



Annex no 1 to the Regulations on the mode of granting financial resources for the completion of tasks funded by the National Science Centre (Narodowe Centrum Nauki, NCN) as regards research projects, post-doctoral fellowships and doctoral scholarships

**EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS OF RESEARCH PROJECTS,
APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING OF POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS
AND DOCTORAL SCHOLARSHIPS IN THE CALLS
OPERATED BY THE NATIONAL SCIENCE CENTRE**

II. Principles of evaluating proposals submitted under the call for research projects carried out by researchers at the beginning of their career, holding no doctorate degree – “PRELUDIUM.”

▪ **Has the proposal been written with all due diligence?⁴**

- yes
- no

In the case of “no” please justify.

▪ **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?⁴**

- yes
- no

In the case of “no” please justify.

▪ **Does the project meet the criteria of basic research^{5?4}**

- yes
- no

In the case of “no” please justify.

▪ **Does the project meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?⁴**

- yes
- no

In the case of “no” please justify.

A. EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT (WEIGHTING 75%)

A.1. EVALUATION OF PLANNED RESEARCH OR PROJECT TASKS (WEIGHTING 60%)

- 5** Excellent. Upon its completion, the project results are likely to be published in academic press/journals of the highest global rank.
- 4** Very good. Upon its completion the project results are likely to be published in mainstream academic press/journals for a given field.
- 3** Good. Upon its completion the project results are likely to be published in specialist academic press/ journals.
- 2** Average. Upon its completion the project results are likely to be published in local academic press/ journals.



- 1 Poor . There is a small chance of publishing the project results.
- 0 Very poor.

Justification:

A.2. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND ITS IMPACT FOR 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 a wrong review panel.

Justification:

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

B.1. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 10%)

▪ **scientific achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in renowned 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:

B.2. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PI SUPERVISOR (WEIGHTING 10%)

▪ **scientific achievements of the PI supervisor, including publications in academic press/ journals:**



- 5 Outstanding. The PI supervisor is one of the world's top researchers in their particular field.
- 4 Very good. The PI supervisor is an internationally recognised expert in their particular field.
- 3 Good. The PI supervisor is internationally recognised in the field.
- 2 Moderate. The PI supervisor has national recognition in the field.
- 1 Modest. The PI supervisor lacks recognition in the field.
- 0 The PI supervisor 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 regards to the subject and scope of the research?⁴**

- 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 PRELUDIUM and OPUS calls?⁶**

- yes
- no

JUSTIFICATION FOR EVALUATION

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal: