

INFORMATION SESSION ON MARIE SKŁODOWSKA-CURIE ACTIONS INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS

ROYAL ACADEMY, BRUSSELS, 15 MAY 2018

HOW PROPOSALS ARE EVALUATED

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 reports for inconsistencies, inaccuracies, formulation, etc.

Step 3: (if necessary) experts improve reports.

Step 4: remote consensus. One of the three experts compares prose reports + and drafts consensus report. A consensus is also established on the score for each of the three criteria.

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 <i>ex aequo</i>		

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 environment** (infrastructure)

HOW IS EACH CRITERION SCORED?

- Between 0 and 5 with 0,1 intervals. Total score: 0-100.
- Prose report is mostly in bullet points: strenghts + weaknesses
- **Proposals are evaluated per criterium, not just based on the scientific quality of the 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](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 (PhD) projects**;
3. Think carefully about **added value for yourself and for the 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!