



PRINCIPLES OF EVALUATING PROPOSALS SUBMITTED UNDER THE “WERTURA CALL.

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

- **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?¹**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.

- **Does the project meet the criteria of basic research^{2?1}**
 - yes
 - noIn the case of “no” please justify.

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

I STAGE OF PROPOSAL EVALUATION

A. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH TRACK RECORD OF THE FELLOWSHIP CANDIDATE (60%)

- **Scientific achievements, including publications in renowned academic press/journals:**
- 6** Top-level global achievements
 - 5** Outstanding achievements
 - 4** Distinguishing achievements
 - 3** Very good achievements
 - 2** Good achievements
 - 1** Average achievements
 - 0** Modest achievements

¹ This question applies at the first stage of evaluation.

² Pursuant to Article 4(2)(1) of the Act on Science and Higher Education of 20 July 2018, basic research means experimental or theoretical endeavours undertaken primarily to gain new knowledge of the foundations of phenomena and observable facts, without concern for direct commercial use.

Justification:

B. EVALUATION OF A RESEARCH PROJECT TO BE SUBMITTED UNDER THE ERC CALL (35%)

▪ **Evaluation of the scientific level of research to be completed**

3 Outstanding, very likely to receive an ERC grant

2 Very good, quite likely to receive an ERC grant

1 Good, unlikely to receive an ERC grant

0 Weak, very unlikely to receive an ERC grant

Justification:

C. THE CHOICE OF A SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATE IN THE ERC CALL (WEIGHTING 5%)

1 Partner chosen accurately

2 Partner chosen inaccurately

Justification:

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

II STAGE OF PROPOSAL EVALUATION

▪ **Interviews with candidates**

After an interview, the Expert Team shall pass recommendations for proposals:

A project recommended for funding

B project recommended for funding as long as financial resources are available

C project not recommended for funding

JUSTIFICATION FOR EVALUATION

prof. dr hab. Janusz Janeczek
Chair of the Council of the National Science Centre