**Criteria for evaluation of quality of mid-term results of refinanced project under subprogramme “ERA Chairs" of the program “Spreading Excellence and Widening Participation”**

(Guidelines for experts selected from the European Commission’s database for evaluation of projects of Measure 1.1.1.5.)

**1. EXCELLENCE**

*Evaluate information of mid-term report (Section 1 “Project Progress Description” and Section 2 “Excellence”) and other sections of Mid-term report as well as correspondence to Proposal Section 1 “Excellence”.*

The expert should evaluate:

1) whether implementation of the project is aimed at achieving of objectives and results planned in the application?

2) whether the implemented activities in the middle of the project will ensure structural changes and sustainable excellence of the institution?

3) whether the beneficiary has used an appropriate methodology, approaches and activities to achieve the goal and final results of the project?

3) how does the initial project goal and activities correspond to the actual results?

4) to what extent has this project raised field of research to a higher level?

5) to what extent has this project in mid-term promoted institution of beneficiary to a higher level?

6) whether the research activities involve the development of novel methodology?

7) whether the scientific quality of the achieved research/ innovation results[[1]](#endnote-1) is appropriate, considering the scientific value of the achieved results, the level of novelty, interdisciplinarity:

(a) the activities carried out so far and the results achieved are scientifically sound and innovative.

(b) the information contained in the scientific articles developed and published within the project corresponds to the purpose and content of the project.

(c) technology developed within the project implementation complies with the definition of new technology[[2]](#endnote-2) (if applicable).

**Expert evaluation:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Compliant with the planned |  |
| Compliant with suggestions for improving research progress and excellence or structural changes |  |
| Not compliant with the planned |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Recommendations for the project implementation (*to be filled in if evaluation result "Compliant with suggestions for improving research progress and excellence or structural changes/ Not compliant " is selected*) | *Please fill recommendations in evaluation report template (if applicable)* |

**2. IMPACT**

*Evaluate the information in Section 3 “Impact” and other sections of the Mid‑term report as well as correspondence to Proposal (Section 2 “Impact”).*

The expert should evaluate:

1) whether project activities and results achieved in mid-term proves project direction toward:

a) institutional changes within the ERA Chair host institution allowing for its full participation in the European Research Area.

b) improvements in attractiveness of the institution for internationally excellent and mobile researchers (including a policy of compliance to the European Research Area priorities like (an open recruitment policy, gender balance, peer review and innovative doctoral training).

c) research excellence of the institution in the specific fields covered by the ERA Chair holders (as well as whether project activities, results and indicators achieved in mid-term illustrate quantitatively and qualitatively progress toward to research excellence).

d) improvements of capability to compete successfully in internationally competitive research funding.

2) whether results achieved in project ensure transformation of national economy and implementation of priorities set by RIS3 or the development of areas of smart specialization?

3) whether dissemination and transfer of research results have positive impact on the needs of beneficiary institution, economic development, and society?

**Expert evaluation:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Compliant with the planned |  |
| Compliant with suggestions for improving research progress and excellence or structural changes |  |
| Not compliant with the planned |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Recommendations for the project implementation (*to be filled in if evaluation result "Compliant with suggestions for improving research progress and excellence or structural changes/ Not compliant " is selected*) | *Please fill recommendations in evaluation report template (if applicable)* |

**3. QUALITY OF IMPLEMENTATION**

*Evaluate the information in section 4 “Quality of implementation” and other sections of the Mid-term report”, including the appendix “Summary of the Project Budget”.*

The expert should evaluate:

1) the conformity of financial resources used for the implementation of the project activities with the amount of work accomplished and the results achieved;

2) efficiency of the project activities (activities, work packages), tasks, deliverables and milestones, and compliance with project proposal “Proposal” and the time chart (Gantt chart). The expert shall evaluate, inter alia, whether the remaining research results can be achieved during the remaining project implementation period;

3) the adequacy of the resource and results management system for the purpose (s) of the project, including quality and risk management;

4) quality of cooperation of scientific staff and contribution to the achievement of the project objectives.

**Expert evaluation:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Compliant with the planned |  |
| Compliant with suggestions for improving research progress and excellence or structural changes |  |
| Not compliant with the planned |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Recommendations for the project implementation (*to be filled in if evaluation result "Compliant with suggestions for improving research progress and excellence or structural changes/ Not compliant " is selected*) | *Please fill recommendations in evaluation report template (if applicable)* |

***Evaluation procedure***

1. The mid-term evaluation of quality of the project consists of two stages:

1) the initial individual assessment of each expert made according to the evaluation criteria;

2) formulation and approval of the consolidated opinion of the expert group.

2. In the initial individual assessment, the expert assesses the evaluation form in each of the evaluation criteria (i.e. Excellence, Impact, Quality of Implementation), indicating its relevance to the specific criterion “*Compliant with the planned/ Compliant with suggestions for improving research progress and excellence or structural changes/ Not compliant with the planned*”; reasonably argues its assessment.

If an expert's assessment of one of the criteria is “*Compliant with suggestions for improving research progress and excellence or structural changes/ Not compliant with the planned*”, the expert makes recommendations to improve the implementation process of the project by completing the additional section “*Recommendations for the project implementation*”, which should also indicate the degree of achievement of the research results and results achieved in the project against the initial mid-term (in percentage).

3. To develop a consolidated assessment (Consensus Evaluation Report), including a unified opinion of the degree of achievement of the project results at the originally planned (in percentage) of the project, the experts have to agree on the consolidated opinion, which includes a mid-term evaluation of the project and recommendations (if necessary) for the scientific quality and implementation process of the project, as well recommendations on improvements in project to ensure structural changes of institution to achieve excellence on a sustainable basis.

4. Consolidated assessment includes evaluation, argued justification in each of evaluation criteria, as well as recommendations for improvement of project implementation process (if applicable). In each section of the evaluation criteria, expert should indicate the strengths and weaknesses of the project's progress.

5. If experts agree that there is a fundamental disagreement between them and it is not possible to achieve a consolidated assessment of the project, the experts shall inform the Central Finance and Contracting Agency (hereinafter - CFCA) thereof and discontinue the evaluation of the project.

In such case, the CFCA invites the third expert - a dispute solver. The third expert is introduced to all previously prepared mid-term evaluation documentation of quality of the project, including the draft consolidated assessment, which has not been agreed upon by the two previous experts. The third expert prepares a new consolidated review. The evaluation of each of the criteria in this opinion may not exceed the lowest or highest rating given in the individual assessments. For each criterion, the arguments of all three experts should be summarised.

6. The anonymous evaluation of experts, without the names of experts, shall be available to the beneficiary (host institution) and the researcher. Implementation of the recommendations to improve the scientific quality and implementation process of the project will be considered/ assessed in the evaluation of the final scientific quality.

1. See description results and indicators in Section 1 “Project Progress Description” of the mid – term report. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. A new technology – technology, that meets the requirements of Commission Regulation (EU) No 172/2014 of 17 June 2014 On the definition of certain categories of aid as compatible with the internal market pursuant to Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty (Official Journal of the European Union, 26 June 2014, No L 187), as defined in Article 2 (114), i.e. is a new and unproven technology compared to the technical level achieved in the industry, which is associated with the risk of technological or industrial failure and is not the optimization or improvement of existing technology. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)