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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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weighing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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!

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!