

Self-evaluation form

This form is made available to applicants who may themselves wish to arrange an evaluation of their proposal (eg. by a disinterested colleague) prior to final editing, submission and deadline. The forms used by the experts during the Commission evaluation will be broadly similar, although the final layout may differ.


Marie Curie Initial Training Networks (ITN)

Proposal No.:	
Acronym:	
Panel:	

I. Detailed evaluation

Criterion 1. S&T QUALITY
<p><u>Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>S&T objectives of the research programme, including in terms of inter/multi-disciplinary, intersectoral and/ or newly emerging supra-disciplinary fields.</i> • <i>Scientific quality of the research training programme.</i> • <i>Where relevant, appropriateness of research methodology and approach.</i> • <i>Originality and innovative aspect of the research training programme.</i> • <i>Contribution of the private sector and, where relevant, other socio-economic actors in the research programme</i>
<p>Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • •
<p>Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • •
<p>Overall comments: (reflecting the relative importance of the strength and weaknesses above mentioned)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • •
<p>Overall mark (out of 5) Note : The threshold is 3</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: center; align-items: center; gap: 20px;"> ➡ <input style="width: 60px; height: 20px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/> </div>


*0= Fails to address the criterion or missing/incomplete information; 1= Poor; 2= Fair; 3= Good; 4= Very Good; 5= Excellent.
Marks for each criterion are given to one decimal point. Note that the maximum is 5.*

Criterion 2. TRAINING		
Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the training programme. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contribution and relevance to the training programme of the private sector and, where appropriate, of other socio-economic actors. - Transferable skills offered: entrepreneurship, management, communication, standardisation, management of IPR, ethics, grant writing, take up and exploitation of results, research policy, etc. - Quality of supervision * • Importance and timeliness of the training needs (e.g. multidisciplinary, intersectoral, and newly emerging supra-disciplinary fields) • Appropriateness of the size of the requested training programme with respect to the capacity of the host • a) For ITNs and IDPs: Meaningful exposure of each researcher to another sector, in particular through secondments. b) For EIDs: Appropriate time spent by the ESR in each sector. • a) For ITNs and IDPs: Adequate combination of local specialist training with network-wide training activities. b) For EIDs: Adequate supervision arrangements and combination of local specialist training with wide training activities 		
Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 		
Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 		
Overall comments:		
(reflecting the relative importance of the strength and weaknesses above mentioned)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 		
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : The threshold is 4</i>		<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/>

*0= Fails to address the criterion or missing/incomplete information; 1= Poor; 2= Fair; 3= Good; 4= Very Good; 5= Excellent.
 Marks for each criterion are given to one decimal point. Note that the maximum is 5.*

Criterion 3. IMPLEMENTATION		
Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Capacities (expertise / human resources, especially regarding supervision/ facilities / infrastructure/private sector involvement) to achieve the research training programme and access of fellows to these resources. Adequacy of task distribution and schedule.</i> <i>Adequate exploitation of complementarities and synergies among partners in terms of research and training, including well targeted secondments to the private sector and to other socio-economic actors where relevant.</i> • <i>Private sector involvement at the highest possible level appropriate to the research topic, and sufficient evidence of commitment.</i> • <i>How essential is non-ICPC Third Country funding, if any, to the objectives of the research training programme.</i> • <i>Networking and dissemination of best practice among partners. Where appropriate, clarity of the plan for organizing training events (e.g. workshops, conferences, training courses).</i> • <i>Appropriateness of the plans for the overall management of the training programme (demarcation of responsibilities, rules for decision-making, composition of supervisory board including involvement of the private sector); also working conditions, transparency of recruitment process and career development. *</i> 		
Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 		
Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 		
Overall comments:		
(reflecting the relative importance of the strength and weaknesses above mentioned)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 		
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : The threshold is 3</i>		<input style="width: 60px; height: 20px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/>

*0= Fails to address the criterion or missing/incomplete information; 1= Poor; 2= Fair; 3= Good; 4= Very Good; 5= Excellent.
 Marks for each criterion are given to one decimal point. Note that the maximum is 5.*

Criterion 4. IMPACT	
<u>Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Contribution of the proposed training programme to: *</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>structure training at doctoral level with the acquisition of key skills needed in both the public and private sectors;</i> - <i>improve career prospects and employability of researchers, including ERs where appropriate;</i> - <i>stimulate creativity and entrepreneurial mindset of researchers at doctoral level.</i> • <i>Contribution of the training programme to the policy objective of structuring the initial research training capacity at European level (through establishing longer term collaborations and /or lasting structured training programmes between the partners' organisations).</i> • <i>The contribution of the training programme towards the policy objective of enhancing public-private sector collaborations in terms of research training.</i> • <i>Where appropriate, mutual recognition by all partners of the training acquired, including training periods in the private sector. *</i> • <i>Where appropriate, plans for exploitation of results.</i> • <i>Impact of the proposed outreach activities.*</i> 	
Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 	
Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 	
Overall comments:	
(reflecting the relative importance of the strength and weaknesses above mentioned)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • 	
Overall mark (out of 5) Note : The threshold is 4	 <input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

** Sub-criteria to be evaluated in the light of the principles of the 'European Charter for Researchers' and the 'Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers'*

http://ec.europa.eu/eracareers/pdf/am509774CEE_EN_E4.pdf

*0= Fails to address the criterion or missing/incomplete information; 1= Poor; 2= Fair; 3= Good; 4= Very Good; 5= Excellent.
Marks for each criterion are given to one decimal point. Note that the maximum is 5.*

II. Evaluation Summary

Marks for the evaluation criteria should reflect the quality of the proposal as submitted by the applicants.

Criterion	Mark	Weight	Score
1. S&T Quality		30%	
2. Training/Transfer of Knowledge		30%	
3. Implementation		20%	
4. impact		20%	
Total score expressed out of 5 (threshold 3.5)			
Total score expressed out of 100 (threshold 70%)			

0= Fails to address the criterion or missing/incomplete information; 1= Poor; 2= Fair; 3= Good; 4= Very Good; 5= Excellent.
Marks for each criterion are given to one decimal point. Note that the maximum is 5.