HOMING PLUS PROGRAMME

INSTRUCTIONS AND EVALUATION FORM FOR REVIEWERS

COMPETITION No. 1/2010

General information

1. Each application is evaluated by at least three reviewers.
2. 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
3. After awarding points, the reviewer gives a recommendation of the application as a whole on a scale of 1 to 5 (where 5 is the top mark) and lists any issues that need to be clarified during the evaluation panel's interview with the applicant.
4. After the first stage of the competition, a ranking list is created on the basis of the total number of points obtained by individual applications. Invitations to an interview are issued to applicants who are highest on the ranking list and who fulfil two other conditions: their average recommendation is no less than 3, and their average sum of points is no less than 75.
5. The reviewer's identity will not be revealed to the applicant, but it can be made known to members of the panel conducting the second stage of the evaluation. The panel members agree to maintain confidentiality of the data entrusted to them. Marks and commentaries may be passed on to the applicant while maintaining the reviewer's anonymity.

Team for Programmes Financed from Structural Funds
tel. +48 (0)22 424 02 52
tel. +48 (0)22 424 02 25

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 (ever):
- 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.

Research ties (ever):
- scientific supervision over the applicant,
- joint publications,
- direct scientific competition with the applicant

Economic ties:
- personal economic interest related to the application under evaluation (competitive 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.

Evaluation criteria:

- **Originality of the scientific achievements of the project manager on the basis of the 3 publications submitted from the past 4 years (max. 30 points)**

  Applicants should present their CV and scientific achievements from the past 4 years, including their most important publications, experience in carrying out research projects (national and international projects, successes), foreign traineeships, obtained patents or submitted patent applications, successful implementations of research results.

  Scientific achievements are evaluated on the basis of the presented publications or descriptions of implementations or patents. The main consideration is the originality of the publications (and not their number) and the international competitiveness of the research.

- **Scientific and innovative value of the proposed project (max. 30 points)**

  The scientific value of the proposed project is evaluated in accordance with the highest international standards in a given field, as accepted by the reviewer.

- **Assessment of the feasibility of implementing the project in the indicated research team i.e. within the chosen by the Candidate unit in Poland (max. 15 points)**

- The team and the research unit where the candidate plans to carry out the project are evaluated. This criterion is related to the scientific potential of the unit. At this stage of his or her career, the candidate has not yet achieved research independence, which makes it important for the scientific supervisor or leader of the team planned for the project to guarantee the proper conditions and enable the candidate to further the experience he or she obtained abroad. It is also very important that the unit where the project will be carried out fulfill all requirements necessary for proper project implementation.

- **The quality of the planned cooperation on the project with a foreign or Polish research unit other than the unit where the project is to be carried out, based on the letter of intent (max. 15 points)**

  The scope of co-operation is evaluated; this may assume various forms within the project. The declared co-operation between the units should confirm the project's importance for the scientific community. The evaluation also considers the scientific standing of the research unit which has decided on such co-operation in the given field of research.

  The quality of co-operation is evaluated on the basis of the declarations contained in the letter of intent from the Polish or foreign unit other than the unit where the project is to be completed, regarding the scope of co-operation within the project.

- **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.

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.

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

Priority areas of the PO IG		Yes/No
1. Bio	• Biotechnology and bioengineering • Biological progress in agriculture and environmental protection • New medical products and techniques	
2. Info	• Information and telecommunication technologies • Intelligent, telecommunication and data communication networks of new generation • Optoelectronics • Computational sciences	
3. Techno	• New materials and technologies • Nanotechnologies • Designing specialised systems • Mechatronics • Chemical technology and engineering	
4. Other		

Evaluation table

Criterion		Commentary	Mark
1. Originality of the scientific achievements of the project manager on the basis of the 3 publications submitted from the past 4 years (max. 30 points)	Strengths		
	Weaknesses		
2. Scientific and innovative value of the proposed project (max. 30 points)	Strengths		
	Weaknesses		
3. Assessment of the feasibility of	Strengths		

implementing the project in the indicated research team i.e. within the chosen by the Candidate unit in Poland (max. 15 points)	Weaknesses		
4. The quality of the planned cooperation on the project with a foreign or Polish research unit other than the unit where the project is to be carried out, based on the letter of intent (max. 15 points)	Strengths		
	Weaknesses		
5. Legitimacy and effectiveness of the project budget (max. 10 points)	Strengths		
	Weaknesses		
		Sum (maximum number of points: 100**)**	

Additional commentary
Other comments (optional)

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