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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Grading scale** |
| **A. Assessment of the research proposal**  **50%** of final result, 0-20 points | |
| 1. Aim/Objectives of the research proposal 0-5 points | 5 Excellent: research results are likely to be published by the highest-ranking publishers or journals.  4 Very good: research results are likely to be published by mainstream publishers or journals in the research field  3 Good: research results are likely to be published by specialist publishers or journals.  2 Average: research results are likely to be published only with low-ranked publishers or journals.  1 Poor.  0 Very poor. |
| 2. Research method 0-4 points | 4 Very good: the method is appropriate for the research problem and it is in line with the current trends in the discipline.  3 Good: the method is appropriate for the research problem and it meets relevant standards, though not the highest standards.  2 Average: not in line with the standards accepted in a discipline. 1 Poor: not quite appropriate for the problem.  0 Very poor: poorly defined method. |
| 3. Knowledge of the state of research and literature  0-5 points | 5 Excellent: knowledge of the latest theories and research published in high ranking Polish and international journals.  4 Very good: knowledge of new theories and research published by mainstream Polish and international publishers.  3 Good: knowledge of theory and research published in Poland.  2 Average: knowledge in a limited scope of theory and research.  1 Poor: knowledge insufficient for problem analysis. 0 Very poor. |
| 4. Originality of the research proposal 0-4 points | 4 Unique proposal  3 Innovative proposal  2 Proposal with some innovative elements. 1 Proposal with few innovative elements.  0 Proposal with no innovative elements. |
| 5. Chances of implementing the proposal  0-2 points | 2 Good.  1 Poor.  0 The proposal can not be implemented. |
| **B. Assessment of publications**  **20%** of final result, scale 0-5 points | |
|  | 5 Excellent: articles published in journals from the JCR and/or Scopus lists, and/or monographs, chapters in international publications.  4 Very good: articles published in journals included on the list by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education which are mainstream in Poland, and /or monographs, and/or chapters published by mainstream Polish research publishers.  3 Good: articles published in local journals and /or monographs, chapters published in local publications.  2 Poor: popular science publications prevail over research publications  1 Very poor: a single popular science or local research publication.  0 No publications. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **C. Participation in research grants**  **10%** of final result, scale 0-7 points | |
|  | 7 Obtaining a research grant from a foreign grant-giving institution - project leader (principal researcher).  6 Obtaining a research grant from a national grant-giving institution (e.g. from the National Science Centre or the National Centre for Research and Development) - project leader (principal researcher).  5 Obtaining an internal research grant at a university - project leader.  4 Participation in a team research program funded by a foreign grant-giving institution – researcher.  3 Participation in a team research program funded by a national grant-giving institution (e.g. the National Science Centre or the National Centre for Research and Development) - researcher.  2 Participation in a team research program funded by a university - researcher.  1 Participation in a team research program as a collaborative researcher (under a specific contract).  0 No participation in research grants. |
| **D. Interview**  **20%** of final result, scale 0-15 points | |
| Presentation of the research proposal 0-5 points | 5 Excellent: very accurate and logical presentation of the proposal. 4 Very good: clear and consistent presentation of the proposal.  3 Good: presentation of the proposal mostly logical, but not always precise.  2 Poor: imprecise and relatively inconsistent presentation of the proposal.  1 Very poor: imprecise, inconsistent presentation of the proposal. 0 Insufficient: poor presentation performance or no presentation at all. |
| Discussion on the presented research proposal and research interests  0-5 points | 5 Excellent: very precise and logical answers to the questions. 4 Very good: clear and consistent answers to the questions.  3 Good: answers to the questions mostly logical, but not always precise.  2 Poor: relatively imprecise and inconsistent answers to the questions.  1 Very poor: imprecise and inconsistent answers to the questions. 0 No answers to the questions. |
| Assessment of the candidate's aptitude for research work  0-5 points | 5 Excellent aptitude for research work. 4 Very good aptitude for research work. 3 Good aptitude for research work.  2 Poor aptitude for research work.  1 Very poor aptitude for research work. 0 No aptitude for research work. |