

# **INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AGENDA PROGRAMME**

## **EVALUATION FORM FOR REVIEWERS**

**COMPETITION No. 1/2015 and 2/2015**

1

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AGENDAS PROGRAMME — INSTRUCTIONS AND EVALUATION FORM FOR  
REVIEWERS

## General information

1. Each application is evaluated by at least two 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 30 points. Each criterion has a defined upper limit of 10 points. A criterion is met when the average score assigned by the reviewers is no less than 3 points.
3. After awarding points, the reviewer gives a recommendation for the application as a whole on a scale of 0-5.
4. Apart from the evaluation of content-based criteria, the reviewer may suggest certain issues to be clarified with the Applicant(s) during the 3rd stage of content-based evaluation and is encouraged to highlight whether the proposal is of high-risk high-gain potential or of cutting edge or ground-breaking nature or presents important economic/social opportunities.
5. Invitations for interviews are subject to the position of the proposal in the ranking list created based on the number of points and issued only to those applicants whose applications met all the criteria.
6. The reviewer's identity will not be revealed to the applicant, nor to members of the panel conducting the third stage of the evaluation. Marks and commentaries may be passed on to the applicant while maintaining the reviewer's anonymity.
7. If due to the interdisciplinary nature of the proposal or due to other reasons a certain part of the proposal may be considered beyond the scope of the reviewer's expertise, we would be grateful for noting so in the comments section.
8. The online data system requires reviewers to give a statement on their potential conflict of interests. The Foundation considers the following situations as requiring reporting in this category:
  - a. Personal relations:
    - i. being related to the nominee, being a legal guardian of the nominee or in a relationship with the nominee;
    - ii. being in personal conflict with the nominee.
  - b. Professional relations: having any professional ties to the nominee in the past three years or professional ties will arise as a result of the success of this application.
  - c. Research ties:
    - i. providing references for the applicant;
    - ii. academic supervision over the nominee during the past five years;
    - iii. joint publications and/or Joint research project or grant in the past three years;
    - iv. being in direct competition with the nominee.
  - d. Economic ties: the proposal can have economic consequences for the reviewer.

International Research Agenda Team  
tel. +48 (0) 22 845 94 30 Maria Pawłowska  
tel. +48 (0) 22 845 95 46 Kinga Słomińska

2

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AGENDAS PROGRAMME — INSTRUCTIONS AND EVALUATION FORM FOR REVIEWERS

<b>1. Applicant's name</b>	
<b>2. Project title</b>	
<b>3. Date</b>	

**Introductory note:** Please consider the following parts of the application when conducting your evaluation:

- All documents concerning the applicant,
- the letter (s) of intent from the foreign strategic partner,
- the complete description of international research agenda,
- the description of competences of foreign partner unit(s).

## Evaluation criteria:

- **Evaluation of the competitiveness of the proposed agenda on international level (max. 10 points)**

The subject of evaluation is the proposed IRA that covers a comprehensive approach to the solution of a problem characterised by high social or economic importance or is fundamental from the scientific point of view. The IRA must be competitive on a global scale, it has to be an innovative proposal that enables the unit to be ranked among leading global scientific institutions in the given field of science and ensure the recognisability of Polish science throughout the world.

*Background information:* The applicants were asked for the agenda to take into account the activities of the first 5 – 7 research teams in the first 5 years of the project and to specify which groups and at which stages will co-operate with entrepreneurs.

- **Evaluation of the applicant's competences (max. 10 points)**

Experts evaluate the scientific achievements of the applicant in a global context. Experts answer, among others, the following questions: How did the applicants contribute to the development of global science? Which general questions did they manage to answer? Do the studies published by them refer to hypotheses formulated by them or by other scientists? Do their works propose new hypotheses that are important for the given field of science or, potentially, for other fields? Are the research outcomes of the applicant protected by patents?

- **Evaluation of the competences and involvement of the partner unit(s) (max. 10 points)**

The experts evaluate the scientific adequacy of the foreign partner unit(s) in the thematic area that will be covered by the IRA and the degree of its involvement in the IRA realisation both on organisational and substantial levels.

*Background information:* The applicants were asked that their description of foreign partner(s) contains at least the following information:

- 1) achievements in science and implementation,
- 2) organisational culture,
- 3) good practices related to the organisation and conducting scientific research and the evaluation of work of research teams.

## Scoring system:

- Each of the criteria is evaluated independently by at least 2 experts. Each reviewer awards scores for each criterion.
- The scores reflect the degree of fulfilment of the given criterion as follows:
  - (10-9) – highest
  - (8-7) – very good
  - (6-5) – good
  - (4-3) – average
  - (2-1) – low
  - 0 – insufficient
- Moreover, each of the experts issues recommendations on a scale from 1 to 5 points, as follows:
  - outstanding application that should certainly receive funding – 5,
  - very good application that should receive funding – 4,
  - good application that may receive funding if there are sufficient funds – 3,
  - average application that should rather not receive funding – 2,
  - poor application that should not receive funding – 1.

## Evaluation table

Criterion		Commentary	Mark
1. Competitiveness of the proposed agenda on international level (max. 10 points)	Strengths		
	Weaknesses		
2. Evaluation of the applicant's competences (max. 10 points)	Strengths		
	Weaknesses		
3. Evaluation of the competences and involvement of the partner unit(s) (max. 10 points)	Strengths		
	Weaknesses		
<b>Sum (maximum number of points: 30)</b>			

## Evaluation table for second applicant\* (fill out only if two applicants are listed)

Criterion		Commentary	Mark
<b>Evaluation of the second applicant's competences (max. 10 points)</b>	Strengths		
	Weaknesses		

\* In the case of applications with two applicants please provide scores for both applicants. Please note that only the lead applicant's score will be used when summing up the marks. The scores for the second applicant will be used to evaluate their suitability as a PI. Low marks will be understood to indicate that the candidate is not a suitable PI without further verification by an independent hiring committee.

Comments  
(e.g. highlight whether the proposal is of high-risk high-gain potential or cutting edge or ground-breaking nature or presents important economic/social opportunities)

Recommendation	Mark
<p><b>General evaluation of the application:</b></p> <p>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</p>	
<p>Please list any issues to be explained by applicant facing the panel of experts during the interview if the applicant qualifies for the next stage of the evaluation.</p>	
Empty space for listing issues	