

# ERC Advanced Grant Evaluation

## SH3 Environment and Society

Tüzin BAYCAN-LEVENT

# Domain and Panel Structure

## THREE DISCIPLINARY DOMAINS

Social Sciences and Humanities (SH)

Life sciences (LS)

Physical and Engineering Sciences (PE)

## 25 PANEL TITLES

Social Sciences and Humanities (SH) (**6 Panels**)

Life sciences (LS) (**9 Panels**)

Physical and Engineering Sciences (PE) (**10 Panels**)

# Social Sciences and Humanities

**SH1 Individuals, institutions and markets:** economics, finance and management

**SH2 Institutions, values, beliefs and behaviour:** sociology, social anthropology, political science, law, communication, social studies of science and technology

**SH3 Environment and society:** environmental studies, demography, social geography, urban and regional studies

**SH4 The human mind and its complexity:** cognition, psychology, linguistics, philosophy and education

**SH5 Cultures and cultural production:** literature, visual and performing arts, music, cultural and comparative studies

**SH6 The study of the human past:** archaeology, history and memory

# SH3: Environment and Society

## Proposals:

23 proposals submitted  
2 Ineligible proposals  
8 Submitted to Eligibility committee  
21 to be sent for evaluation

## Foreseen Outcome:

Numbers of proposals to be finally granted within the panel : 2 -3  
Numbers of proposals to be finally granted in the interdisciplinary domain : 1

## Panel Members:

10 panel members including Panel Chair  
5 "cross -atlantic" panel members

# Evaluation

**Remote Evaluation**

**Panel Evaluation**

# Remote Evaluation

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

## EVALUATION IS A 2-STEP PROCESS

Each step consists of a remote evaluation followed by a panel meeting. The remote evaluation consists of individual reviews carried out on each proposal prior to the meeting. Each review contains explanatory comments on each evaluation criterion and awarding scores.

**Step 1:** The section 1 of each proposal is assessed and scored on the PI and the research project.

**Step 2:** The full proposal (all 3 sections) is assessed and scored (PI, research project and research environment).

# Remote Evaluation

## **SECTION 1:**

scientific leadership profile (2 pages)  
curriculum vitae (2 p)  
10-year track record (2 p)  
extended synopsis of the project (5 p)

## **SECTION 2:**

full scientific proposal (15 pages)

## **SECTION 3:**

research environment (2 pages)

# Evaluation

## Suggestions for the upcoming evaluation procedure

### Step 1

#### Remote evaluation:

Assignment to 4 panel members per proposal + when necessary external PM

Approx. workload : max. 9 reviews per panel member

All section 1 proposals to be read by panel members in order to help the discussion

#### Panel Meeting : 13 -15 May 2008

In any case every PM should attend

10 proposals should be eliminated in a first batch

At the end of the meeting, 5-6 proposals should be selected for step 2 evaluation

Estimated time needed for the meeting : max. 2 days

# Evaluation

## Suggestions for the upcoming evaluation procedure

### Step 2

#### Remote evaluation

Assignment to 3 panel members + 2 external referees (suggested at step 1)

Approx. workload : max. 3 proposals per panel member

All retained proposals to be read by panel members

#### Panel Meeting : 8 -10 July 2008

Cross-atlantic panel members : Attendance optional

Phone conference provided end of afternoon for consultation, discussion and finalization

At the end of the meeting, 2-3 proposals should be selected for granting and potentially 1 submitted to interdisciplinary domain

Estimated time needed for the meeting : 1 day

# Remote Evaluation

## EVALUATION CRITERIA

***The Principal Investigator (PI):*** Quality of Research Output/Track-Record  
Intellectual Capacity and Creativity

***The Research Project:*** Groundbreaking Nature of the Research  
Potential Impact of the Research  
Methodology  
High-gain/High-risk Balance

***The Research Environment:*** Contribution of the Research Environment to the Project  
Participation of Other Legal Entities

# Remote Evaluation

## SCORING OF THE CRITERIA AND QUALITY THRESHOLD

*for the potential of the PI (publications, conferences, patents ...):*

- 4.0 absolutely outstanding records
- 3.5 internationally competitive and excellent records
- 3.0 excellent records in the field, qualified for the proposal
- 2.5 very good records but not exceptional
- 2.0 average records but commonplace
- 1.5 uncompetitive records with weaknesses
- 1.0 totally insufficient records

# Remote Evaluation

## SCORING OF THE CRITERIA AND QUALITY THRESHOLD

*for the quality of the proposed research project:*

- 4.0 absolutely outstanding and original, internationally competitive
- 3.5 groundbreaking, innovative within a field
- 3.0 excellent, relevant but not exceptional
- 2.5 very good and feasible
- 2.0 average or good, however commonplace, not enough original or not novel in this team
- 1.5 feasible but pursued by many, not relevant in the field
- 1.0 fundamentally flawed in rationale, methodology or work hypothesis, uncompetitive, not feasible

# Remote Evaluation

## SCORING OF THE CRITERIA AND QUALITY THRESHOLD

A quality threshold of = 2 will be applied on these evaluation criteria.

If a proposal is marked below this threshold on any of the 2 evaluation criteria, it will not be retained.

# Remote Evaluation

## SCORING OF THE CRITERIA AND QUALITY THRESHOLD

The allocation of the top mark 4 will not exceed 10%

No more than a third of the proposals will be assigned a mark above the fail threshold of 2.

# Panel Evaluation

**Step 1:** The panel ranked the proposals according to their final scores. Proposals with scores below the quality threshold rejected. Proposals with scores above the quality threshold ranked and the ones above the budgetary cut-off (which corresponds to 3 times the indicative budget of the panel) passed to step 2.

**Step 2:** The full proposals assessed and scored (PI, research project and research environment). The panel requested additional reviews by remote referees when a particular expertise is needed. The proposals scored below the quality threshold eliminated. The panel prepared a consolidated list of retained proposals which are above the quality threshold and which can be funded in order of priority within the budget allocated to the panel. The panel also decided an interdisciplinary proposal with score above the quality threshold to transfer to the Interdisciplinary domain.

# Critical Success Factors

The potential of the PI is very important.

**BUT**

The quality of the proposed research project is more important.

Panel members are more interested with the originality and novelty of the proposed research projects than the potential and records of the PI

# Critical Success Factors

Successful PIs propose excellent and relevant research projects.

**BUT**

They may fail in proposing original, innovative and groundbreaking research projects. Their proposals may reflect the continuity of their previous projects.

Internationally competitive and excellent records of the PI do not guarantee the originality and novelty of the proposed research project.

# Critical Success Factors

## Successful PIs

- A high leadership profile with internationally competitive and excellent records
- An original idea and creativity

## Successful Research Proposals

- An innovative approach
- A high potential impact
- Novelty in methodological approaches (new methodologies or combination of different methodologies which is new)
- A high quality of the research environment, relevant research infrastructure

# Recommendations

- Write your project proposal in a very systematic way
- Avoid to propose a project which reflects the continuity of your previous researches
- Emphasize the originality and novelty of your project
- Highlight the potential impact of your project
- Emphasize what is new in your methodological approach
- Pay more attention to the extended synopsis of the project as panel members will eliminate the proposals in Step 1 on the basis of this part
- To pass to Step 2 may increase your chance not only for the present call but also for the next calls
- An interdisciplinary approach may also increase your chance to be evaluated by interdisciplinary domain. This is a second chance that should not be missed.