

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 MAESTRO 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?^{2?1}**

- yes

- no

if no, please justify:

▪ **Does the principal investigator meet the criterion of advanced investigator?^{3?1}**

- yes

- no

if no, please justify:

▪ **Does the preproposal 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:

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.

³ Advanced investigator is a person holding at least a PhD degree, who in the proposal submission year or within 10 years prior to the proposal submission year:

- a) has published at least five papers in prestigious Polish or foreign academic press/ journals
- b) has coordinated at least two research projects funded in national or international calls for proposals,
- c) fulfils at least three of the criteria below:
 - has been a member of a scientific committee of at least one renowned international conference,
 - has published at least one monograph,
 - has delivered presentations at renowned international conferences,
 - has received an international award or prize,
 - has been or was a member of renowned associations, international scientific organisations or academia,
 - has other significant scientific achievements,

and in the case of research in the field of arts, a person who is an author of works of art of international significance or works significant for the Polish culture and has actively participated in international exhibitions, festivals or other artistic events in visual, musical, theatrical or film arts.

STAGE I OF PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT

A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT 40%

A.1. ASSESSMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC LEVEL OF RESEARCH OR TASKS TO BE PERFORMED 30%

- 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.
- 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:**

- 4 Pioneering project.
- 2 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 50%

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

- 6 Top world level, the principal investigator is among world leaders in his/her area.
- 5 Excellent, the principal investigator is among world leaders in his/her area.
- 4 Prominent, the principal investigator is an internationally renowned expert in his/her area.
- 3 Very good, the principal investigator is an internationally renowned specialist in his/her area.
- 2 Good, the principal investigator is internationally recognised in his/her area.
- 1 Average, the principal investigator is domestically recognised in his/her area.
- 0 Poor, no recognition in the area.

▪ **assessment of performance by the principal investigator of other projects that were funded from the budget for science:**

- 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 FEASIBILITY 10%

▪ **assessment of project feasibility, including competencies of the principal investigator, 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?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.