

Evaluation of applications for the position of *adiunkt*

31 March 2025

PRINCIPLES

The evaluation is based on the University regulations and guidelines

<https://pwr.edu.pl/en/university/european-human-resources-strategy-for-researchers/otm-r>

follows the rules of Open, Transparent and Merit-based Recruitment of Researchers

https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/policy_library/otm-r-finaldoc_0.pdf

and aims at implementing the principles of San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)

<https://sfdora.org/read/>,

as well as the CoARA agreement:

https://coara.eu/app/uploads/2022/09/2022_07_19_rra_agreement_final.pdf,

As such, the evaluation implements a merit-based, qualitative assessment of research achievements, taking into account all the forms of researcher's activity and research output, as well as non-academic expertise whenever applicable.

BASE FOR EVALUATION

1. Brief outline of the applicant's professional career so far
Education, professional titles, scientific degrees (discipline, place, year, supervisor), previous and current employment.
2. A narrative statement of academic achievements (narrative CV)¹ highlighting the applicant's achievements from last 5 years in various relevant fields:
 - 2.1. MODULE 1²
Contributions to the generation of new ideas, tools, methodologies, technical solutions or knowledge, taking into account the topical scope of the call
Outputs of all kinds (with hyperlinked DOI whenever possible); tools, methods, resources, ideas; funding won; scholarships, awards and other forms of recognition; research networks and collaborations established; consistency of the expertise with the topic of the call.
This should include (but does not need to be restricted to) up to two major achievements,

¹ We follow a R4RI-like template, see e.g. the Oxford guide

https://researchsupport.admin.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/researchsupport/documents/media/narrative_cv_guide_oxford_june_2023_0.pdf. The exact form of the CV is open and flexible.

² Fulfilling the criterion of *Research* set in the general University rules.

highlighting the applicant's contribution using Contributor Roles Taxonomy³ and listing not more than three supporting outputs for each, along with the recognition achieved. The time periods of the achievements need to be specified.

2.2. MODULE 2⁴

The development of others and maintenance of effective working relationships

Teaching, supervision, mentoring, leadership, management, collaboration & networking, creating or providing development opportunities.

2.3. MODULE 3⁵

Contributions to the wider research and innovation community

Editing and reviewing duties; committee work; positions of responsibility, leadership roles; contributions to research integrity, academic culture, equality, diversity and inclusion; membership in professional bodies and societies; organisation of community events; contribution to open science.

2.4. MODULE 4⁶

Contributions to broader research/innovation users and audiences and towards wider societal benefit

Partnerships and knowledge exchange beyond academia, policy making, activities towards public understanding of science and public engagement, commercialisation.

2.5. Optional additions

Any information that may be relevant for evaluation, including career breaks; note that this information will be transferred in full to the evaluation panel.

3. Research plan (not longer than 5 pages, 11 pt font)

State of the art of the field; research goals; novelty and importance of the proposed research; work plan; research methodology, relevant existing equipment at Wrocław Tech and ways to provide necessary extensions; expected benefits for the professional development of the applicant and for the research capacity at Wrocław Tech; relevant references.

4. Reference letter

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

1. Formal criteria:

application is complete,

the applicant holds a PhD in the required discipline.

Only applications that satisfy the formal requirements are evaluated.

2. Evaluation of applications according to the criteria listed below. The evaluation panel selects candidates for the interview from among those who scored at least a grade of 5 (50%) for their applications.

³ <https://credit.niso.org/>

⁴ Fulfilling the criterion of *Teaching* in the general University rules.

⁵ Partly fulfilling the criterion of *Organization* in the general University rules.

⁶ Partly fulfilling the criterion of *Organization* in the general University rules.

-
3. Interview. The first part of the interview is a seminar talk open to the Faculty members (30 minutes + 15 minutes discussion), followed by a discussion with the panel members only.
 4. The evaluation panel decides on the recommendation of the candidates and on their positions on the ranking list based on the evaluation of applications and the interview.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING APPLICATIONS

1. Applicant's achievements (MODULES 1–4)

Each module is evaluated separately using the scale 0 – 10, taking into account the reference letter:

10: excellent, fully consistent with the topical scope of the call, no or negligible weaknesses

9:

8: very good with minor weaknesses or imperfect consistency with the topics of the call

7:

6: good achievements, some weaknesses in important academic or professional aspects

5:

4: average achievements, substantial weaknesses in important academic or professional aspects, or expertise does not match the topical scope of the call

3:

2: poor achievements, mostly weak in all relevant academic or professional aspects

1:

0: no or negligible achievements

2. Research plan

The grade is an equal-weight average of the partial grades for:

Quality, pertinence and novelty of the project objectives, and to what extent they are ambitious;

Expected impact on the development of science and beyond;

Soundness of the proposed methodology;

Quality and appropriateness of the applicant's expertise;

Effectiveness of the work plan, assessment and mitigation of risks;

Feasibility, based on the existing research capacity and its reasonable extension;

Expected benefits for the applicant and for the relevant department at Wrocław Tech;

Open science practices and outreach activities;

Each aspect is evaluated using the scale

4: excellent

3: very good

2: good

1: poor

0: very poor

The grade for the research proposal is then normalized to 10.

3. **Final grade**

The final grade is obtained by averaging the grades for the the respective modules and research plan with the weights

MODULE 1: 35%

MODULE 2: 20%

MODULE 3: 5%

MODULE 4: 5%

RESEARCH PLAN: 35%