

Extract from Annex 1 to the Regulations of awarding funding for research tasks funded by the National Science Centre as regards research projects, set forth in NCN Council Resolution No 26/2019 of 14 March 2019

II. Proposal assessment criteria in the PRELUDIUM call

▪ **Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner?**Błąd! Nie zdefiniowano załączki.

- yes

- no

if no, please justify:

▪ **Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?**Błąd! Nie zdefiniowano załączki.

- yes

- no

if no, please justify:

▪ **Does the project meet the criterion of basic research?**Błąd! Nie zdefiniowano załączki. Błąd! Nie zdefiniowano załączki.

- yes

- no

if no, please justify:

▪ **Does the project meet the other requirements of the call announcement?**Błąd! Nie zdefiniowano załączki.

- yes

- no

if no, please justify:

A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT 75%

A.1. ASSESSMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC LEVEL OF RESEARCH OR TASKS TO BE PERFORMED 60%

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 15%

▪ **project nature:**

3 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 INVESTIGATORS IN THE PROJECT 20%

B.1. ASSESSMENT OF ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR 10%

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

5 The principal investigator has prominent research achievements.

4 The principal investigator has very good research achievements.

3 The principal investigator has good research achievements.

2 The principal investigator has poor research achievements.

1 The principal investigator has no research achievements.

Justification:

B.2. ASSESSMENT OF ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE MENTOR 10%

▪ **research achievements of the mentor, including publications in renowned scientific papers/ magazines:**

5 Outstanding, the mentor is among world leaders in his/her area.

4 Very good, the mentor is an internationally renowned expert in his/her area.

3 Good, the mentor is internationally recognised in his/her area.

2 Average, the mentor is domestically recognised in his/her area.

1 Poor, no recognition in the area.

0 No research achievements.

Justification:

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT FEASIBILITY 5%

- **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?**Błąd! Nie zdefiniowano zakłádki.

- yes

- no

if no, please justify:

- **Does the proposal meet the admissibility criteria to future OPUS, PRELUDIUM calls?**Błąd! Nie zdefiniowano zakłádki.

- yes

- no

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

This document is not a certified translation and has been prepared for your convenience. In the case of any doubts as to the interpretation of its provisions, the Polish version shall prevail.