

Stages of the competition

The **FNP Prize** is conferred upon a multi-step procedure, with its key stages being:

- Nominations by invited representatives of the scientific community
- Selection of up to 5 nominees in each thematic field by The FNP Council
- Peer-review assessment
- Award decision by The FNP Council

Nomination procedure

The FNP Prize programme is based solely on the nominations. The Council of the Foundation selects the prize Laureates only among candidates that have been nominated by the members of the academic community in Poland. Those include the FNP Prize alumni, established scholars who are beneficiaries of schemes managed by the Foundation, advanced researchers awarded by the National Science Centre, etc.

A standard nomination for the FNP Prize consists of the following:

- letter of recommendation including the title of the nomination and a thorough description of the candidate's academic background and the significance of his/her achievement (with references);
- selected publications (up to 5) supporting the candidate's academic achievement.
- CV of the nominee (if available)

Nomination may also contain (as a non-obligatory attachment) additional files presenting the candidate and his/her achievement.

Nominations are kept strictly confidential, and the Foundation does not contact the candidates at any stage of the competition.

Based on submitted nominations, the Council of the Foundation qualifies the selected candidates, from this point onwards called **nominees**. Only the nominees undergo the process of the external peer-review resulting in the selection of prize laureates.

Principles of the peer-review process in The FNP Prize competition

Manner of assessment and expectations from the assessor

First and foremost, please note that The FNP Prize **is not** intended as a form of recognition for the entirety of the recipient's academic activities. **The FNP Prize is an individual award granted for a precisely defined academic achievement.** Therefore, an assessor is requested to address the following issues:

- whether the achievement is precisely defined and whether it is absolutely clear that it is a unique candidate's achievement;
- the **scientific excellence** of the nominated achievement, i.e. significance and original character of the achievement, its internationally acclaimed impact, its importance to the development of the discipline, and its usefulness for other fields of science. The Foundation would like to receive confirmation from the international academic community regarding the scientific excellence of the achievement of the candidate, which could be justified by more than just pure bibliometrics,

- strong and weak points pertaining to the nomination.

The nominees selected by the Council of the Foundation are assessed within a two-tracks, parallel peer-review process:

1. Firstly, each nominee is assessed independently by at least three leading experts in the discipline of nominee's focus and interests. This exercise is applied in order to gain an in-depth view of the scientific excellence of each of the nominees.
2. Secondly, all of the nominees in a given field are assessed by a group of up to 5 world-class researchers, whose task is to draw a comparative review finalized with a ranking of nominees. These referees, apart from the access to content of nominations, are supplied with critiques prepared by individual experts.

We believe deeply, that such assessment by carefully selected and highly recognized scholars of broad experience, can lead to a fair and unbiased judgment of the scientific impact of nominees.

Track 1: in-depth assessment by individual experts

At this stage, we are seeking an in-depth assessment of individual nominations by world-leading experts in the field of nominee's focus.

In principle, the opinion should be about 1 – 3 pages in length, including critical commentary to the nomination, e.g. scientific excellence of the reported achievement.

However, based on expert's knowledge and expertise in the field, invited experts shall provide within their critiques answers to three crucial questions:

1. ***Is the achievement of the candidate presented in the nomination truly outstanding? If so, why is that?***
2. ***Can the achievement of the candidate presented in the nomination be unambiguously considered as his/her? If not, why is that?***
3. ***Is the achievement recognized by the international community as the Polish scholar's contribution to world science? If so, why is that?***

Candidates shall be evaluated in view of the 'terms of reference' of the FNP Prize, i.e. with a focus on a '**precisely defined scientific achievement**' which has in recent period shifted academic boundaries and opened new perspectives for research, provided an exceptional contribution towards the advancement of science and culture as well as helped to assure Poland a significant position for undertaking the most ambitious challenges of the modern world.

An expert opinion shall be summarized by giving an overall grade of the nomination. This gives the potential for the panel of reviewers and the Foundation's Council to draw comparative justification among expert opinions within the given field of science, in which few nominees are selected for the prize. The grade scale is as follows:

7 - Outstanding (exceptionally strong nomination referring to a path-breaking achievement of the highest scientific excellence and an outstanding impact on global science; a nomination which definitely should be awarded with the prize),

6 - Excellent (very strong nomination with just negligible weaknesses; most likely should receive the prize; the scientific excellence and the international impact of the achievement deserves the recognition),

5 - Very good to excellent (very strong nomination with minor weaknesses; may be awarded with the prize),

4 -Very good (strong nomination with minor weaknesses; could be considered for the prize),

3 - Good (nomination with some strengths, but also moderate weaknesses; could potentially be considered for the prize; additional opinions may be required),

2 - Weak (nomination with a few strengths, but also at least one major weaknesses and/or several minor weaknesses; shall not be considered for the prize),

1 - Poor (nomination with very few, if any, strengths and numerous major weaknesses; should definitely not be considered for the prize).

General information

Neither the assessor's identity nor the assessment itself will be revealed to the candidate.

The Foundation reserves the right to request supplementary information from the assessor.

The Foundation may terminate its agreement with an assessor if the work is not performed within the agreed deadline or contains incomplete information.

The Foundation would like to receive the critique within a timeframe and in a form enabling an honest evaluation and qualification of the nominations selected within the competition.

Ethical rules for assessors

An assessor consenting to review a nomination is equivalent to that assessor agreeing to treat all information received as confidential, including the candidate's name and other data contained in the nomination. Treating the data as confidential also means that the contents of the nomination may not be used for any purpose other than their evaluation.

The assessor should evaluate the nomination impartially and compare it with the highest academic standards within a given field.

Withdrawing from an evaluation does not free the assessor of the obligation to maintain confidentiality.

Meeting the evaluation deadline guarantees that the programme selection procedure will run smoothly and ensures an equal chance for all the nominees. The assessor agrees to inform the Foundation immediately of his/her inability to complete the evaluation on time.

The assessor may not be in any conflict of interests with a nominee which would prevent the impartial evaluation of the nomination. If in doubt, the assessor should describe any potential conflict of interests in an appropriate form.

The assessor reporting a conflict of interests does not necessarily mean that the Foundation will dispense with their evaluation. An assessor should withdraw from an evaluation if he/she is unable to be impartial.