



TECHNOLOGICKÉ  
CENTRUM AV ČR

# POHLED HODNOTITELŮ – NEJČASTĚJŠÍ CHYBY A JAK SE JICH VYVAROVAT

**Workshop k přípravě projektů do výzvy ERA Chairs 2017**

Anna Vosečková, [voseckova@tc.cz](mailto:voseckova@tc.cz)

16. 3. 2017

---

# HODNOTITELÉ SEWP

- **r. 2014 - seznamy publikovány na Portálu pro účastníky** (v r. 2015 hodnoceny pouze projekty Twinning)
  - 124 expertů
  - 29 zemí (26 ČS a 3 AZ)
  - nejvíce z DE (13), UK (10), EL, FR, IT, PL (9)
  - SK (2), CZ (0)
- **hodnocení projektů ERA Chairs (77 z 88)**
  - celkem 37 expertů, nejvíce DE a UK (po 4), PL a ES (po 3), SK (2)
  - každý projekt – min. 3 experti
  - 5 tematických oblastí (Physics & Chemistry; Mathematics, Engineering and ICT; Social Sciences and Economics; Environment and Agriculture; Life Sciences and Medicine)

## Hodnotitelé v návrhu posuzují:

- míru zohlednění popisu tématu
- přehlednost a relevantnost cílů
- věrohodnost postupu/metody
- důkladnost koncepce
- kvalitu navrhovaných opatření

## Analýza SWOT

- SWOT analysis is not presented in a structured way
- institutional strengths and weaknesses are not discussed to justify the need of the ERA Chair holder
- it is not clear why there are 2 SWOT analyses: one for UNI and one for the department, the latter being relatively short
- SWOT analysis of the institution's position within the national and European context is not clearly provided
- strengths of the applicant are well explained, the weaknesses are given only as a bullet list of few items

## Přehlednost a relevantnost cílů

- objectives are not clearly stated / are too general / lack quantitative information
- research area covered by ERA Chair is too large (no. of very broad fields)
- some of the objectives are either self-evident (“to properly plan, manage and report the project”) or lacking (socioeconomic objectives)
- extent to which ERA Chair holder and his/her team are likely to help the research organisation to significantly improve its research performance, to attract high quality human resources and to achieve excellence on a sustainable basis is not sufficiently addressed in the project

## Popis instituce

- analysis of research opportunities is not adequately illustrated and falls short of a comprehensive assessment
- description of the necessary investments in facilities and infrastructures is vague
- insufficient evidence is provided on the current critical research mass of the host institution

## Akční plán pro institucionální změny

- does not define measures for innovation and international integration
- suffers from a lack of focus on the concrete measures needed to fully achieve the objectives of the ERA Chair
- is not convincing regarding facilitation of institutional changes, fostering excellence and improvement and better use of research facilities
- some measures are highlighted but they are insufficiently elaborated

## Priority ERA

- compliance with ERA priorities regarding recruitment and gender but no initiative for innovative PhD training
- not all ERA priorities are adequately addressed (e.g. evolution towards an external peer-review model of institutional and research activities is not foreseen)
- gender equality is only mentioned, but not in detail
- training actions are not developed and there is no information on doctoral training
- compliance with ERA priorities is not clearly presented: open recruitment actions are not detailed and the possibility to have an innovative doctoral training is not clearly described
- external peer review of the institution activity is not clearly planned



## Institucionální/strukturální změny

- insufficient/scarce information on planned institutional changes aiming at support for better research performance, attracting high quality human resources and achieving excellence on a sustainable basis
- main weakness is a significant fragmentation of research structure but it is not fully clear if the ERA Chair holder would be in the position to impose an effective reorganization
- it is not well explained what changes are expected
- it is not credible that he/she would have a large catalytic effect for institutional changes
- details of achieving intended structural change are not provided

## Hodnotitelé v návrhu posuzují:

- očekávané dopady uvedené v pracovním programu
- účinnost navrhovaných opatření pro využití a šíření výstupů projektu (včetně správy IPR), pro komunikaci o projektu a tam, kde je to relevantní, i nakládání s výzkumnými daty
- do jaké míry budou výstupy projektu užitečné/využitelné na evropské a/nebo mezinárodní úrovni

## OČEKÁVANÉ DOPADY VE WP

- increased attractiveness of the institution, host region and country for internationally excellent and mobile researchers
- increased research excellence of the institution in the specific fields covered by the ERA Chair holders
- improved capability to compete successfully for internationally competitive research funding
- institutional changes within the ERA Chair host institution to implement the ERA priorities (including an open recruitment policy, gender balance, peer review and innovative doctoral training)

## Research Excellence (RE)

- increasing of RE of the hosting institution in the field covered by the ERA Chair holder is unclear
- only some project activities suggest potential impact on RE (expected outcomes include mainly increase of publications, engagement in international research projects and impact on research in practice)
- overall approach on RE is not developed / is too generic without sufficient specific details
- concrete elements to measure performance indicators are lacking
- the envisaged potential of ERA Chair for the enhanced scientific capabilities is provided only in a short perspective

## Granty (budoucí projekty)

- although there is a task to devote to future projects preparation, insufficient emphasis is put on enhancing the potential of the applicant for participation in the ERA
- improved capacity to compete successfully for international competitive research funding is presented in a too broad and generic manner / not convincingly described
- proposal does not contain effective measures aiming to increase the institution's capability to attract European funds (only measure foreseen is training of the researchers in proposal writing)
- only proposed institutional change is the establishment of a grant support system but only through seminars and visits
- capability to compete successfully for internationally competitive research funding is not demonstrated convincingly

## Institucionální změny / priority ERA

- evidence of substantial institutional changes required in order to implement ERA priorities is not provided / no institutional changes are foreseen / described in too broad terms without necessary details
- vague references are made to peer review and open recruitment
- future institutional changes are not fully demonstrated, since the proposed measures concerning doctoral training or peer review remain too general
- since the institutional changes are not well specified, it is impossible to evaluate their impact
- although the vision is strong (enduring structural change, leading to increased research excellence and improved capability to compete for funding) there is only limited detail on how the change is to be realised
- it is unclear how the ERA Chair and team will be recruited internationally

## **IPR, Open Access, Results, Dissemination**

- management of IPR is not even mentioned / is not fully elaborated / is not clear
- measures to exploit and disseminate the project's results are shown in a too broad way and lack quantitative indicators and a time table for their implementation / contains standard activities that are too generic / are not convincingly developed
- impact on the broader socio-economic environment is relatively minor, since only two target audiences (scientists and students) are foreseen in the dissemination measures
- policymakers, representatives of industry, entrepreneurs, and the general public are missing among the targeted audience
- management of research data is not adequately presented
- communication activities are not elaborated in sufficient detail

## RIS3 a ESI fondy

- contribution to the objectives of regional or national S3 is given in a too vague way / no clear connection to S3 is presented
- information on additional support from other sources (e.g. ESIF) is not provided
- contribution to S3 is claimed but not adequately detailed
- limited information is provided on the regional S3 or about how the subject of the proposal will contribute to other key areas of the strategy
- interdisciplinary teams are too narrow in scope to have a real impact in other areas of knowledge relevant for S3
- interactions with national or regional authorities and other stakeholders to coordinate actions and mobilize support, including, where relevant, support from ESIF, are not properly addressed



## Hodnotitelé v návrhu posuzují:

- provázanost (koherenci) plánu práce, včetně přiměřeného rozdělení úkolů a zdrojů
- *doplňkovost (komplementaritu) účastníků v rámci konsorcia (kde je to relevantní)*
- vhodné (přiměřené) řídicí struktury a postupy, včetně řízení rizik a inovací

## Plán práce (WP), úkoly a zdroje

- WP and resources are inadequately structured, distribution of resources is unbalanced / number of estimated man-months is very high
- the coherence between WP and SWOT analysis is not clearly provided / almost no SWOT issues are addressed in WP
- individual work packages lack detail / allocation of tasks in the work packages is inappropriately made and splitted artificially / planned activities focus more on internal than on international cooperation
- timing of the different work packages displayed in the Gantt Chart and their components are not well interlinked
- the targets are not sufficiently reflected in the tasks or the deliverables
- the timing of WP does not adequately support the described strategy for securing and implementing structural changes

## Řídící struktury a postupy, správa rizik a inovací

- management structure is too complicated and the management plan has not been fully demonstrated
- innovation management has not been considered appropriately
- risk management plan is incomplete / critical risks for the implementation were identified but many are inconsistent / main risk identified is the lack of the interest of foreign researchers to work at the host institution / risks analysis is almost exclusively focused on the ERA Chair and his/her team / risks associated with the future necessary structural changes are mentioned but proposed risk-mitigation measures are not convincing
- measures to resolve disagreements between the ERA Chair and the host are not clear
- role of the project manager as an executive arm of the ERA Chair appears to duplicate partially the ERA Chair's functions

## Popis pozice ERA Chair

- level of freedom and independence within the institution has not been well described / autonomy is not very clear – is hard to understand – not convincing / insufficient information on the position in the formal structures and statutes of the university to confirm the claims for his/her freedom and autonomy
- some remarks about the qualifications required for the ERA Chair team are not up to the required standards of excellence / details on the recruitment are insufficient (job description, advert, salary and other conditions) / lack of transparency in the recruitment process
- possibility of a permanent appointment is not addressed although he/she is responsible for attracting funds for sustainable operation of his/her group
- the core research activities of the ERA Chair team are not sufficiently elaborated / tasks, procedures and deliverables for research activities are not adequately specified

## Popis pozice ERA Chair (pokračování)

- description of the ERA Chair autonomy to freely apply for research funding and select his/her team is not clearly reported
- position is not clearly described and roles, level of responsibility, obligations and tasks are insufficiently addressed
- there is no evidence that he/she could take decisions related to budget distribution, fund raising and strategic partnerships
- contract type and remuneration package are not indicated
- description of his/her autonomy and authority has serious weaknesses as little margin is left to take his own initiatives within an already well established strategy structure
- in contrast with the rules of the Call, he/she has no full autonomy in the recruitment of his team

## Rozpočet

- budget is too general and lacks detailed specifications in order to be able to determine its validity
- allocation of person months is unbalanced (management activities are overestimated since the 58% of the person months will be devoted to project management)
- „Other direct costs" are not described and not justified
- serious weaknesses in planning of resources to be committed - the number of PM dedicated to academic staff and resulting personnel costs (including the costs of their assistants) should not be included, considering that they are already active in the academic staff
- costs foreseen for the equipment and for renting are largely overestimated

## Udržitelnost

- strategy to ensure the sustainability and further development of the measures presented beyond the lifetime of the project, including the possibility of a long-term appointment of the ERA Chair holder, is not well described / not sufficiently presented / is not foreseen
- sustainability is not clearly ensured (it states that it will depend on performance) / sustainability is not convincingly addressed

# LESSONS LEARNED

## Doporučení EK

- Clearly define objectives towards institutional changes
- Demonstrate the role and autonomy of the ERA Chair holder
- Work Packages should be consistent and contribute to an overall Action Plan
- Management structures need to be well defined and simple



# DOPORUČENÍ 1

- ❖ důkladná analýza SWOT je základem dobrého návrhu (být sebekritický, nezapomínat na propracování slabých stránek a hrozeb), musí být následně plně zohledněna v akčním plánu
- ❖ cíle musí odpovídat textu pracovního programu, nutné dobře popsat cíl hlavní i cíle specifické (až do úrovně WP)
- ❖ aktualizovaná webová stránka instituce (alespoň základní anglická verze nezbytná – evropské a mezinárodní projekty)
- ❖ text: jasný, stručný, jednoduché krátké věty, vyhnout se módním a zbytečným slovům, neopakovat pasáže, krátké odstavce
- ❖ přitažlivý akronym, význam abstraktu

# DOPORUČENÍ 2

- ❖ administrativní podání (ne vědecký článek) – novinářský styl, (vždy dát návrh přečíst někomu třetímu mimo konsorcium)
- ❖ omezit užívání zkratk
- ❖ reference na důležité dokumenty / evropské či globální strategie EU
- ❖ číselné údaje doložit statistickými údaji s odkazem na jejich zdroj
- ❖ citace mezinárodních zdrojů – omezit odkazy na národní studie a projekty (pokud jsou pouze v češtině)
- ❖ národní i regionální RIS3 a využití ESIF

# DOPORUČENÍ 3

- ❖ strategie: financování, růst, IPR, správa dat, genderová vyváženost, zvýšení atraktivity
- ❖ přidaná hodnota (region, země, EU a svět)
- ❖ komunikace: uvádět konkrétní informace (vyjmenovat všechny *stakeholder groups*), kick off meeting spojit s tiskovou konferencí
- ❖ pracovní plán musí mít logické sekvence
- ❖ počet pracovních balíčků: ideálně 5 – 6
- ❖ manažerská struktura: ne příliš mnoho úrovní, jedna osoba – jedna úloha
- ❖ hodnocení a management rizik a správa inovací

# DOPORUČENÍ 4

- ❖ detailní popis pozice držitele ERA Chair
- ❖ výběrové řízení zahájit hned po zahájení projektu
- ❖ nástup ERA Chair předpokládat v 6. – 9. měsíci
- ❖ identifikovat kvantitativní *success indicators* a uvést časový plán pro jejich implementaci
- ❖ udržitelnost i po skončení projektu
- ❖ pečlivě zvážit a projednat s vedením instituce, zda existuje ochota k institucionálním / strukturálním změnám a zda bude držitel grantu součástí vrcholného managementu

# DOPORUČENÍ 5

❖ úspěšné projekty z výzvy 2014 – zadáním akronymu na [http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/home\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/home_en.html)

CEITER (EE)

CySTEM (CY)

EnvMetaGen (PT)

CREATE (PL)

FoReCaST (PT)

BioEcon (PL)

BIORISE (CY)

SupraChem Lab (RO)

PaRaDeSEC (HR)

ERAatUC (PT)

EXCELLtoINNOV (PT)

TransGeno (EE)

SynBioTEC (EE)

COEL (EE)

Děkuji za pozornost a

**GOOD LUCK !!!**

[voseckova@tc.cz](mailto:voseckova@tc.cz)