*Annex 2*

*to the regulations for the competition to select* ***the******leader of an interdisciplinary scientific team in the research area “Emerging biological hazards in view of the globalization and changing socio-economic factors, and development of bioremediation techniques for polluted environment”*** *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 - 30% 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 published 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 specialised international journals of lower scientific significance.*

* **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 benefits for the University of Warsaw (UW)\* - 30% of the final score.**

*(\*in the case of Candidates already employed at the University of Warsaw, only the additional benefit (so-called added value) resulting from the employment of the Candidate under Action I.3.4 should be assessed).*

Scoring:

* **Excellent benefits - 9-10 points**

*Definition: Excellent benefits for the UW: introducing at the UW a novel, highly original and innovative, research topic, establishing international collaboration, novel to the UW, with research institutions / groups that are the best in a given discipline, creating or joining the most important international research networks, establishing close collaboration with groups already existing at the UW.*

* **Very substantial benefits - 7-8 points**

*Definition: Very substantial benefits for the UW: introducing at the UW a novel research topic with numerous innovative and interdisciplinary elements, establishing international collaboration, novel to the UW, with research institutions / groups that are renowned in a given discipline, creating or joining important international research networks, establishing close collaboration with groups already existing at the UW.*

* **Substantial benefits - 5-6 points**

*Definition: Substantial benefits for the UW: introducing at the UW a novel research topic with a few innovative and interdisciplinary elements, establishing international collaboration, novel to the UW, with research institutions / groups specializing in a given discipline, creating or joining international research networks, establishing collaboration with groups already existing at the UW.*

* **Moderate benefits - 3-4 points**

*Definition: Moderate benefits for the UW: introducing at the UW a novel research topic without substantial innovative and interdisciplinary elements, limited prospects for establishing international collaboration, novel to the UW, with research institutions / groups specializing in a given discipline, creating or joining international research networks, and establishing collaboration with groups already existing at the UW.*

* **Poor benefits - 1-2 points**

*Definition: Poor benefits for the UW: introducing at the UW a novel research topic without innovative and interdisciplinary elements, no prospects for establishing international collaboration, novel to the UW, with research institutions / groups specializing in a given discipline and creating or joining international research networks, limited prospects for establishing collaboration with groups already existing at the UW.*

* **No benefits - 0 points**

*Definition: No benefits for the UW: no prospects for introducing to the UW a novel research topic, establishing international collaboration, novel to the UW, with research institutions / groups specializing in a given discipline, creating or joining international research networks, and establishing collaboration with groups already existing at the UW.*

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

**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 4: ........**

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

1. **Evaluation of the most important achievements - 10% 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 5: ........**

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

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

(0.3 x score for section 2 + 0.3 x score for section 3 + 0.3 x score for section 4 + 0.1 x score for section 5)

**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, excellent benefits for the University of Warsaw resulting from the employment of the Candidate under Action I.3.4.*

* **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, very substantial benefits for the University of Warsaw resulting from the employment of the Candidate under Action I.3.4.*

* **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, substantial benefits for the University of Warsaw resulting from the employment of the Candidate under Action I.3.4.*

* **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, moderate benefits for the University of Warsaw resulting from the employment of the Candidate under Action I.3.4.*

* **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, poor benefits for the University of Warsaw resulting from the employment of the Candidate under Action I.3.4.*

* **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, no benefits for the University of Warsaw resulting from the employment of the Candidate under Action I.3.4. Alternatively, the candidate did not participate in the interview.*

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

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