Evaluator’s point of view

Dr. Maria Cinta Pujol Baiges
Dr. Isabel Parreu Alberich
• have high-level of expertise in the relevant fields of research and innovation (see call for details on types of expertise).
• can be available for occasional, short-term assignments

1. **Register** in the European Commission central expert database (CV) (panel, area & subareas of research expertise)
2. The Research Executive Agency (REA) selects evaluators with balanced composition: various skills, experience, knowledge, geographical diversity and gender, private-public sector balance. (Setting a maximum number of 120 working days for experts in H2020).

3. Panel Programme Office contact you asking for availability and verifying any "disqualifying" conflict of interest (COI).

**Receipt of proposals**

- **Expert**
  - Preselection
  - ~ 50 proposals (abstract)

- **REA**
  - Assigns ~ 15 proposals → IER
  - Assigns ~ 5 CR

- **REA/Expert**
  - Contract Confidentiality, COI, Schedule, IERs, CRs

IER: Individual Evaluation Reports (100-200 experts depending on the panel)
CR: Consensus Reports (as Rapporteur)
Evaluation Procedure

1. **Briefing**
2. Individual evaluation → Individual Evaluation Reports (IER)
3. Consensus Meeting → Consensus Report (CR)
4. Panel Review & Ranking

---

**Evaluators**

- **Receipt of proposals**
  - Eligibility check
  - Allocation of proposals to evaluators

- **Individual evaluation**
  - Individual Evaluation Reports
    - (Usually done remotely)

- **Consensus meeting**
  - Consensus Report
    - (May be done remotely)

- **Panel Review**
  - Panel report
    - Evaluation Summary Report
    - Panel ranked list

- **Finalisation**
  - Final ranked list

---

20th May, Tarragona
Evaluation Procedure. 1. Briefing

- Evaluation Procedure Overview

- Evaluation criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Priority if ex-aequo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Proposal scoring (0-5)

- Report Writing (IER & CR)

- Electronic system (SEP)
Evaluation Procedure. 1. Briefing

✓ MSCA-IF Overview (nº of proposals by panel)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>GF</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Submitted
- Ineligible/Inadmissible
- Total Eligible
- Withdrawn
- TOTAL Evaluated

✓ Scheduling, Panel Organisation

Vice-Chair

Panel Chair

Panel Programme Officer

10%  30%  60%  100% *

Panel meeting

Friday

TIME
Evaluation Procedure. 2. Individual evaluation

- Remote: verification, if necessary (papers, projects, patents, ...)
- Only access to assigned proposals

Read the proposal and evaluate it against all evaluation criteria & sub-criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellence</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality, innovative aspects and credibility of the research</td>
<td>Enhancing research- and innovation-related human resources, skills and working conditions to realise the potential of individuals and to provide new career perspectives</td>
<td>Overall coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including inter/multidisciplinary aspects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity and quality of transfer of knowledge/training for the development of researcher in light of the research objectives</td>
<td>Effectiveness of the proposed measures for communication and results dissemination</td>
<td>Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the supervision and the hosting arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity in research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and institutional commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complete an Individual Evaluation Report (IER)

- **View on operational capacity.** Has the applicant the necessary basic operational capacity to carry out their proposed activity(ies) based on the information provided? (CV, relevant publications or achievements, relevant previous projects or activities, description of any significant infrastructure or any major items of technical equipment,..)

- **Asses the CV of the Experienced Researcher throughout the 3 evaluation criteria** *(Please take into account the researchers' track record in relation to their level of experience)*

- **Comments** for all evaluation criteria & sub-criteria. Express facts, not opinions.

- **Strengths & Weaknesses** in bullet point format (explain shortcomings, but do not make recommendations)

- **Scores** for all evaluation criteria. You give a score of between 0 and 5 to each criterion based on your comments.
### Full scoring scale consistent with the comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20th May, Tarragona
Before CM:
Experts read IER, rapporteur prepares a draft CR
Rapporteur estimates time bounds for discussion of each criterion taking into account its relative importance, divergent views and resubmission.

CM:
• Consensus meeting: 3 Experts + optional: REA personnel (observer, vice-chair) (30 minutes), meeting leaded by the rapporteur.
• To discuss discrepancies-agreements for each criteria and subcriteria.
• Agreement on the scores.
• Selection of the comments for each criteria and subcriteria. Encode comments into score using judgment and common sense consistency checks.

Resubmission: - Each previous strength that now appear as weakness must be addressed and properly justified.
Evaluation Procedure. 3. Consensus Meeting

Workflow Overview

IER PHASE

Write IER

CR PHASE

Write CR

Approve CR

Disapprove

Draft ESR comments

Review ESR comments

Finalize ESR

Panel coordinator

Quality Controller

Disapprove

Submit

Disapprove

Submit

Disapprove

Submit
Writing of the *consensus report*.

- Written by one of the experts (*rapporteur*).
- Approved by all the evaluators.
- Revised by the *Vice-chair*.
- Particular case: *Resubmitted proposals.*

- The comments are consistent with the score, taking into account the proposal's strengths and weaknesses.
- The comments are related to the (sub)criterion in question, well allocated.
- The comments don’t summarize the proposal.
- The comments describes the facts, not personal opinions of the experts.
- The comments are not ambiguous, clear and precise.
- The comments are of adequate length.
- The comments cannot be also recommendations.
- The evaluator (and all the evaluation system) follows the guidelines.
Full scoring scale consistent with the comments

**Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

**Very Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.

**Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.

**Fair.** The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.

**Poor.** The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

The proposal **fails** to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
List of the proposals ordered by the final score.

Indication of the approximated number of proposals which can be granted.

Possible final discussion of the proposals with identical score.

Final Ranking list & presentation (rapporteur) of the 3 first granted proposals.

Time for open discussion of all the members of the panel, about evaluation procedure, incidences, etc....
Evaluator’s point of view

✓ A proposal should be really very well written, including all the criteria and subcriteria in a clear way, overall coherence, and has to fulfill clearly the objective of the call:

“The goal of Individual Fellowships is to enhance the creative and innovative potential of experienced researchers, wishing to diversify their individual competence in terms of skill acquisition through advanced training, international and intersectorial mobility”

✓ It must be evident that there is indeed a research and training plan put up together by the future post-doc and the laboratory head – Clear Commitment. Find/ or be a supporting supervisor!

✓ Self-evaluation. Spelling mistakes
**Evaluator’s point of view**

- All 3 criteria are important (we tend to think only or focus all the effort in the excellence 1\textsuperscript{st} sub-criteria but sometimes the impact can mean the difference). Science is fundamental, but it is not enough. Remember that training is the aim!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellence</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality, innovative aspects and credibility of the research (including inter/multidisciplinary aspects)</td>
<td>Enhancing research- and innovation-related human resources, skills and working conditions to realise the potential of individuals and to provide new career perspectives</td>
<td>Overall coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity and quality of transfer of knowledge/training for the development of researcher in light of the research objectives</td>
<td>Effectiveness of the proposed measures for communication and results dissemination</td>
<td>Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the supervision and the hosting arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity in research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and institutional commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluator’s point of view

Criterion Excellence/Sub-criterion 1

Quality, innovative aspects and credibility of the research (including inter/multidisciplinary aspects)

- Clearly present the question you want to answer with your research. Do not assume that the evaluator is a hard-core expert in the field.
- Write a clear description of the research methodology.
- Explain why it is original, innovative, timely,
- Highlight interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary aspects of your research.
- Demonstrate the host expertise in the field and quality of the supervisors. Do not assume that they are well known. Evaluators base their evaluation on what is written, not on reputation.
Evaluator’s point of view

Criterion Excellence/Sub-criterion 2

Clarity and quality of transfer of knowledge/training for the development of researcher in light of the research objectives

- Transfer of knowledge, from the host to the researcher: explain why the research and training will bring new skills and knowledge to the candidate (doing the same thing that the PhD is not highly ranked).
- Identify the training and transfer of knowledge objectives.
- Complementary skills are highly scored. The aim is to be trained to become mature and possibly a independent researcher. Examples: research management, presentation skills, ethics, gender balance, exposure to industry sector.. etc.
- From the researcher to the host: knowledge and skills previously acquired.
- For Global Fellowships: assess how the new skills and knowledge acquired in the Third Country will be transferred back to the host institution in Europe.
Evaluator’s point of view

Criterion Excellence/Sub-criterion 3

Quality of the supervision and the hosting arrangements

- Demonstrate the experience of the host/supervisor in training postdocs. Again write it clear, do not assume that the evaluators know by reputation.
- Describe the supervision commitment.

Criterion Excellence/Sub-criterion 4

Capacity of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity in research

- A clear CV demonstrating the past achievements and experience of the candidate should be presented.
- Demonstrate independent thinking and leadership qualities, previous mentoring experiences, etc. All personal initiatives which can be meaningful.
- If the project will reinforce or pave the way for future collaboration do you should highlight.
Evaluator's point of view

Criterion Impact/Sub-criterion 1
Enhancing research- and innovation-related human resources, skills and working conditions to realise the potential of individuals and to provide new career perspectives

✓ to what extent competences acquired during the fellowship, including any secondments, increase the impact of the researcher’s future activity on European society.
✓ The main focus and attention should be on the impact of the project on the career of the researcher and not on the researcher's activity on European society.

Criterion Impact/Sub-criterion 2
Effectiveness of the proposed measures for communication and results dissemination

✓ Distinguish between dissemination & communication activities.
✓ Identify the target audiences of your communication and dissemination activities.
✓ Describe the activities in a very concrete way, with clear plans (don’t be vague)
✓ Be original.
✓ Science should be accessible to a wider audience: the communication on your project’s outcome to the general public is important.
Evaluator’s point of view

**Criterion Implementation/Sub-criterion 1**

Overall coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

- Present a realistic and verifiable work plan: timeline, work packages, milestones and deliverables. Add a Gantt Chart.
- 2/3-year project, demonstrate work plan feasibility (tasks, resources & time), ambition is good, but do not be too bold.
- Include all the tasks & activities described before in sections 1 & 2.

**Criterion Implementation/Sub-criterion 2**

Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management

- Explain the implementation support at host, build yourself a safety net.
- Emphasise and describe your coordinator role (management, communication, decision-making)
- Provide the risk analysis/mitigation plans, and, if possible, show a plan B.
Evaluator’s point of view

Criterion Implementation/Sub-criterion 3
Appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructure)

✓ Demonstrate the necessary infrastructure for your project is available at the host (collaborations)/participating organisations.

Criterion Implementation/Sub-criterion 4
Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and institutional commitment

✓ Demonstrate the availability of appropriate staff resources to supervise/train researcher.
✓ Demonstrate complementarity of participating organisations (global or industry secondments).
✓ Explain the practical things for hosting the fellow – housing, language courses, support for integration in a foreign system, kindergartens and schools – all the necessary things for moving to another country, in some cases with a family.
Round table
Conflict of interest (CoI)

- was involved in the preparation of the proposal
- stands to benefit directly or indirectly if the proposal is accepted
- has a close family or personal relationship with any person representing an applicant legal entity
- is a director, trustee or partner or is in any way involved in the management of an applicant legal entity
- is employed or contracted by one of the applicant legal entities or any named subcontractors

Experts with a COI shall not evaluate the relevant proposal but may participate in the evaluation

Aware of CoI? You must immediately inform REA