

III. Principles of evaluating proposals for research projects carried out by persons at the beginning of their career in research who have been awarded a doctorate within 3 years before submitting the proposal– “SONATINA.”

- **Has the proposal been written with all due diligence?¹**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.

- **Does the project meet the research criteria?²¹**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.

- **Does the project meet other criteria specified in the call for proposals?¹**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.

FIRST STAGE OF PROJECT EVALUATION

A. PROJECT EVALUATION (WEIGHTING 55%)

A.1. EVALUATION OF THE LEVEL OF EXPERTISE OF THE RESEARCH OR TASKS TO BE CARRIED OUT (WEIGHTING 40%)

- 5** Excellent. The project results are likely to be published in press/journals of the highest academic 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 international specialist academic press/ journals.

- 2** Average. The project results are likely to be published in minor academic press/ journals.

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

² Pursuant to Article 4 (2) (1) of the Act on Higher Education and Science, research means any activity comprising (a) basic research understood as empirical or theoretical work undertaken primarily to gain new knowledge of the foundations of phenomena and observable facts, without concern for direct commercial use; b) application research understood as work undertaken to gain new knowledge and skills, aimed at developing new products, processes or services or introducing significant changes.

1 Poor

0 Very poor

Justification:

A.2 ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT'S INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND IMPACT ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC FIELD/DISCIPLINE (WEIGHTING 15%)

▪ **Nature of the project:**

3 The project is innovative.

1 The project has some innovative aspects.

0 The project has no innovative aspects.

▪ **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 the wrong review panel.

Justification:

B. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (WEIGHTING 30%)

▪ **Scientific achievements of the principal investigator, including publications in renowned academic press/journals:**

5 Outstanding achievements of the Principal Investigator.

4 Distinguishing achievements of the Principal Investigator.

3 Very good achievements of the Principal Investigator.

2 Good achievements of the Principal Investigator.

1 Poor achievements of the Principal Investigator.

0 No achievements of the Principal Investigator.

▪ **Evaluation of other research projects carried out 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 mainstream academic press/journals 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 specialist academic press/journals.
- 1 The results of the completed projects have been published in minor academic press/journals.
- 0 The results of the completed projects have not been published.

Justification:

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT FEASIBILITY (WEIGHTING 5%)

- **Assessment of the feasibility of the 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:

D. JUSTIFICATION OF THE CHOICE OF FOREIGN FELLOWSHIP LOCATION (WEIGHTING 10%)

- **Academic rank of a foreign research institution hosting the foreign fellowship of the Principal Investigator:**
 - 5 Outstanding research institution, i.e. one of world's leading institutions in its field
 - 4 Very good research institution, i.e. internationally recognised in its field
 - 3 Good research institution, i.e. internationally recognised in its field
 - 2 Average research institution, i.e. domestically recognised in its field
 - 1 Poor research institution
 - 0 Research institution with no achievements
- **Appropriate choice of the research institution**
 - 1 Well chosen

0 Poorly chosen

- Impact on the development of Principal Investigator's research career:

2 The fellowship will have a significantly impact on research development by increasing the importance of publications, developing cooperation and participating in research projects

1 The fellowship will have an impact on research development

0 The fellowship will have no impact on research development

Justification

Are the costs to be incurred well justified with regards to the subject and scope of the research?³

- yes
- no

In the case of "no" please justify:

II STAGE OF PROJECT EVALUATION

- External reviews (according to the criteria applicable to the first stage)
- Interview with the Principal Investigator

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.