

## Stage 1 - Final Decision

### 2013 Evaluation of FCT Research and Development Units

#### Review process - Stage 1: Final Decision

#### Stage 1 - Preliminary Hearing

The applicant requested Preliminary Hearing after Stage 1?

Yes

Do you find any grounds (factual errors or shortcomings of scientific nature) to change the initial Panel decision?

No

#### Comments

##### Feedback to applicants

One of the usual problems faced in the evaluation of proposals is the different criteria used by different referees. Therefore, in order to harmonize the grades and end up with a fair evaluation process, all proposals have been discussed in a consensus meeting with the full panel members. In this case, even if the referees gave initially 16, 16 and 18 points, the harmonization made by the full panel adopting standard criteria led to 14 points. This can be easily misunderstood for those that didn't participate in the panel meetings but it's totally justified. Sometimes, referees range from those that give maximum score almost always to those that give harsh grades no matter how good is the proposal. This has not been the case but different criteria have to be smoothed in the final outcome. A thorough discussion was made at the panel meeting, certain standards were laid down that transcended disciplinary fields, and an overall grade of 14 and a qualification of "good" was reached by consensus of the panel. The appeal submitted by the applicants has been read and taken into consideration by two referees and validated by all panel members. The arguments given in the appeal do not affect the grade agreed at the consensus panel meeting, and therefore do not alter the outcome of the evaluation process at this stage.

#### Outcome of Stage 1

Proceeding to Stage 2?

No

Total Score (0...20)

Total Score (A+B+C+D)

14

Grade

Good

Proposal for funding

Annual Core Funding (€)

10000.00
----------

Elegible for restructuring funding?

All units graded as Good and with an overall score of 14 or 15 (as the sum of scores for the four evaluation criteria), in Stage 1 of the review, are eligible for the Strategic Restructuring Plan / Incentive.

Funding is conditional to submission of a plan for strategic restructuring of the research unit.

Yes
-----

## **Individual criteria**

Grading Scale for individual criteria:

5 - Excellent (All relevant aspects of the assessment criteria successfully addressed. Any shortcomings are minor)

4 - Very Good (Assessment criteria very well addressed/met, although certain improvements are still possible)

3 - Good (Assessment criteria well addressed/met, although improvements would be necessary)

2 - Fair (Assessment criteria broadly addressed, however there are significant weaknesses)

1 - Poor (Assessment criteria addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses)

### **A. Productivity and contribution to the National Scientific and Technological System (NSTS)**

i.) Research outputs; knowledge and technology transfer activities, when applicable, giving particular importance to the registration and value of patents, models or other relevant innovation indicators;

ii.) Contribution to the accumulation of knowledge and skills of the National Science and Technology System (expected effects and results); contribution to the advanced training of researchers; contribution to the promotion and dissemination of scientific and technological research; dissemination of results and actions to promote scientific culture, as well as participation in activities designed to promote public understanding of science, technology, art and culture; relationship between available past funding and output;

iii.) Degree of multidisciplinary and of internationalization, when relevant

Score

4
---

### **B. Scientific and technological merit of the research team**

i.) Scientific productivity and merit of the results of the Unit's research, taking into account the relevance of both current and planned research, as well as the level of internationalization of scientific activities, including publications and citations of published works or other relevant aspects;

ii.) Skills and composition of the research team to adequately execute the proposed program;

iii.) Ability to successfully compete for national and international research grants and contracts, including contracts with companies.

Score

3
---

### **C. Scientific merit and innovative nature of the strategic programme**

i.) Relevance, originality and impact of the proposed strategic programme;

ii.) Contribution of the scientific, technological, artistic or cultural activities of the proposed programme for a smart specialization strategy of the region in which the R&D Unit is incorporated;

iii.) Degree of multidisciplinary and of internationalization, when relevant.

Score

4
---

## D. Feasibility of the work plan and reasonability of the requested budget

- i.) Organisation of the programme in terms of the proposed objectives and resources (budget, duration, infrastructures); organisation and work environment, with special focus on the adequacy of the research team's critical mass to perform the proposed objectives and on the management of resources directed to research activities, which includes supervision of postgraduate students and post-doctoral involvement in R&D activities;
- ii.) Adequacy of proposed budget to accomplish the proposed strategic programme;
- iii.) Institutional resources (technical, scientific, organisational and managerial) of the participating entities. The commitment of the host institution in providing the manpower and material resources to implement the proposed programme is especially valued.

Score

3

## Additional questions

### 1. Laboratory intensity level

Do you agree with the laboratory intensity level suggested in the consensus report?

Yes

### 2. Suggested basic and applied research/experimental development share

Do you agree with the suggested basic and applied research/experimental development share suggested in the application?

No

If no, please indicate your recommended basic/applied research share

Indicated in % as XX/xx, with basic share always in first position, i.e. 60/40 = 60 basic research and 40 applied research

50/50