INFORMATION SESSION ON MARIE SKŁODOWSKA-CURIE ACTIONS INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS

15 MAY 2018

PROF. DR. STEVEN VANDERPUTTEN

GHENT UNIVERSITY

WHO ARE THE EXPERTS?

A. European Commission works with a **pool of experts** from all disciplines.

B. Eligible are (mostly senior) **researchers from higher education and the private sector** with a track record of scientific excellence.

C. Candidates must register in **EC database**, indicating their field of expertise.

D. Spring: the EC administration, chair, and vice-chairs **select** experts and enquire about availability and conflicts of interest.

E. Summer/early Fall: the EC **invites** experts to review 10-15 proposals.

THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Step 1: experts remotely evaluate proposal X: prose reports.

Step 2: vice-chair checks for inconsistencies, inaccuracies, formulation, etc.

Step 3: (if necessary) experts improve reports.

Step 4: remote consensus. One of the three experts compares prose reports + proposes score and drafts consensus report.

Step 5: vice-chair checks consensus report. Approved version results in final score and prose report seen by the candidate.

Step 6: administration, chair, and vice-chairs meet to discuss results, check quality of the reports, finalize scores, and make final selection.

PRINCIPLES FOR EVALUATION

Independence

Impartiality

Objectivity

Accuracy

Consistency

HOW TO PREPARE YOURSELF AS A CANDIDATE

Step 1: Check eligibility

- Carefully **read the instructions** on the webpage of the EC;

- Check if scheme is **appropriate** for the candidate;

- Check if the candidate is **eligible**;

- Check **eligibility of the host institution** (!);

- Ask supervisor(s)/host(s) to read the instructions.

Step 2:

Study evaluation criteria and their relative weight

Excellence	Impact	Quality and efficiency of the implementation
Quality and credibility of the research/innovation project; level of novelty, appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary and gender aspects	**Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the researcher**	Coherence and effectiveness of **the work plan**
Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way **transfer of knowledge** between the researcher and the host	Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and **disseminate** the project results	Appropriateness of the allocation of **tasks and resources**
Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team/institution	Quality of the proposed measures to **communicate** the project activities to different target audiences	Appropriateness of the **management structure and procedures**, including risk management
Capacity of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity/independence		Appropriateness of the **institutional environment** (infrastructure)
50%	30%	20%
Weighing		
1	2	3
Priority in case of *ex aequo*		

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION 1:
EXCELLENCE (50%)

1. **Quality and credibility** of the research/**innovation** project; level of novelty, appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary and gender aspects

2. Quality and appropriateness of the **training** and of the **two way transfer of knowledge** between the researcher and the host

3. Quality of the **supervision** and of the **integration** in the team/institution

4. Capacity of the researcher to reach or reenforce a position of professional **maturity/independence**

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION 2:
IMPACT (30%)

1. Enhancing the **potential and future career prospects** of the researcher

2. Quality of the proposed measures to **exploit and disseminate** the project results

3. Quality of the proposed measures to **communicate** the project activities to different target audiences

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION 3:
QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION (20%)

1. Coherence and effectiveness of the **work plan** (milestones, deliverables, GANTT-chart)

2. Appropriateness of the **allocation of tasks and resources**

3. Appropriateness of the **management structure** and procedures, including **risk management**

4. Appropriateness of the **institutional environmen**t (infrastructure)

HOW IS EACH CRITERION SCORED?

- Between 0 and 5 with 0,1 intervals. They are weighted and added to a total score: 0-100

- Prose report is mostly in bullet points: strengths/weaknesses

- **Proposals are evaluated per criteria, not just based on the scientific quality ofthe research project or the applicant's CV**

Step 3: Do a simulation

http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/
call_ptef/ef/2016-2017/h2020-call-ef-mscaif-
2016-17_en.pdf

SOME TIPS

1. Read the guidelines **multiple times**;

2. Avoid straight **continuations of former/current projects;**

3. Think carefully about **added value for yourself and host;**

4. Consider all three criteria with equal attention: **work on your 'weak(er) criteria'** prior to submitting;

5. Take time to **discuss** each part of the proposal **with supervisor/host;**

6. Start **preparing well in advance**.

GOOD LUCK!