Evaluación de las solicitudes de becas Marie-Skłodowska-Curie de la Unión Europea

Ingo Dreyer
idreyer@utalca.cl

Criterios de evaluación

3.2.1 CRITERION 1: EXCELLENCE

EXCELLENCE is about:

- the quality and novelty of the research;
- the training activities in the project;
- the capacity of the researcher, the scientific supervisor and their interaction.

50%

3.2.2 CRITERION 2: IMPACT

IMPACT refers to the impact on the fellow's career development and the dissemination and communication activities.

30%

3.2.3 CRITERION 3: IMPLEMENTATION

IMPLEMENTATION is about the quality of the work plan, including the allocation of tasks and resources, and project management.

20%

Escala de evaluación

EXCELLENT. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.	5	Excellent
VERY GOOD. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.	4 (4.9 ↕ 4.0)	Very Good
GOOD. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.	3 (3.9 ↕ 3.0)	Good
FAIR. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.	2 (2.9 ↕ 2.0)	Fair
POOR. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.	1 (1.9 ↕ 1.0)	Poor
The proposal **FAILS** to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.	0	

Altamente competitivo:
¡Un promedio de 4,5/4,6 podría no ser suficiente para la financiación!

en general: la evaluación es un proceso de dos pasos

Etapa 1:

(Oct 2020)

3 expertos evalúan una solicitud individualmente

⇒ 3 informes de evaluación individuales
(IERs con “Strengths” y “Weaknesses”)

⇒ 3 Scores diferentes (todavía preliminar)

Etapa 2:

(Nov 2020)

- Discusión entre los 3 expertos hasta llegar a un consenso.
- uno de los 3 expertos es nombrado “rapporteur” y escribe el informe de consenso (“Consensus Report”; CR). Aquí se reúnen todas las opiniones de los 3 IERs y se aclaran las posibles contradicciones en la discusión.
- Basado en el CR, los Scores para los criterios 1, 2 y 3 están establecido conjuntamente por los 3 expertos.
- Sólo cuando los 3 expertos estén de acuerdo con el CR y los scores (unánimemente), esta etapa estará terminada.

⇒ CR y Score final (¡Esto cuenta!)

INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS 2018 - ASSESSMENT GRID	PROPOSAL NUMBER/ACRONYM: _____	ASSESSMENT					
		Fail	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
EXCELLENCE	**1**						
Quality and credibility of the research/innovation project, level of novelty, appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary and gender aspects	**1.1**						
Are the state-of-the-art, specific objectives and an overview of the action provided and relevant?	1.1						
Is the proposed research methodology and approach credible (in view of the type of research / innovation activities proposed)?	1.1						
Is the planned research original and innovative? Will the action contribute to advance the state-of-the-art within the research field (i.e. new concepts, approaches or methods)?	1.1						
Where applicable, are there interdisciplinary aspects to consider?	1.1						
Where applicable, is the gender dimension in research content well addressed (i.e. in research activities where human beings are involved as subjects or end-users)?	1.1						
Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host	**1.2**						
Is the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host institution oultined and credible?	1.2						
For Global Fellowships only, does the proposal explain how the newly acquired skills and knowledge will be transferred back to Europe?	1.2						
Are training activities described and relevant? [NOTE: do NOT penalize the proposal in case there is no Career Development Plan]	1.2						
Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team/institution	**1.3**						
Are the qualifications and experience of the supervisor well described and adequate, taking into account their level of experience on the research topic and their track record of work (e.g. main international collaborations, experience in supervising/training especially PhD, postdoctoral researchers)?	1.3						
Do the hosting arrangements allow for a good integration of the researcher in the team/institution to maximize knowlegde and skills generated from the fellowship? Are the nature and the quality of the research group/environment as a whole outlined? Are international networking opportunities offered?	1.3						
For Global Fellowships only, are the hosting arrangements at the partner organisation adequate to accomodate the researcher?	1.3						
Potential of the researcher to reach or re-enforce professional maturity/independence during the fellowship	**1.4**						
Will the researcher's existing professional experience, talents and proposed research contribute to their development as an independent researcher during the fellowship?	1.4						
Are the new competences and skills that will be acquired during the fellowship relevant to the researcher's profile? [NOTE: fellowships will be awarded to the most talented researchers as shown by the proposed research and their track record *in relation to their level of experience.]*	1.4						

Los errores más graves

- **Los solicitantes no proporcionan toda la información necesaria**
  (La propuesta debe proporcionar en un máximo de 10 páginas respuestas sustanciales a TODAS las preguntas de la tabla de evaluación "assessment grid")

IMPACT	2
Enhancing the future career prospects of the researcher after the fellowship	**2.1**
Will the planned research and training activities have an impact on the future career prospects of the researcher after the fellowship? i.e. what is the added value of the fellowship?	2.1
How can the new competences and skills (as explained in 1.4) make the researcher more successful in their long-term career?	2.1
Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results	**2.2**
How will the new knowledge generated by the action be disseminated and exploited? Is the potential impact realistic?	2.2
Is the strategy for targeting peers (scientific, industry and other actors, professional organisations, policy makers, etc.) and the wider community clear, consistent and appropriate?	2.2
Where applicable, does the proposal describe potential commercialisation, and how intellectual property rights will be dealt with?	2.2
Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences	**2.3**
Will the planned public engagement activities contribute to creating awareness of the performed research? Example of outreach activities: Internet presence, press articles and participation in European Researchers' Night events.	2.3
Will the research and results be made known to the public in such a way they can be understood by non-specialists?	2.3

Los errores más graves

- **Los solicitantes no proporcionan toda la información necesaria**
  (La propuesta debe proporcionar en un máximo de 10 páginas respuestas sustanciales a TODAS las preguntas de la tabla de evaluación "assessment grid")

IMPLEMENTATION	3
Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources	**3.1**
Are the work planning and mobilised resources appropriate to ensure that the research and training objectives are achieved?	3.1
Is the number of person-months planned and requested for the project appropriate in relation to the proposed activities?	3.1
Is a Gantt chart included and clear? Does it cover all planned activities? Does it include at least one work package? Where applicable, does it include major deliverables, milestones and secondments? [NOTE: there is no fixed template provided]	3.1
Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management	**3.2**
Will the organisation and management structure (including support services), as well as the progress monitoring mechanisms put in place, ensure that objectives are reached?	3.2
Does the proposal adequately address the research and/or administrative risks that might endanger reaching the action objectives and the contingency plans to be put in place should risk occur?	3.2
Where applicable, if entities with a capital or legal link to the beneficiary are involved, is their contribution well explained?	3.2
Appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructure)	**3.3**
Is the active contribution (main tasks and commitment) of the beneficiary to the research and training activities clear?	3.3
For Global Fellowships only, is the active contribution (main tasks and commitment) of the partner organisation clear?	3.3
Are the infrastructure, logistics and facilities offered suitable for the good implementation of the action?	3.3

Los errores más graves

- **Los solicitantes no proporcionan toda la información necesaria**
  (La propuesta debe proporcionar en un máximo de 10 páginas respuestas sustanciales a TODAS las preguntas de la tabla de evaluación "assessment grid")
- **Demasiada confianza en sí mismo**
  ("Tengo buenas publicaciones, ¡así que seguro que lo conseguiré!")
- **Muy poca confianza en sí mismo**
  ("No tengo suficientes publicaciones buenas, así que no tengo ninguna chance.")
- **No hay o hay poca coordinación con la institución patrocinante**
  (Las instituciones europeas, que tienen la posibilidad de acoger a un becario del MCSA, suelen disponer de una oficina que apoya a los solicitantes en la redacción de las partes técnicas/administrativas de la propuesta. Una beca del MCSA no es sólo una distinción para el solicitante sino también para el anfitrión.)
- **Una propuesta escrita bajo presión de tiempo es casi una garantía de fracaso.**
  (para una excelente propuesta, planee con mucha anticipación)

INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS 2018 - ASSESSMENT GRID	PROPOSAL NUMBER/ACRONYM: _____	ASSESSMENT: Fail / Poor / Fair / Good / Very Good / Excellent
EXCELLENCE	**1**	
Quality and credibility of the research/innovation project, level of novelty, appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary and gender aspects	**1.1**	
Are the state-of-the-art, specific objectives and an overview of the action provided and relevant?	1.1	
Is the proposed research methodology and approach credible (in view of the type of research / innovation activities proposed)?	1.1	
Is the planned research original and innovative? Will the action contribute to advance the state-of-the-art within the research field (i.e. new concepts, approaches or methods)?	1.1	
Where applicable, are there interdisciplinary aspects to consider?	1.1	
Where applicable, is the gender dimension in research content well addressed (i.e. in research activities where human beings are involved as subjects or end-users)?	1.1	
Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host	**1.2**	
Is the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host institution oultined and credible?	1.2	
For Global Fellowships only, does the proposal explain how the newly acquired skills and knowledge will be transferred back to Europe?	1.2	
Are training activities described and relevant? [NOTE: do NOT penalize the proposal in case there is no Career Development Plan]	1.2	
Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team/institution	**1.3**	
Are the qualifications and experience of the supervisor well described and adequate, taking into account their level of experience on the research topic and their track record of work (e.g. main international collaborations, experience in supervising/training especially PhD, postdoctoral researchers)?	1.3	
Do the hosting arrangements allow for a good integration of the researcher in the team/institution to maximize knowlegde and skills generated from the fellowship? Are the nature and the quality of the research group/environment as a whole outlined? Are international networking opportunities offered?	1.3	
For Global Fellowships only, are the hosting arrangements at the partner organisation adequate to accomodate the researcher?	1.3	
Potential of the researcher to reach or re-enforce professional maturity/independence during the fellowship	**1.4**	
Will the researcher's existing professional experience, talents and proposed research contribute to their development as an independent researcher during the fellowship?	1.4	
Are the new competences and skills that will be acquired during the fellowship relevant to the researcher's profile? [NOTE: fellowships will be awarded to the most talented researchers as shown by the proposed research and their track record *in relation to their level of experience.*]	1.4	
IMPACT	**2**	
Enhancing the future career prospects of the researcher after the fellowship	**2.1**	
Will the planned research and training activities have an impact on the future career prospects of the researcher after the fellowship? i.e. what is the added value of the fellowship?	2.1	
How can the new competences and skills (as explained in 1.4) make the researcher more successful in their long-term career?	2.1	
Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results	**2.2**	
How will the new knowledge generated by the action be disseminated and exploited? Is the potential impact realistic?	2.2	
Is the strategy for targeting peers (scientific, industry and other actors, professional organisations, policy makers, etc.) and the wider community clear, consistent and appropriate?	2.2	
Where applicable, does the proposal describe potential commercialisation, and how intellectual property rights will be dealt with?	2.2	
Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences	**2.3**	
Will the planned public engagement activities contribute to creating awareness of the performed research? Example of outreach activities: Internet presence, press articles and participation in European Researchers' Night events.	2.3	
Will the research and results be made known to the public in such a way they can be understood by non-specialists?	2.3	
IMPLEMENTATION	**3**	
Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources	**3.1**	
Are the work planning and mobilised resources appropriate to ensure that the research and training objectives are achieved?	3.1	
Is the number of person-months planned and requested for the project appropriate in relation to the proposed activities?	3.1	
Is a Gantt chart included and clear? Does it cover all planned activities? Does it include at least one work package? Where applicable, does it include major deliverables, milestones and secondments? [NOTE: there is no fixed template provided]	3.1	
Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management	**3.2**	
Will the organisation and management structure (including support services), as well as the progress monitoring mechanisms put in place, ensure that objectives are reached?	3.2	
Does the proposal adequately address the research and/or administrative risks that might endanger reaching the action objectives and the contingency plans to be put in place should risk occur?	3.2	
Where applicable, if entities with a capital or legal link to the beneficiary are involved, is their contribution well explained?	3.2	
Appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructure)	**3.3**	
Is the active contribution (main tasks and commitment) of the beneficiary to the research and training activities clear?	3.3	
For Global Fellowships only, is the active contribution (main tasks and commitment) of the partner organisation clear?	3.3	
Are the infrastructure, logistics and facilities offered suitable for the good implementation of the action?	3.3	
OVERALL COMMENTS		
Based on the information available in the proposal, does the beneficiary possess the basic operational capacity to carry out the proposed work? The operational capacity of the beneficiary relates to whether it has, or will have in due time, the operational resources and capacity to implement the action. This is the purpose of the table in Section 5 of Part B.		Y/N
Does this proposal involve the use of hESC? If yes, please state whether the use of hESC is, or is not, in your opinion, necessary to achieve the scientific objectives of the proposal and the reasons why. Alternatively, please also state if it cannot be assessed whether the use of hESC is necessary or not because of a lack of information.		Y/N
Were there excess pages that could not be evaluated?		Y/N

Gracias por su atención.

¡ Muchos Exitos !