

Annex 2 to the terms of and regulations on awarding funding for research tasks funded by the National Science Centre under the MINIATURA call for research activities, as laid down in NCN Council Resolution No 105/2025 of 6 November 2025

EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO THE MINIATURA CALL FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

A. MERIT-BASED EVALUATION OF A RESEARCH ACTIVITY AND JUSTIFICATION THEREOF IN VIEW OF THE FUTURE RESEARCH PROJECT (80%)

The evaluation should include the scientific quality, feasibility, potential impact of the research activity on the development of the discipline and justification of the research activity in view of its potential impact on the scientific quality of the research project submitted to future NCN calls and/or other national or international calls.

SCORING

- 5** Outstanding
- 4** Very good
- 3** Good
- 2** Average
- 1** Poor
- 0** The description of the research activity cannot be evaluated due to incomplete information/ the description of the research activity has not been thoroughly prepared / the research activity does not involve basic research¹ / the research activity does not meet the criteria of scientific proposal / the research activity does not meet other requirements of the call text.

Justification:

Please fully justify your assessment, explicitly indicating the strengths and weaknesses of the research activity (scientific quality, feasibility, potential impact on the advancement of the research discipline) and relevance of the research activity in terms of the future research project. In identifying the strengths and weaknesses, you should identify the most significant ones and explain why you chose them.

B. EVALUATION OF SCIENTIFIC ACHIEVEMENTS OF A RESEARCHER CARRYING OUT A RESEARCH ACTIVITY (20%)

Evaluation of scientific achievements included in the "Research Achievements" section of the proposal: research publication described in the "Most Important Research Publications" tab and justification for choosing it, for research in art, the most important artistic achievement or achievement in the research in art with justification for choosing it; career in research and research or artistic activity, or activity in research in art, including publication record, participation in research projects, research experience, lectures and presentations, awards and other significant achievements.

¹ Pursuant to Article 4(2)(1) of the Act on Higher Education and Science of 20 July 2018, basic research means 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.

The assessment should take into account the DORA guidelines², the stage of scientific career, and the diverse range of research outputs.

SCORING

- 5** Outstanding
- 4** Very good
- 3** Good
- 2** Average
- 1** Poor / Research achievements were not thoroughly described.

Justification:

Please fully justify your assessment, explicitly indicating the strengths and weaknesses of the achievements of the researcher chosen to perform a research activity. In identifying the strengths and weaknesses, you should identify the most significant ones and explain why you chose them.

Are the costs to be incurred well justified with regard to the subject and scope of the research?

Yes

No

In the case of “no”, please justify:

Have the ethics issues been duly addressed, and data management plan been duly prepared?

Yes

No

In the case of “no”, please justify:

Prof. Dr hab. Tomasz Dietl
President of the Council of the
National Science Centre

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

² The NCN undertakes to promote the DORA recommendations and not to use journal-based metrics for evaluation of journals as a surrogate measure of the quality of individual research articles to assess an individual scientist's contributions. In the assessment of the publication component, experts and reviewers should take into account expert knowledge of their field of research, as well as the citation and publication practices of that field. Track record assessment should take into account the overall quality, contribution to the field, and impact of publications.