*Annex 2*

*to the regulations for the competition to select* ***the******leader of an interdisciplinary scientific team in the research area “The circular economy – energy storage”*** *as part of**Action I.3.4 – “Creation of three research teams that will initiate development of scientific networks conducting studies in the area of civilization diseases, emerging pollutants and circular economy”.*

**EVALUATION FORM FOR THE FIRST STAGE OF RECRUITMENT**

**(Evaluation of the Candidate’s application)**

1. **Formal evaluation**
	1. The Candidate fulfils the formal criteria included in the job offer.
* yes
* no
	1. The Candidate has supplied all of the files requested.
* yes
* no
1. **Evaluation of the project proposal – 50% of the final score.**

Scoring:

* **An excellent project – 9-10 points**

*Definition: A flawless, innovative, and interdisciplinary project. It has very good potential to obtain external funding from international and national sources, and initiate collaboration with the most renowned scientists in the field. The project outcomes have very good prospects for publication in the most renowned scientific journals.*

* **A very good project – 7-8 points**

*Definition: A very good project with numerous innovative and interdisciplinary elements. It is likely to obtain external funding from international and national sources, and initiate collaboration with the most renowned scientists in the field. The project outcomes are likely to be published in mainstream scientific journals.*

* **A good project – 5-6 points**

*Definition: A good project, which includes a few innovative and interdisciplinary elements. It is likely to obtain external funding from national sources, and initiate collaboration with experts in the field. The project outcomes can be prepared for publication in specialised international journals.*

* **A mediocre project – 3-4 points**

*Definition: A mediocre and unoriginal project without interdisciplinary elements. It has limited prospects for obtaining external funding from national sources and initiating collaboration with experts in the field. The outcomes may only be published in less significant scientific journals.*

* **A poor project – 1-2 points**

*Definition: A poor project with no innovative and interdisciplinary elements or prospects for obtaining external funding and/or initiating collaboration with experts in the field. The outcomes may only be published in local, specialised journals of low scientific significance.*

* **No project – 0 points**

*Definition: Lack of any project proposal.*

 **Score for section 2: ........**

 **Short justification of the score: …………….**

1. **Evaluation of the Candidate’s academic record (CV) – 30% of the final score.**

Scoring:

* **An excellent academic record – 9-10 points**

*Definition: The Candidate is among the most prominent scientists in their field. The results of finished projects have been published in the most renowned scientific journals; the Candidate has outstanding experience with group leadership and/or supervising students.*

* **A very good academic record – 7-8 points**

*Definition: The Candidate is an internationally-recognised expert in their field. The results of the Candidate's completed projects have been published in mainstream journals; the Candidate has significant experience with group leadership and/or supervising students.*

* **A good academic record - 5-6 points**

*Definition: The Candidate is internationally recognised in their field. The results of finished projects have been published in specialised journals; the Candidate has satisfactory experience with group leadership and/or supervising students.*

* **A mediocre academic record – 3-4 points**

*Definition: The Candidate is locally recognised in their field. The results of finished projects have been published in specialised journals of moderate and low significance; the Candidate has little experience with group leadership and/or supervising students.*

* **A poor academic record – 1-2 points**

*Definition: The Candidate is not recognised in their field. The results of finished projects have been published in journals of low scientific significance; the Candidate has no or little experience with group leadership and/or supervising students.*

* **No academic record – 0 points**

*Definition: The results of finished projects remain unpublished; the Candidate has no experience with group leadership and/or supervising students.*

**Score for section 3: ........**

**Short justification of the score: …………**

1. **Evaluation of the most important achievements – 20% of the final score.**

Scoring:

* **Excellent achievements – 9-10 points**

*Definition: Breakthrough discoveries in the relevant field.*

* **Very good achievements – 7-8 points**

*Definition: Highly significant discoveries in the relevant field.*

* **Good achievements – 5-6 points**

*Definition: Important discoveries in the relevant field.*

* **Mediocre achievements – 3-4 points**

*Definition: Mediocre, non-unique discoveries.*

* **Poor achievements – 1-2 points**

*Definition: Insignificant discoveries.*

* **No achievements – 0 points**

*Definition: Lack of scientific achievements.*

**Score for section 4: ........**

**Short justification of the score: …………….**

**FINAL SCORE (MAX. 10 points):.......**

(0.5 x score for section 2 + 0.3 x score for section 3 + 0.2 x score for section 4)

**EVALUATION FORM FOR THE SECOND STAGE OF RECRUITMENT**

**(Evaluation of the interview with the Candidate)**

1. Evaluation of the interview with the Candidate.

Scoring:

* **An excellent candidate – 9-10 points**

*Definition: an innovative/breakthrough and interdisciplinary project; well-considered, ambitious, and feasible plans for obtaining external funding and initiating collaboration with the most renowned researchers in the field, excellent social aptitude for leading a research group.*

* **A very good candidate – 7-8 points**

*Definition: a very good project with interdisciplinary elements; well-considered, ambitious, and relatively feasible plans for obtaining external funding and initiating collaboration with the most renowned researchers in the field, very good social aptitude for leading a research group.*

* **A good candidate – 5-6 points**

*Definition: a good project with interdisciplinary elements; well-considered, fairly ambitious, and fairly feasible plans for obtaining external funding and initiating collaboration with experts in the field; average social aptitude for leading a research group.*

* **A mediocre candidate – 3-4 points**

*Definition: A decent and suitable (but not innovative or interdisciplinary) project; fairly well-considered, unambitious, but feasible plans for obtaining external funding and initiating collaboration with experts in the field, moderate social aptitude for leading a research group.*

* **A poor candidate – 1-2 points**

*Definition: A scientifically inadequate project without innovative and interdisciplinary elements; inaccurate and unfeasible plans for obtaining external funding and initiating collaboration with experts in the field, lack of satisfactory social aptitude for leading a research group.*

* **An unacceptable candidate – 0 points**

*Definition: An unprepared, ill-considered project without innovative and interdisciplinary elements; lack of plans for obtaining external funding and initiating collaboration with experts in the field; lack of social aptitude for leading a research group. Alternately, the candidate did not participate in the interview.*

**Score: ........**

**Short justification of the score: ………….**