

Συμβουλές για την συγγραφή μιας επιτυχημένης πρότασης
από αξιολογητή της προκήρυξης HORIZON-MSCA-2021-DN-01

Nikolaos D. ALEXOPOULOS

Associate Professor

University of the Aegean, School of Engineering, Department of Financial Engineering

 nalexop@aegean.gr

Διαδικτυακή Εκδήλωση "Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions: Doctoral Networks 2022"
Τρίτη, 24 Μαΐου 2022 (10:30-13:00)

Motivation

- ❑ to provide information per criterion
- ❑ to give a feedback by an evaluator
- ❑ to report several error/mistakes during submission

“this presentation gives several **individual thoughts** and concerns by an evaluator – they do not represent official guidelines by the EU call”

Introduction

- ❑ Criterion 1 – Excellence (weight 50 %)
- ❑ Criterion 2 – Impact (weight 30 %)
- ❑ Criterion 3 - Quality and Efficiency of the Implementation (weight 20 %)

😊 usually, criterion 1 is well structured and justified

😞 criteria 2 & 3 are often underestimated

Criterion 1 – Excellence (weight 50 %)

1.1 Quality and pertinence of the project's research and innovation objectives (and the extent to which they are ambitious and go beyond the state of the art).

The evaluator must answer to the following questions:

- ✓ is the state-of the art is well covered?
- ✓ is the advancement on the state-of-the-art highlighted?
- ✓ are the specific objectives reflecting the outcomes of the proposal?
- ✓ is the novelty and innovation per individual ESR project reported?
- ✓ are the challenges per ESR sufficiently documented?
- ✓ is the planned research is well structured?

☺ state-of-the-art is well covered – do not extend

☹ advancement beyond the state-of-the-art

☹ novelty is not evident for all ESRs

Criterion 1 – Excellence (weight 50 %)

1.2 Soundness of the proposed methodology (including interdisciplinary approaches, consideration of the gender dimension and other diversity aspects if relevant for the research project, and the quality and appropriateness of open science practices).

The evaluator must answer to the following questions:

- ✓ is the research methodology credible?
- ✓ does it give the background for all the individual PhDs research?
- ✓ are there inter-disciplinary aspects from various sectors?
- ✓ are there means to promote gender dimension and equality?
- ✓ are there measures to address geographical and economical inequalities?
- ✓ is there information on the open science practices?
- ✓ are there data management principles reported?

😊 research methodology

😞 geographical and economical inequities

😞 data management

Criterion 1 – Excellence (weight 50 %)

1.3 Quality and credibility of the training programme (including transferable skills, inter/multidisciplinary, inter-sectoral and gender as well as other diversity aspects).

The evaluator must answer to the following questions:

- ✓ is there a sufficient description on the training programme? (schools, workshops, and courses)
- ✓ does it involve different training aspects (fundamental knowledge, research courses and technical skills)
- ✓ are the soft skills or transferable skills well described?
- ✓ does it include network-wide training events with complementarity?
- ✓ do the non-academic participants have an active role on the training programme?
- ✓ are the secondment of the ESRs well described?
- ☺ description of the training programme is extended
- ☹ the involvement of non-academic participants is not essential
- ☹ not efficient description of the ESRs secondments

Criterion 1 – Excellence (weight 50 %)

1.4 Quality of the supervision (including mandatory joint supervision for industrial and joint doctorate projects).

The evaluator must answer to the following questions:

- ✓ do every ESR have enough supervisors?
- ✓ qualifications of the Academic supervisors
- ✓ have the Supervisors supervised any PhD student?
- ✓ has the Academic institutions a track record in EU funded projects?
- ✓ is the assigned time per supervisor appropriate? (minimum 10 % fte)
- ✓ are there a planned meeting schedule per ESR?

😊 tip: the supervisors should come from both, Academia, and Industry

😞 the supervisors do not provide a track record on PhD supervision

😞 meeting plans not reported

Criterion 2 – Impact (weight 30 %)

2.1 Contribution to structuring doctoral 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 training, as appropriate to the implementation mode and research field**
- b) developing sustainable elements of doctoral programmes.**

The evaluator must answer to the following questions:

- ✓ does the Non-academic sector contribute well to the doctoral network?
- ✓ is the means to provide a structuring doctoral training at EU level explained?
- ✓ the way to strengthen European innovation capacity is well described?

☹ usually, the last 2 bullets are described in a very generic manner

Criterion 2 – Impact (weight 30 %)

2.2 Credibility of the measures to enhance the career perspectives and employability of researchers and contribution to their skills development.

The evaluator must answer to the following questions:

- ✓ is the impact of the research and training on the Doctoral candidates' careers explained?
- ✓ is the **added value** of the doctorates highlighted?
- ✓ are the skills/competences to be acquired explained?

☹ the added value of the training is not highlighted

Criterion 2 – Impact (weight 30 %)

2.3 Suitability and quality of the measures to maximize expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities.

The evaluator must answer to the following questions:

- ✓ does it provide a dissemination strategy with a variety of events and timeline?
- ✓ is the implementation plan well described?
- ✓ is the communication campaign well structured?
- ✓ is the dissemination with the public well described?
- ✓ are the IPRs issues treated?

😊 the dissemination strategy should be informative but not extensive

😞 the IPRs are too generic and the measures to address the IPRs are needed

Criterion 2 – Impact (weight 30 %)

2.4 The magnitude and importance of the project's contribution to the expected scientific, societal and economic impacts.

The evaluator must answer to the following questions:

- ✓ are the scientific impacts well described and related to the goals of the project?
- ✓ are the expected economic/technological impact(s) explained?
- ✓ are the societal impacts described and with sustainable development goals?

😊 usually, the scientific impacts are well described

😞 the last two bullets are underestimated

Criterion 3 – Quality and Efficiency of the Implementation (weight 20 %)

3.1 Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages.

The evaluator must answer to the following questions:

- ✓ is the WPs structure appropriate and well defined?
- ✓ are the Deliverables and Milestones appropriate?
- ✓ is the Individual research project of each ESR with planned secondment appropriate?
- ✓ are the Supervisory Board and the Management Board well described? (as well as their responsibilities)
- ✓ will the gender equality be taken into account? (a target value will be welcome)
- ✓ is the recruitment strategy documented?
- ✓ are the selection criteria for the ESRs set?
- ✓ is the progress monitoring efficient?
- ✓ are the environmental aspects considered?
- ✓ does it identify technical risks wrt to the development of the technology?

☹ usually, the SB and MB are not efficiently described

☹ recruitment strategy and the selection criteria are not described

Criterion 3 – Quality and Efficiency of the Implementation (weight 20 %)

3.2 Quality, capacity and role of each participant, including hosting arrangements and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.

The evaluator must answer to the following questions:

- ✓ are the Infrastructure and capacity of the hosting institutes presented in clear way?
- ✓ do the associated partners demonstrate a commitment letter?
- ✓ is the complementarity among the consortium partners well described?

😊 infrastructure is well described

☹ complementarity is not evident

Thank you for your attention !