

Order No. 26/2022

issued by the Rector of Akademia Wychowania Fizycznego im. Bronisława Czecha w Krakowie on 12 September 2022 setting out rules of financing and delivery of research tasks / scientific projects by Doctoral Students, including Doctoral School participants

Pursuant to Art. 23 of the Higher Education and Science Law Act of 20 July 2018 (Journal of Laws year 2022, item 574 as amended) I hereby order as follows:

General provisions

§ 1

1. This Order sets out rules of financing research tasks/ scientific projects conducted by doctoral students of the Doctoral School or participants of doctoral programmes from the subsidy granted to Akademia Wychowania Fizycznego im. Bronisława Czecha w Krakowie, hereinafter referred to as „the University” by the Minister of Education and Science.
2. The funds allocated to the funding of research tasks/ scientific projects conducted by doctoral students of the Doctoral School, including Doctoral School participants, are administered by the Doctoral School Director.
3. The Rector determines the amount of funding from the subsidy for the implementation of research tasks/scientific projects carried out by doctoral students, including participants of the Doctoral School, for each calendar year, after consulting the Vice-Rector for Science, the Doctoral School Director, the Bursar, and the Head of the Science and Publishing Department.
4. The funds received for the implementation of a research task/scientific project should be spent in accordance with the applicable regulations, in particular with Article 44, Section 3 of the Public Finance Act (Journal of Laws year 2022, item 305 as further amended) ensuring that any such expense is:
 - 1) purposeful and cost-effective and observes the principles of: achieving optimal results from the expenditures made, optimal selection of methods and means to achieve the intended goals;
 - 2) managed in a way that allows for the timely completion of tasks;
 - 3) disbursed in amounts and timeframes reflecting any previously incurred obligations.

§ 2

Funds from the subsidy allocated for research, conducted by doctoral students of the Doctoral School, including Doctoral School participants, may be used to finance:

1. salaries, in cases where the work necessary for the delivery of planned tasks, due to their specific nature, cannot be performed by employees employed by AWF Kraków;

2. participation in scientific conferences and training courses (seminars) related to the scope of research;
3. business trips and fellowships for conducting research;
4. co-financing the publication of scientific articles;
5. services necessary for the delivery of research tasks;
6. photocopying services outsourced outside AWF Kraków (in cases where such services cannot be reasonably performed at the University);
7. purchases of scientific literature;
8. purchases that will be necessary for the delivery of research tasks;
9. purchases of scientific research equipment related to the research.

Rules for organising the competition

§ 3

1. The Doctoral School Director announces a competition for funding scientific projects/research tasks for doctoral students, including participants of the Doctoral School, through an internal competitive procedure.
2. The competition announcement, along with the applicable deadlines for the given year, is published on the websites of the AWF Kraków Science and Publishing Department and the AWF Doctoral School.
3. Participation in the competition requires that a written application be submitted within a prescribed time limit (by 31 January of the calendar year).
4. The funding application template is provided as Appendix No. 1 to the Order.
5. The application template is available on the websites of the Science and Publishing Department and the Doctoral School.
6. The financial plan (general framework) for the total project costs may not exceed PLN 15,000.00.
7. To evaluate applications for research funding, the Doctoral School Director will appoint reviewers.
8. The substantive evaluation of the application is carried out by a reviewer appointed by the Doctoral School Director, based on the "**Research Project Review Questionnaire**", which is attached as **Appendix No. 2a or 2b** to the Order.
9. The basic criteria for evaluation and qualification for funding include:
 1. substantive value of the project;

2. reasons for conducting research related to the delivery of the research project constituting the subject of the doctoral dissertation;
3. potential practical applicability of the obtained results;
4. reasons justifying the need for incurring financial expenditures.

10. After completing the substantive evaluation of the submitted applications, the Doctoral School Director will make a decision regarding the award of funding and determine the amount allocated to the projects that have been approved for implementation.

11. The number of projects accepted for funding is determined by the amount of funds allocated by the Rector from the subsidy granted to the University.

12. The final distribution of funds for a given calendar year and the decisions on the amounts awarded are approved by the Doctoral School Director.

13. The Doctoral School Director has the right to grant funding for an approved project in an amount different (higher or lower) from the requested amount, subject to the availability of funds and opinions from the project reviewers.

14. The allocation of funds is made within 14 days of the date of receiving Rector's notification on the allocation of funds for financing research conducted by Doctoral School participants.

15. Funding is granted for one calendar year. The project leader may submit an application for the continuation of the project and its funding for a maximum of two years from the commencement of the research implementation.

Principles of delivering research projects

§ 4

1. The funds are released immediately after the applicants are notified of the Doctoral School Director's decision on award of funding.

2. The funds allocated for delivery of the project cannot be used for purposes other than those specified in the application.

3. If it is necessary to defer the expenditure of some part of the funds until the following year, a request for approval must be submitted to the Doctoral School Director, along with a cost estimate and a statement of reasons.

4. Final expenditure of the funds in the following year only after submitting a report on expenditures incurred so far (as of 30th. November of the grant year).

5. All expenses related to the delivery of the research project must comply with applicable regulations, be justified, and have a direct connection with the planned research, in accordance with the submitted application and cost calculation.

6. Indirect costs are charged on direct expenditures, as determined by a separate Rector's order.

7. The Doctoral School Director exercises supervision as well as substantive and financial control over the use of awarded funds.
8. The recipient of the funds is required to submit an expenditure report and a research progress report for approval by the Doctoral School Director by 31st of January of the year following the grant year, using the template specified in Appendix No. 3 to the Order.
9. The final outcome of the research should be a scientific publication or a doctoral dissertation, which must be submitted to the Doctoral School Director not later than 18 months after the completion of the project.
10. Failure to submit the report or to publish the research within the specified timeframe will prevent the person from applying for further funding for a period of five years.
11. Whenever irregularities are detected, the recipient will lose the funding and will be required to return the improperly expended funds within seven days of the date on which the irregularity was detected.
12. If the applicant decides to forgo the allocated funding, the unused funds will be redistributed through an additional competition announced by the Doctoral School Director.

§ 5

1. This Order shall take effect on 1 October 2022.
2. *Rector's Order no. 12/2019 dated 16 May 2019 determining the principles of awarding funds for research projects undertaken by young scientists and doctoral students* is no longer in effect.

RECTOR

(-) Andrzej Klimek Prof., Dr hab.

**APPLICATION FOR FUNDING A RESEARCH PROJECT DELIVERED AS PART OF SCIENTIFIC
RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT WORK AND RELATED ACTIVITIES AIMED AT THE DEVELOPMENT
OF DOCTORAL SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS IN THE YEAR ____**

1. Title of the research project to be completed at the Doctoral School:

.....
.....

2. Project leader and other contractors (full name, academic title/degree, position):

.....
.....
.....
.....

3. Place of project delivery (Institute, Department):

.....

4. Project start date:

5. Project termination date:

6. Type of actions related to the research project covered by the application:

.....
.....

7. Project overview:

Aim and scope of the project

Research material and methods

8. PROJECT COST ESTIMATE

	Year	Total
Calculation		
Salaries *		
Specialised instruments		
Materials		
Chemical reagents		
Business trips**		
Transport costs (fuel costs, lump sum)		
Printing services		
Outsourced direct services ***		
Indirect costs (15% of the costs, excluding instruments)		
Total		

*/ Salaries from the non-personal fund only for external individuals

/ Costs of business trips, participation in national and international conferences and congresses

*** / Costs of research and construction work, science and technology assistance necessary for research that cannot be conducted in house at the University (based on invoices submitted by the contractor).

Publication costs will be reimbursed only for articles published in a MEiN-listed journal

Substantive description for project cost estimate:

1. Declarations submitted by Application Leader

I declare that the submitted application for research funding is/is not my first application submitted at the University.

.....

Date and signature of Application Leader

I declare that I have submitted the substantive report (report) along with the financial settlement for the research conducted in previous years.

Date and signature of Application Leader

10. Supervisor's statement

I declare that I have reviewed the project, I confirm its substantive and methodological value as well as its feasibility, and I further consent to its implementation as part of the official duties of the project author(s) within the unit under my supervision.

.....

Date and signature of Supervisor

11. I hereby undertake to:

- a) submit – by 31st. of January next year – an annual research report;
- b) submit a research report within two weeks of the date of research completion.

.....

Date and signature of Application Leader

RESEARCH PROJECT REVIEW FORM

<i>Project title</i>	
<i>Project leader</i>	

I. Assessment of the scientific and/or practical value of the research covered by the project

1	Formulation of the scientific and/or practical objective	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ - - - +- + ++
2	Originality of the problem, hypotheses, and research methods	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ - - - +- + ++
3	Accuracy of the selection of research methods and tools	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ - - - +- + ++
4	Significance of the expected results for science	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ - - - +- + ++
5	Significance of the expected results for practice	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ - - - +- + ++

Qualitative assessment:

Score-based assessment: (2-5; 2 – poor, 3 – satisfactory, 4-good, 5 – very good)

II. Assessment of the conditions for project delivery

1	The achievements and qualifications of the supervisor and the project executor	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ - - - +- + ++
2	The conditions provided by the institution where the project will be carried out	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ - - - +- + ++

Qualitative assessment:

Score-based assessment: (2-5; 2 – poor, 3 – satisfactory, 4-good, 5 – very good)

III. Assessment of the cost estimate for the work covered by the project

Qualitative assessment

1	Research plan and its compliance with the description	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ -- - +- + ++
2	Overall project costs in relation to the intended objective	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ -- - +- + ++
3	Justification of planned purchases and costs of instruments	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ -- - +- + ++
4	Justification of travel expenses within the project costs in relation to the purpose of these trips	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ -- - +- + ++

Qualitative assessment

Score-based assessment: (2-5; 2 – poor, 3 – satisfactory, 4-good, 5 – very good)

.....

Signature of Project Reviewer

Instructions for reviewers:

1. **Qualitative assessment** (subpoints in sections I, II, III of the review) expresses deviations from the recognized standard in the field: standard rating (+/-), rating below standard (-), low rating (--), rating above standard (+), and high rating (++). These are not partial numerical scores that contribute to the overall point-based evaluation of sections I, II, and III of the review. Therefore, no numerical values should be entered for qualitative assessment; instead, the selected rating is marked with an "X."

2. **Point-based (numerical) assessment** applies to the overall evaluation of the three sections of the review: **I** – assessment of the project's substantive quality (scores from 2 to 5), **II** – assessment of the conditions for project delivery (scores from 2 to 5), **III** – assessment of the justification for the planned project costs (scores from 2 to 5)

3. In the justification, please indicate which elements from the qualitative assessment had the strongest impact on the score-based assessment. If the funding application lacks information necessary for the Reviewer to determine any of the qualitative sub-assessments, please highlight this issue in the justification.

RESEARCH PROJECT REVIEW FORM

<i>Project title</i>	
<i>Project leader</i>	

I. Assessment of the scientific and/or practical value of the research covered by the project

1	Formulation of the scientific and/or practical objective	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ -- - +- + ++
2	Originality of the problem, hypotheses, and research methods	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ -- - +- + ++
3	Significance of the expected results for science	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ -- - +- + ++
4	Significance of the expected results for practice	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ -- - +- + ++

Qualitative assessment:

Score-based assessment: (2-5; 2 – poor, 3 – satisfactory, 4-good, 5 – very good)

II. Assessment of the conditions for project delivery

1	The conditions provided by the institution where the project will be carried out	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ -- - +- + ++
---	--	---------------------------

Qualitative assessment:

Score-based assessment: (2-5; 2 – poor, 3 – satisfactory, 4-good, 5 – very good)

III. Assessment of the cost estimate for the work covered by the project

Qualitative assessment

1	Overall project costs in relation to the intended objective	↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ -- - +- + ++
---	---	---------------------------

Qualitative assessment

Score-based assessment: (2-5; 2 – poor, 3 – satisfactory, 4-good, 5 – very good)

.....

Signature of Project Reviewer

Instructions for reviewers:

1. **Qualitative assessment** (subpoints in sections I, II, III of the review) expresses deviations from the recognized standard in the field: standard rating (+/-), rating below standard (-), low rating (--), rating above standard (+), and high rating (++). These are not partial numerical scores that contribute to the overall point-based evaluation of sections I, II, and III of the review. Therefore, no numerical values should be entered for qualitative assessment; instead, the selected rating is marked with an "X."
2. **Point-based (numerical) assessment** applies to the overall evaluation of the three sections of the review: **I** – assessment of the project's substantive quality (scores from 2 to 5), **II** – assessment of the conditions for project delivery (scores from 2 to 5), **III** – assessment of the justification for the planned project costs (scores from 2 to 5)
3. In the justification, please indicate which elements from the qualitative assessment had the strongest impact on the score-based assessment. If the funding application lacks information necessary for the Reviewer to determine any of the qualitative sub-assessments, please highlight this issue in the justification.

**DESCRIPTION OF A RESEARCH PROJECT DELIVERED AS PART OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR
DEVELOPMENTAL WORK AND RELATED ACTIVITIES PROMOTING DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTORAL
SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS IN YEAR.....**

- 1. Project leader**
- 2. Project title**
- 3. Project number**
- 4. Project start date**
- 5. Project end date**

- I. List of named contributors including their participation in the project costs:**
- II. Substantive description of the completed task (research objectives, description of completed work, overview of key achievements, hypothesis verification, significance of the results, and methods of disseminating findings)**
- III. List of instruments purchased:**

FINAL COST CALCULATION FOR THE PROJECT DELIVERY

Cost calculation	Costs incurred in years			
				Total
Salaries				
Specialised instruments				
Materials				
Chemical reagents				
Business trips				
Transport costs (fuel costs, lump sum)				
Printing services				
Outsourced direct services				
Indirect costs (15% of the costs, excluding instruments)				
Total				

.....
Date and signature of Application Leader

.....
Date and signature of Supervisor Data