

# Evaluation des projets MSC

Table ronde

Mariana Guergova-Kuras – independent expert

15 juin 2016

[mariana.kuras@free.fr](mailto:mariana.kuras@free.fr)

---

# General principles for evaluators

- **Excellence** ▶▶ Proposals must demonstrate high quality in relation to the topics and criteria set out in the calls.
- **Transparency** ▶▶ Funding decisions must be based on clearly described rules and procedures, and applicants should receive adequate feedback on the outcome of the evaluation.
- **Fairness and impartiality** ▶▶ All proposals submitted in response to a call are treated equally and evaluated impartially on their merits, irrespective of their origin or the identity of the applicants.
- **Efficiency and speed** ▶▶ Evaluation, award and grant preparation should be done as quickly as possible without compromising quality or neglecting the rules.
- **Ethics and security** ▶▶ Proposals must not contravene fundamental ethical principles or relevant security procedures.

---

# Evaluators

- ✓ **Independence** – neither representing their employer nor country
- ✓ **Impartiality** – treat proposals only on their merit, irrespective of origin or identity of the applicants
- ✓ **Objectivity** – proposals are evaluated as submitted not on their potential if changes are introduced
- ✓ **Accuracy** – judgment against official evaluation criteria
- ✓ **Consistency** – same standards to all proposals
- ✓ **Avoidance of Conflict of interest (Col)** – strictly enforced

# MSC ITN: One call – three types of projects

Objective for all: Support for early stage/doctoral research training

**ETN**

**European  
Training  
Networks**

*Participants implement  
a joint research  
programme*

**EID**

**European  
Industrial  
Doctorates**

*Doctoral programme  
with the non-academic  
sector*

**EJD**

**European  
Joint  
Doctorates**

*Doctoral programme to  
deliver joint degrees*

**Research fields chosen freely by applicants  
(CHE, ECO, ENG, ENV, LIF, MAT, PHY, SOC)**

---

## The three implementation modes - The differences are important!

- ✓ The proposal must be consistent with the requirements of the different modes
- ✓ Some of the evaluation criteria are specific to EID and/or EJD

---

# Specificities of the three implementation modes: exemplify the duration of secondments

**Recruitment/fellowship duration: 3-36 months**

Secondments are possible for **up to 30% of the fellowship duration** (except for EID and EJD – where time spent at other participating organisations, in line with the proposal description, is not affected by this limitation).

For ITN EID, researchers **must spend at least 50%** of their time in the non-academic sector. This inter-sectoral mobility has to be between participating organisations located in different countries.

	<b>ETN</b>	<b>EID</b>	<b>EJD</b>
Beneficiaries	≥3 from 3 diff. MS/AC Any type	≥2 from 2 diff. MS/AC: (≥1 acad. award. PhD + ≥1 non-academic)	≥3 (acad. award PhD) from 3 diff. MS/AC
Person-months	Max. 540	Max. 180 / 540	Max. 540
Researchers	ESRs only (3-36 months)		
Partner Organ.	Not pre-defined (any country / sector / discipline)		
PhD enrolment	typically expected	<b>mandatory</b>	<b>mandatory</b>
Non-academic participation	essential	<b>mandatory</b>	essential
Inter-sectoral exposure	possible through secondments	≥50% in non-academic	possible through secondments

## Evaluation criteria – general considerations

### ITN: Marie Skłodowska-Curie Innovative Training Networks

**Excellence**

**Impact**

**Quality and efficiency  
of the implementation**

- ✓ Each criterion is scored between 0 and 5 using decimals
- ✓ The thresholds for individual criteria is 3
- ✓ The overall threshold for the sum of the three scores is 10
- ✓ Priority order for ex-aequo: Excell → Impact → Implem



# Evaluation criteria – Excellence

## 1. EXCELLENCE

*The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion:*

- Quality, innovative aspects and credibility of the **research programme** (including inter/multidisciplinary, **intersectoral** and, where appropriate, gender aspects)
- Quality and innovative aspects of the **training programme** (including transferable skills, inter/multidisciplinary, **intersectoral** and, where appropriate, gender aspects)
- Quality of the supervision (including **mandatory** joint supervision for EID and EJD projects)
- Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations

# Evaluation criteria – Impact often underestimated

## 2. IMPACT

*The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion:*

- Enhancing the career perspectives and employability of researchers and contribution to their skills development
- Contribution to structuring doctoral / early-stage research training at the European level and to strengthening European innovation capacity, including the potential for:
  - a) meaningful contribution of the **non-academic sector** to the doctoral/research training, as appropriate to the implementation mode and research field
  - b) developing sustainable joint doctoral degree structures **(for EJD projects only)**
- Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results
- Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences

# Evaluation criteria – Implementation

## 3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation

*The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion:*

- Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources, (including awarding of the doctoral degrees for EID and EJD projects)
- Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management (with a mandatory joint governing structure for EID and EJD projects)
- Appropriateness of the infrastructure of the participating organisations
- Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and their commitment to the programme

---

# Recommendations

- Check all mandatory requirements for the specific mode
- Use all available materials on the EU website (WorkProgramme, Guides, Mock Evaluation Forms, etc)
- Follow templates and respect page limits and font size
- Be specific and precise, sometimes « less » can be better
- Excellent science is not all – all criteria are important and need careful addressing
- Check for consistency across the proposal and between form A and B