



## **ESRC Presentation**

# **Experiences of Evaluating for the European Commission**

**Professor William Webster**

**Centre for Research into Information, Surveillance and Privacy (CRISP)  
Stirling Management School, University of Stirling**

**9th December 2020**

E: [william.webster@stir.ac.uk](mailto:william.webster@stir.ac.uk)  [@CrispSurv](https://twitter.com/CrispSurv) W: [www.crisp-surveillance.com/](http://www.crisp-surveillance.com/)

# Professor Webster: Expertise

- Professor of Public Policy and Management
- Director, Centre for Research into Information Surveillance and Privacy (CRISP)
- Chair, Living in Surveillance Societies (LiSS) COST Research programme
- Co-Chair, eGovernment Permanent Study Group of European Group of Public Administration (EGPA)
- Co-Editor-in-Chief of Journal 'Information Polity'
- Recent research projects: SmartGov (ESRC); Big Data Surveillance (SSHRC); Digital Escalate (Erasmus+, EU)
- EU H2020 Evaluator of eGov and Smart Cities projects



# The European Commission Evaluation Procedure

- Pool of experts, from different disciplines, for each Call Topic area
- Experts free to interpret Call Topic
- Experts act as 'Evaluators', 'Rapporteurs' and 'Vice-Chairs'
- A sequential phased evaluation procedure (see slide)
- Evaluation takes place remotely online via a technological platform - evaluation constrained to assessment criteria with word limit allocations
- Experts allocated between 6 and 10 proposals to evaluate, which they will do individually initially (IER)
- Three expert evaluators per proposal
- One expert will also act as Rapporteur and draft a Consensus Report (CR) of the Individual Evaluation Reports IERs
- The Consensus Reports are a negotiated outcome
- Each stage of the evaluation process has an allocated time period



# Typical Evaluation Stages: H2020

Call deadline: 14 March 2019

## REMOTE EVALUATION

- *Individual assessment*
- *Full remote 100 % consensus*

24 April – 28 May

## CR/ESR Finalisation – Cross-reading

- *Experts invited to panels will cross-read the proposals to be discussed*

29 May – 10 June

## PANEL MEETINGS

- *Final ranked list by topic/call*

11 – 14 June

Information to applicants: 16 July 2019



# European Research Assessment Criteria

- Proposals have a predefined structure and page limit
- Many proposals follow a formula
- Typically a three part assessment criteria: (1) Excellence; (2) Impact; (3) Implementation (usually equally weighted)
- Scoring typically follows agreed comments
- For tied scores SME involvement and gender come into play
- Proposals must demonstrate 'state-of-the-art'
- Ambitious but realistic aims and objectives
- Expected impact has to be explained with appropriate indicators
- Work packages must be coherent and logical. Consider 'tasks' and 'outputs'
- Full appropriate engagement embedded in the research structure
- Dissemination to multiple audiences with indicators
- Full risk assessment with managed indicators
- Explain how outcomes will be exploited

# EU Evaluation Process: Points to Consider

- Proposals should be drafted by 'one hand'
- Make it easy for the evaluator to read – technical aspects must be written in plain English
- Many proposals struggle to be multi-disciplinary
- Evaluation process 'managed' by EU Project Officer
- Language and content is moderated
- Different Evaluators have different views, consensus is not always straight forward
- Evaluators are discouraged from commenting on budgets and ethics
- Typically, only one or two proposals are funded per Call Topic, so you have to excel in all aspects of the proposal
- Make sure you get extensive peer review prior to submission
- Consider putting yourself forward as an evaluator...

