



Fundacja na rzecz Nauki Polskiej

TEAM PROGRAMME

INSTRUCTIONS AND EVALUATION FORM FOR REVIEWERS

COMPETITION No. 5/2010



General information

1. Each application is evaluated by at least three reviewers.
2. The reviewer should note the project's compatibility with the priority actions of the Innovative Economy Operational Programme 2007-2013.
3. The reviewer should evaluate the application according to the criteria and supplement the awarded marks with a brief commentary pointing out the application's strengths and weaknesses. The sum of marks for all the criteria is a maximum of 100 points. Each criterion has a defined upper limit of points.
4. After awarding points, the reviewer gives a recommendation of the application as a whole on a scale of 1-5 and lists any issues that need to be clarified during the panel's interview with the applicant.
5. Invitations to an interview are issued to applicants whose average recommendation from all the reviewers is no less than 3, and whose average of the sum of points for individual criteria is no less than 75.
6. In exceptional cases, if a large number of applications meet the above requirements, the number of points required to qualify for stage two may be increased, taking into account the general rule that the total amount applied for by the admitted applicants does not exceed the double of the declared budget of the call.
7. The reviewer's identity will not be revealed to the applicant, but it will be made known to members of the panel conducting the second stage of the evaluation. Marks and commentaries may be passed on to the applicant while maintaining the reviewer's anonymity.
8. Foundation for Polish Science has the right to request the Reviewer to append the missing information to her or his evaluation form. The Reviewer is granted the right to have an insight into the evaluation forms of the remaining scientists reviewing the same application.
9. Foundation for Polish Science has the right to depart from the agreement, should the evaluation form be incomplete or received after the deadline.

Team for Programmes Financed from Structural Funds

tel. +48 (0)22 424 02 52

tel. +48 (0)22 424 02 26

Applicant and reviewer data

1. Applicant's name	
2. Project title	
1. Reviewer's name	
2. Job position and workplace	
3. Date	

Ethical rules for reviewers working for the Foundation for Polish Science

1. A reviewer's consent to review an application submitted for a Foundation competition is equivalent to that reviewer agreeing to treat as confidential any and all information received, including the applicant's name and other data contained in the application. Treating the data as confidential also means that the contents of the application may not be used for any other purpose than the evaluation of the proposal.
2. The reviewer will evaluate the application impartially and compare it with the highest scientific standards in a given field.
3. Withdrawal from an evaluation does not free the reviewer from the obligation to maintain confidentiality of information.
4. Meeting the evaluation deadline guarantees proper running of the application selection procedure and ensures equal chances for all applicants. The reviewer agrees to inform the Foundation immediately of his/her inability to complete the evaluation on time.
5. The reviewer may not be in any conflict of interest with the applicant which would prevent an impartial evaluation of the application. If in doubt, the reviewer should describe the potential conflict of interest in the appropriate section of the evaluation form.
6. The reviewer's reporting of a conflict of interest does not mean the Foundation will necessarily dispense with their evaluation. The reviewer should withdraw from the evaluation if he/she is unable to be impartial.

Potential conflict of interest

Before starting an evaluation, please familiarize yourself with the most frequent cases of a conflict of interest between reviewer and applicant:

Personal relations:

- being related to the applicant,
- being a legal guardian of the applicant or having their power of attorney,
- being in personal conflict with the applicant.

Professional relations:

- being in a subordinate/superior relation with any applicant taking part in a given competition,
- a managerial position (dean, director, manager) or research work (or applying for such work) at the applicant's home institution,
- being the applicant's superior during the past three years.

Research ties:

- scientific supervision over the applicant during the past five years,
- joint publications during the past three years,
- direct research rivalry with the applicant.

Economic ties:

- personal economic interest related to the application under evaluation (rivalry or shared interest).

Description of a potential conflict of interest

Do you think your evaluation will be impartial?

Yes No

If your answer is "no", please refrain from any further action in connection with the application's evaluation.

The project's compatibility with the priority areas of the Innovative Economy Operational Programme

Priority areas of the PO IG		Yes/No
1. Bio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biotechnology and bioengineering • Biological progress in agriculture and environmental protection • New medical products and techniques 	
2. Info	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information and telecommunication technologies • Intelligent, telecommunication and data communication networks of new generation • Optoelectronics • Computational sciences 	
3. Techno	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New materials and technologies • Nanotechnologies • Designing specialised systems • Mechatronics • Chemical technology and engineering 	

Commentary (optional)

Evaluation criteria:

○ **The team leader's research or implementation achievements from the past 4 years (max. 30 points)**

The applicant - team leader - has presented his/her CV and research achievements from the past 4 years, including the most important publications, experience in carrying out research projects (domestic and international projects, results), foreign traineeships, any patents or patent applications, successful implementations of research results (max. 10 pages A4). According to documentation of competition the team leader has attached copies (descriptions) of the **three** most important publications, implementations or obtained patents of the principle investigator (from the **previous 4 years**) - publications in the original language, descriptions in English.

Teams should be headed by active researchers who guarantee the continued scientific development and proper supervision of the young team members. Research achievements are reflected in the presented publications or descriptions of implementations or patents. The most important considerations are the standard of presented publications, not their number, the contribution of the research achievements to a given field's development, and international competitiveness.

○ **Scientific or innovative value of the proposed team projects (max. 30 points)**

Evaluation of scientific excellence according to what the reviewer considers to be the highest international standards in a given field, or of the research's innovative nature (max. 8 pages A4).

○ **Legitimacy of the planned number of team members for the proposed research programme (max. 10 points)**

The projects will be carried out in the applicant's team by young researchers, hence the necessity for the team leader to quote the exact number of young researchers. The reviewer evaluates the necessity of participation of the proposed number of team members for project completion and for achieving the research goals, and whether the planned number of members is justified and adequate.

○ **Procedures of selecting young researchers to work on the team (max. 10 points)**

Young researchers will be selected by the applicant exclusively by means of an open competition. The competition procedure should ensure that the relevant information reaches all scientific centres in Poland and enables researchers from other countries to enter as well.

Specification of the criteria adopted by the applicant to select young researchers, and the transparency of the planned competition, are also important, aspects to be evaluated. The following requirements should be met by the planned recruitment procedure:

- announcements on the competition must be published both nationwide and internationally at least in a national medium addressed to potential team members and on international websites
- the team leader is obliged to appoint a commission consisting of at least three members, responsible for conducting the recruitment
- the commission may specify the criteria of candidates' eligibility for the recruitment (in particular: the fields which the candidates may represent, a recommendation from their current scientific supervisor).
- an interview conducted in English constitutes one of the stages in the recruitment procedure.

○ **Scope of the team's international co-operation on the project, based on the letters of intent from the foreign units (max. 10 points)**

The reviewer should evaluate the scope of co-operation which may assume various forms within the project. The best projects involving a foreign unit are those which enable young team members to gain international research experience or enable the team to take part in international research projects. The renown of the foreign research unit in a given field of research is also subject to evaluation, and the co-operation between the applicant's unit and the given foreign unit. Please note that applicants may enclose several letters of intent in one document attached to the application.

○ **Legitimacy and effectiveness of the project budget (max. 10 points)**

Evaluation consists in confirming that the declared spending is necessary for project completion and for achieving the planned goals of the action in the operational programme, and in confirming the compatibility of planned spending with the goals and tasks planned in the project (including the number of team members, international co-operation). A project can be given a lower mark if the expenses planned in the budget are found to be illegitimate.

In the team programme the overall project budget comprises:

- stipends for graduate students 1000 PLN per month
- stipends for PhD students: 3 000 to 3 500 PLN per month (for students who exercise the right to voluntary pension insurance coverage).
- stipends for postdoctoral fellows 5 000 PLN per month
- project grant in an amount depending on the number of PhD students and postdoctoral fellows selected in the competition and exceeding PLN 35 000 per year per PhD student and PLN 80 000 per year

per postdoctoral fellows. This applies to the period during which a given person is actually involved in carrying out the project.

The budget is expected to be planned in accordance to the catalogue of eligible costs, comprised in the documentation of competition. Following restrictions apply to the following budget categories:

- spending on laboratory equipment necessary for carrying out the project, not exceeding 20% of the project's total qualified costs (i.e. 20% of the sum of funds from the grant and project parts of the budget).
- spending on recruitment procedures, not exceeding 3% of the project's total qualified cost (i.e. 3% of the sum of funds from the grant and project parts of the budget).
- spending on publications, database access and other paid information sources necessary to carry out the project, not exceeding 5% of the project's total qualified cost (i.e. 5% of the sum of funds from the grant and project parts of the budget).
- overheads (such as rent for premises, administration costs, electricity and heating bills, remuneration for management, administration and financial personnel), not exceeding 10% of the project's total qualified cost (i.e. 10% of the sum of funds from the grant and project parts of the budget).

The project budget should list expenses actually necessary for project completion. Spending should account for both the highest standard of equipment and a properly conducted assessment of its market availability. It is important also to plan spending on remuneration for team leader and another researchers involved in carrying out the projects, in an amount appropriate for the size of the team. The cost of remuneration should correspond to a person's actual remuneration calculated proportionally to the required time of involvement in the project. Funds for international exchanges should be commensurate with the planned international co-operation and the involvement of the young scientists.

In his/her commentary the reviewer may propose (and provide justification for) a lower value of the project budget. However, the value of stipends specified in the competition documentation will remain unchanged.

Evaluation table

Criterion		Commentary	Mark
1. The team leader's research or implementation achievements from the past 4 years (max. 30 points)	Strengths		
	Weaknesses		
2. Scientific or innovative value of the proposed team projects (max. 30 points)	Strengths		
	Weaknesses		
3. Legitimacy of the planned number of team members for the proposed research programme (max. 10 points)	Strengths		
	Weaknesses		
4. Procedures of selecting young researchers to work	Strengths		

on the team (max. 10 points)	Weaknesses		
5. Scope of the team's international co-operation on the project, based on the letter of intent from the foreign unit (max. 10 points)	Strengths		
	Weaknesses		
○ Legitimacy and effectiveness of the project budget (max. 10 points)	Strengths		
	Weaknesses		
Sum (maximum number of points: 100)			

Additional commentary (optional)

Recommendation	Mark
<p>General evaluation of the application:</p> <p>5 – an outstanding application which definitely should receive funding 4 – a very good application which should receive funding 3 – a good application which may receive funding if there are sufficient funds 2 – a mediocre application which probably should not receive funding 1 – a poor application which should not receive funding</p>	
<p>Please list any issues to be explained by the applicant facing the panel of experts during the interview, if the applicant qualifies for stage two of the evaluation.</p>	