



**METODIKA**

# R&D Evaluation Methodology

## Pilot testing

Conference in Prague, Oct 15, 2015

Arnold Driessen



INVESTICE DO ROZVOJE VZDĚLÁVÁNÍ



# Research assessment FCT

- Portugal (FCT, Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia)
- ~ 350 institutions

- Documentation

List of EvU members

Report of past performance, future directions, thematic lines

Individual short reports of RUs on past performance

Description of infrastructure, match to national agenda, internationalization, teaching (@ PhD level), proposed budget

Output parameters (papers, patents, demonstrations, personnel #, funding, prizes etc.); future projections

- Assessment

A: Productivity and contribution to the National Scientific and Technological system

B: Scientific and technological merit of the research team

C: Scientific merit and innovative nature of the strategic programme

D: Feasibility of the work plan and reasonability of the requested funding

Added parameters: Laboratory intensity level & Suggested basic and applied research

# Research assessment FCT



- Stage 1 – Remote assessment

Reviews by 2 external and 2 panel members

**Rebuttal**

Lead rapporteurs assessment and pre-synthesis

Panel meeting, interim report and selection for site visits

**Rebuttal**

- Stage 2 – Site visits (about 1/2 of the EvUs)

Research unit interviews and evaluation

Panel meeting for consensus reporting and ranking (per discipline)

**Rebuttal**

Final decision funding level by FCT board

# Research assessment FCT



- Evaluation at the level of the EvU and **NOT** RU
  - PRO: global assessment, critical mass; CON: little detail on individual RUs
- Assessment linked to an institutional funding scheme
  - PRO: Clear incentive, EvUs very motivated to participate; CON: Exact funding breakdown not clear from the beginning
- Selection for site visits, site visits experiences
  - PRO: made process manageable; CON: high number of appeals; units unfamiliar with protocols; different expectations
- Rebuttals and Appeals
  - PRO: Carefully monitored process; CON: high number of rebuttals/appeals slowed down process



# Importance self-assessment

## Different levels

- EvU

Level at which overall assessment should take place !

Defines strategic programme and future directions

Proposes thematic lines

Ensures uniformity

Should provide thorough SWOT

- RU

Important for assessing past performance (heterogeneous sizes RUs)

Role in EvU and match to thematic lines

Output, funding and internationalization parameters, personnel # and categories need to be defined at this level to identify weak and strong RUs

- Researchers

Minimal criteria to qualify as research based on output

Output numbers need to be available at this level to assess uniformity of performance



# Comments Pilot testing

## Biological panel (2 RUs; 1 site visit - Brno)

- RUs might be too small for assessment; little awareness of strategic directions; little understanding of need for assessment
- Ad hoc construction of EvUs! Role of RUs not always defined within EvUs
- **Overall assessment at level of EvUs for ranking and identify weak and strong RUs** (one integrated document per EvU)
- Review of selected publications not so useful; overall output in relation to personnel # at RU level; bibliometric data of good quality; report should list output for full and associated professors and provide information for time distribution on teaching *versus* research
- Enforce SWOT analysis at EvU level (was not uniformly done)
- Statistics on gender balance; PhD duration; drop-out rate (@ EvU level)
- Site visit: PRO: get to know real situation; CON: lot of work
  - Possible workaround: interviews with leadership in Prague to focus on weaknesses, integration and strategy; alternative: selected site visit @ EvU level
- Organization of pilot testing was done very well; useful exercise