



V. Principles of evaluating proposals submitted under the call for research projects, aimed to establish new research teams, carried out by persons with an academic degree or title, who have been awarded a doctorate within 5 to 12 years of submitting the proposal – SONATA BIS

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

- yes
- no

In the case of “no” please justify.

1ST STAGE OF MERIT-BASED EVALUATION

A. EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT (WEIGHTING 45%)

A.1. EVALUATION OF PLANNED RESEARCH OR PROJECT TASKS (WEIGHTING 35%)

- 5** Excellent, the project results are likely to be published in academic press/journals of the highest global 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 specialist academic press/journals.
- 2** Average, the results might be published in academic press/ journals of the low scientific importance.
- 1** Poor, there is little chance of publishing the results.

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

² Basic research is defined as 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(3)(a) of the act of 30th April 2010 on the principles of funding science (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 87).



0 Very poor

Justification:

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND ITS IMPACT (WEIGHTING 10%)

▪ 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. 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 field.

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 international 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. EVALUATION OF THE RATIONALE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW RESEARCH TEAM (WEIGHTING 10%)

- **In relation to the proposed scope of research, the composition and size of the research team have been:**

- 3 very well planned
- 1 adequate
- 0 inadequate

Justification:

D. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT FEASIBILITY (WEIGHTING 5%)

- **Assessment of the feasibility of the proposed project, including the Principal Investigator's and research team's qualifications, 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
- no

In the case of "no" please justify.

JUSTIFICATION FOR EVALUATION



Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

2nd STAGE OF MERIT-BASED EVALUATION

- **External reviews (following the criteria given in stage 1)**

- **PI interview**

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.

JUSTIFICATION FOR EVALUATION

The English version of this document 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.