

The EU Framework Programme
for Research and Innovation

HORIZON 2020



RISE

The Evaluation Process

Remote evaluation

- Use SEP at all moments
- Experts write IER
- Rapporteur prepares *draft* CR for central phase

Central evaluation

- Experts discuss draft CR during consensus meeting + moderator
- CR checked by VC – ESR
- Double quality check by other VC - final ESR
- Ranking list - Not the ones you prefer, but based on objective facts (global note, threshold).
- Ex aequo? Excellence, Impact, Implementation
- Ethics will be looked at by separate screening
- Decision goes to proposer (yes/no, no negotiation!)
- Complaints: redress procedure (very exceptional!)

Tools

Well organised, assistance and tools

Three experts, VC and REA

SEP:

- Proposals
- Templates report(s)
- Communication tool (messages)
- Access to information, documents, ...

The Grid:

- Understand items in each criterion
- Use it to take notes while doing analysis
- Have a reminder aid during consensus meeting discussions

Careful:

- * Grid is *not* report, just aid;
- * Comments should be merged and synthesised.

Role of experts

Read proposals,
apply expertise,
write report ...

- that's it!

Independent, impartial, objective, accurate, consistent,
confidential, professional, ...

The evaluator does not decide about yes/no, only evaluates quality of proposal, gives info enabling comparison afterwards

Excellence (50), impact (30), implementation (20)

Total >70

Evaluation - fail/poor/good/very good/excellent (0 – 5)

It's all about quality:

- Comments should be clear, precise, accurate and justified.
- There will be a quality control afterwards, but need quality from the start.

Reporting:

Verdict should be credible, justified, the right tools are identified.

Example: combining A and B matches the proposal very well...

Is everything clear?

All sub-criteria covered?

Is the work plan feasible?

Credible?

...

Caveat!

- Artificial collaborations (we are not a travel agency!)
- Report plagiarism, false results/citations , ...
- Check subdivision over industry/academia countries, ...
- Only use info *in* the proposal (no google, etc)
- Does proposal match evaluation criteria?
- Do *not* give advice, just evaluate!
- Gender, operational capacity, ethics
- General comments?

Some advice

- Be brief and concrete; no blah blah!
- Not *opinion*, but *facts*, so, no: I think...; it should be funded; I worked with these people, they're good; the work plan does not deal with climate change - nowadays ...
- Do not repeat (parts of) the proposal: evaluating \neq describing
- Good, bad? Why
- Mind contradictions
- Beware of repetitions and double penalising
- Use whole spectrum of marks
- Avoid “good, but ...”
- Mind your language (be nice, text goes to proposer...)

Better Proposals

Some 300 submissions (ENG 90 – MATH 8)

- Good, clean and clear, precise and readable
- Explain clearly the aim of the proposal
- Claims: prove them, convince us!
- Motivate the composition of consortium, in particular role academia versus industry; do *not* forget “administration” with active link with R&I (technical, administrative or managerial).

RISE = “Research and Innovation Staff Exchange”

Practically:

- Use diagrams and tables to explain (very helpful for experts!)
- Do not squeeze text up to last letter
- Pagelimit (30p for 3 criteria, excluding letters of commitment, operational capacity, etc):
 - * excess pages will be disregarded;
 - * no tricks; font size, margins!

Good luck!

