

**INFORMATION SESSION ON MARIE SKŁODOWSKA-CURIE  
ACTIONS INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS**

**ROYAL ACADEMY, BRUSSELS, 7 MAY 2019**

**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

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

# 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.

***0– The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.***

***1– Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.***

***2– Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.***

***3– Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.***

***4– Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.***

***5– Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.***

- Prose report is mostly in bullet points: strengths + 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**.

# SPECIAL TIPS FOR SOC PANEL APPLICATIONS

1. Frame the research in the **international state of the art**
2. Pay attention to **'true'/'false' interdisciplinarity**
3. **Two-way transfer of** skills/knowledge is important
4. Acquisition of new technical, linguistic, etc. **skills** has to be set in a realistic timeframe/context
5. Acquisition of above skills should not impede **progress of the research**
6. Think about **how the fellowship will truly change your profile and enhance career opportunities**
7. **Work plan** has to be realistic + sufficiently detailed
8. Pay attention to **dissemination**: do you have an outreach strategy? Think about impact

**GOOD LUCK!**