

# FCT EVALUATION OF R&D UNITS 2013

## **Stage 1 Complaints — Panel Report**

## FCT EVALUATION OF R&D UNITS 2013

### Complaints - Stage 1

**Application ID**  
(e.g. 14-FCT-001)

14-FCT-042

**PANEL MEMBER NAME:**

Complaints Panel

While accessing the complaint it is expected that you answer only to the scientific issues of the complaints expressed in the text by the units' coordinators. In order to have an informed opinion, you will have to read all documentation relevant to the complaint. Please note that a complaint is not a second evaluation or an additional opportunity for units to present new information that was not included in the application. Panel members should also be aware that a difference of opinion on a scientific issue should not be considered a factual error. Should any errors or shortcomings indeed be identified, they would need to be acknowledged by the complaints assessment Panel and collegially agreed upon by consensus.

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

Yes

No

#### 2. If you selected "Yes" please choose below the new classification?

Proceed to 2<sup>nd</sup> stage

Good

Fair

Poor

### 3. Panel Report

The Complaints Panel gave the case made in the complaint very careful consideration and concluded that it wished to change one of the scores given by the original panel. It was, however, of the view that the feedback to the preliminary appeal was generally measured and sound.

The change agreed by the Complaints Panel is in relation to criterion C(iii), the degree of internationalisation, with a change for a score of 3 to 4 for criterion C. This shift makes no substantial change to the overall grading of *Good*, but does recognise more explicitly the impressive international networking that is underway in this unit.

The panel considered all other features of the complaint and found itself in complete agreement with the original panel on each point. Points 1-3 in the case for complaint are matters of judgment and not inaccuracies. Point 5 relates to the publication record and was considered very thoroughly by the Complaints Panel. It reached the conclusion on the basis of both bibliographic data and, to an extent, the location of the key publication outputs in the application, that the original judgment was entirely fair.

Finally, the Complaints Panel was of the view that point 6 in the case for appeal was a matter of judgement and not inaccuracy and therefore could not be considered at this stage.