines.
- 2 Effects of completed projects published in specialist papers/magazines.
- 1 Effects of completed projects published in papers/magazines of little scientific significance.
- 0 Projects completed without the results being published.

Justification:

C. ASSESSMENT OF REASONS FOR AND PROCEDURE OF APPOINTING A NEW RESEARCH TEAM 10%

- **composition of the team and number of team members with regards to the proposed research has been planned:**

- 3 Very well.
- 1 Adequately.
- 0 Inadequately.

Justification:

D. ASSESSMENT OF FEASIBILITY 5%

- **assessment of project feasibility, including competencies of the principal investigator, 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?¹**

- yes

- no

if no, please justify:

- **Data management has been:**

- duly planned

- unduly planned

- does not apply

if unduly planned, 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**

After the interview, the expert team decides on the recommendation for the proposal:

- A** Proposal recommended for funding.
- B** Proposal recommended for funding as a secondary choice.
- C** Proposal not recommended for funding