

# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS

## SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

UPF – 29 MAY 2019

- Marie Skłodowska-Curie IF is part of a wider set of programmes of the European Commission, for the development of European Research, to promote researcher's mobility, training and excellence in Europe.
- It also promotes through the international part of the programme the mobility of researchers , training and European excellence world wide

# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

I have 20-30 minutes, to make a presentation for you, and my objectives are:

- To give you a general idea of what the Marie Curie fellowships are for those who pay for them,(not what you think they are and probably you would want to be)
- To explain you the evaluation process of your proposals and the priorities
- And finally give some advise if it wroth the effort to participate and some tips to maximize your chances.

My objective is not to give you details and a complete training. It would need far more time and preparation.

You can evaluate my effort after the end of this presentation and the degree I achieved them.

## CONCLUSION

Define clearly your objectives in your application within the context of the call. You are evaluated for them and against them . You have a budget, a timeschedule, a framework of what is required and funded.

*Georgios Giannoulis Giannoulopoulos*



# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

## **The overall Framework of the EC actions**

- Innovative Training Networks (ITN)
- Innovative doctoral-level training providing a range of skills in order to maximise employability
- • **Individual Fellowships (IF)**
- Support for Experienced Researchers undertaking mobility between countries, optionally to the non-academic sector

[https://ec.europa.eu/research/mariecurieactions/news/2019-msca-call-individual-fellowships-open\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/research/mariecurieactions/news/2019-msca-call-individual-fellowships-open_en)

296.5 million Euros

- **Research and Innovation Staff Exchange (RISE)**
- International and intersectoral collaboration through the exchange of research and innovation staff
- • **Co-funding of regional, national and international programmes (COFUND)**
- Co-financing high-quality fellowship or doctoral programmes with transnational mobility



# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

## Two types

- Individual
  - are open to researchers moving within Europe, as well as those coming in from other parts of the world.
  - can restart a research career after a break, such as parental leave.
  - can help researchers coming back to Europe find a new position.
- Global
  - fund positions outside Europe for researchers based in the EU or associated countries.
  - last between two and three years.
  - the researcher has to come back for one year to an organisation based in the EU or associated countries.

# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

## EXPECTED OUTPUT / Criteria of evaluation

### **At researcher level:**

Increased set of skills, both research-related and transferable ones, leading to improved employability and career prospects both in and outside academia 6

Increase in higher impact R&I output, more knowledge and ideas converted into products and services

Greater contribution to the knowledge-based economy and society



# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

EXPECTED OUTPUT / Criteria of evaluation

## **At organisation level:**

- Enhanced cooperation and stronger networks 
  - Better transfer of knowledge between sectors and disciplines
- Boosting of R&I capacity among participating organisations

# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

## EXPECTED OUTPUT / Criteria of evaluation

### **At system level:**

Increase in international, interdisciplinary and intersectoral mobility of researchers in Europe

Strengthening of Europe's human capital base in R&I with more entrepreneurial and better trained researchers

Better communication of R&I results to society

Increase in Europe's attractiveness as a leading destination for R&I

Better quality research and innovation contributing to Europe's competitiveness and growth



# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

## ○ **Excellence**                      **50%**

- Quality of the selection / recruitment process for the researchers (transparency, composition and organisation of selection committees, evaluation criteria, equal opportunities)
- Quality of the research options offered by the programme in terms of science, interdisciplinarity, intersectorality and level of transnational mobility
- Quality of career guidance and training, including supervision arrangements, training in





# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

## ○ Impact 30%

- Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of researchers; Strengthening human resources on regional, national or international level
- Aligning practices of participating organisations with the principles set out by the EU for human resources development in research and innovation
- Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the results
- Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the results to different target audiences



# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

- **Quality and efficiency of the implementation 20%**
  - Coherence, effectiveness and appropriateness of the work plan
  - Appointment conditions of researchers
  - Competence of the participant to implement the programme



# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

- **Overall threshold 70 / 100**
- Each criterion will be scored out of 5. Decimal points may be given.
- The scores indicate the following with respect to the criterion under examination:
- *0 – 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. Proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.*
- *3 – Good. Proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.*
- *4 – Very Good. Proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.*
- *5 – Excellent. Proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.*



# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

- **Successful proposals to my experience in ECOSOC have to reach the zone of 4,5 – 5 to all criteria (at the upper scale of 90 /100) , particularly in excellence, to have good chances to be funded.**



# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

- The Strengths / Weaknesses scheme of evaluation



# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

- **Evaluators / on-line distant process**
  - *Multidiscipline and multi-professional origin*
  - *Different scientific sensitivities*
  - *Overall view – impression – comparative approach*
  - *Details importance*
  - *Negotiations process (limitations, personals strong views, complementarity, compromise)*
  - *Extreme cases and process to deal with*



# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

## Proposal in numbers

- **2018** : 9830
- 2017: 9089
- 2016: 8946

# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

## Proposal in numbers 2018

- Standard European Fellowships (MSCA-IF-EF-ST): **7,145** proposals
  - Career Restart Panel (MSCA-IF-EF-CAR): **352** proposals
  - Reintegration Panel (MSCA-IF-EF-RI): **561** proposals
  - Society & Enterprise Panel (MSCA-IF-EF-SE): **173** proposals
- Global Fellowships (MSCA-IF-GF): **858** proposals



# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

The statistics (average estimate depends on the year 2015) and the approved

- **27 November 2014 12:13**A total of 7472 proposals were submitted in response to this call. The number of proposal for each topic is shown below:
  - European Fellowships (EF): 6,425 proposals (86% of the total)
  - Global Fellowships (GF): 1,047 proposals (14% of the total).
- A number of 1256 grant agreements have been successfully signed so far.

No more than 16,8% will find their way to funding

It seems low but.....

# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

## The Panels 2017 – choose the right panel

- **Standard European Fellowships** (each area has a separate ranking list) **The core of the call.**

7,139 proposals (2015)

- Career Restart Panel (EF-CAR) 248 proposals 2015

- Reintegration Panel (EF-RI) 509 proposals 2015

205,000,000

**Society & Enterprise Panel (EF-SE)** (10M budget-means around 25 fellowships) 134 proposals 2015

**Global Fellowships (GF)** (for non-associated countries) 12 months return phase 33,700,000



# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

Don't desperate!

The real statistics are rather different.

- A small number of proposals is rejected for administrative reasons.
- Another part, not insignificant, is below or around the threshold, or out of competition. In my experience this part is around the 30% of each call (however it can vary considerably depending on the topic and call).
- The vast majority of the proposals are acceptable, good, above the threshold, but not within the fundable zone. Another 30% approx.
- The remaining 30-35%, are your real competitors.

Don't forget that we are talking about excellence and you compete with the excellent. If you feel so, you have about 1 out of 2,5 chances to succeed.

# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

Some advises

- If you submit a “trash” proposal, with no effort, you don’t lose almost anything. You give more and easy work for the evaluators. The one who loses is the university and the supervisor’s reputation given that following the rules: *The submission of the proposal falls under the full responsibility of the applicant organisation represented by the main supervisor (and any other action that follows this procedure such as withdrawal or request for evaluation review). .... it is emphasised that the submission by the researcher must be made with the agreement of the main supervisor.*
- If you believe that your proposal is around average scoring, you will probably invest some time and you will not get it. Hopefully it can serve as an exercise for a next call.
- If you really have a good idea, a great research topic, and you are ready to put the necessary effort go-on, take your chances! At the end, in the worst case, you will have advanced your existing research and you will have the opportunity of valuable feedback, resubmit and improve.

Again a “but”..... :

# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

Don't forget that

Success does not depend only on the excellence of the research proposed although it is a condition sine qua non.

- This is a training action. You must prove what and how you're going to learn, and, persuasively how you will benefit from that (you and the host).
- Not only you need an adequate supervisor/s and a corresponding institution but you have to prove it.
- You must prove that you know, how to implement, you have a consistent implementation plan, you are aware of the risks, it and demonstrate it clearly.
- You need to address all the topics, however boring they seem to you (impact, European added value, wide public, scientific community dissemination e.t.c.) . Don't forget that this is taxpayers money, and the Commission want the taxpayers to know what they pay for (dissemination / communication). Additionally this is not paid by the member states, but from European funds. You must explain why your proposal is of European interest.
- Don't tire the evaluators. Make it easy for them to understand, to localize the necessary information in the corresponding sections, (refer to it when it is presented already elsewhere to avoid repetition and save pages). Structure clearly your text
- Maximize in all criteria the STRENGTHS . No significant WEAKNESSES are allowed for winners usually. Only few weaknesses of minor importance (unavoidable) will not reduce considerably your chances,.

# MARIE CURIE INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS SCOPE AND EVALUATION PROCESS

Good Luck

and

Questions

(?)

GEORGIOS GIANNOULIS GIANNOULOPOULOS  
<georgios.giannoulis@upf.edu>

*Georgios Giannoulis Giannouloupoulos*

