



UNIMORE

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI
MODENA E REGGIO EMILIA



H2020-MSCA-IF-2016

Panel Excellent Science

Marie Skłodowska Curie Individual Fellowships

Franca Manghi

Dipartimento di Fisica, Informatica e Matematica

IF 2016: Topics & Budget

EF

**European
Fellowships**

*in EU Member States or
Associated Countries*

179.71 M€

GF

**Global
Fellowships**

*an outgoing phase to a
third country and a return
phase in MS/AC*

29 M€

Call Opening: **12 April 2016**
Call Deadline: **14 September 2016, 17:00:00 CET**
Evaluation: **October – December 2016**
Launch Grant preparation: **January 2017**
Budget: **218.71 million €** (of which: Society and Enterprise Panel: 10 M€)

What are IFs?

- The best and most promising **experienced*** researchers moving to another country for further training
(* PhD or 4-year full-time equivalent research experience)



- ✓ **Secondments** of 3 – 6 months in Europe (MS or AC), for greater impact
- ✓ Career development by an **inter-sectoral** mobility

Ruolo dei valutatori

- Valutare individualmente n progetti (tipicamente $n \sim 20$) e scrivere per ciascuno un ***Individual Report***
- Agire da *rapporteur* e stilare un ***Consensus Report*** per un sottoinsieme di progetti (tipicamente 6/7)
- Ogni progetto e' esaminato da 3 valutatori; il *rapporteur* stila il *Consensus Report* e gestisce la discussione con gli altri 2 (da quest'anno in remoto).



La valutazione individuale prevede 3 voti con pesi diversi sulle 3 voci:

1. Excellence – peso 50%:


- Quality and credibility of the research (level of novelty, multidisciplinary, gender aspects)
- Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge
- Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team/institution
- Capacity of the researcher to reach/re-enforce a position of professional maturity

2. Impact – peso 30%:

- Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the researcher
- Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results
- Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the action activities to different target audiences

3. Implementation – peso 20%:

- Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan
- Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources
- Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures & risk management
- Appropriateness of the institutional environment



Nella fase di valutazione individuale viene richiesto di elencare *strengths/weaknesses* per ognuno dei sotto-campi e di dare un voto complessivo (da 0 a 5) coerente.

Nella fase di *Consensus Report* ad ogni *rapporteur* viene chiesto di stilare un rapporto che tenga conto delle valutazioni individuali, discutendo i punti di dissenso fino a trovare un accordo finale, sia sul testo che sul voto.



Interpretation of the score:

***0–** The **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.** The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.*

***3– Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.*

***4– Very good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.*

***5– Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.*

- 
- NEGLI ULTIMI ANNI SOLO PROGETTI CON VALUTAZIONE SUPERIORE a **90/100** sono stati finanziati.
 - Ogni anno la soglia si innalza. E' indispensabile puntare a punteggi non inferiori a **4.5** per ogni voce.

Dove compare il ruolo dell'Istituzione ospitante (UNIMORE)?

1. Excellence – peso 50%:

- Quality and credibility of the research (level of novelty, multidisciplinary, gender aspects)
- Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge
- Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team/institution
- Capacity of the researcher to reach/re-enforce a position of professional maturity

2. Impact – peso 30%:

- Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the researcher
- Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results
- Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the action activities to different target audiences

3. Implementation – peso 20%:

- Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan
- Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources
- Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures & risk management
- Appropriateness of the institutional environment

Dove compare il ruolo dell'Istituzione ospitante (UNIMORE)?

1. Excellence – peso 50%:

- Quality and credibility of the research (level of novelty, multidisciplinary, gender aspects)
- Quality and appropriateness of the **training** and of the two way transfer of knowledge
- Quality of the **supervision and of the integration in the team/institution**
- Capacity of the researcher to reach/re-enforce a position of professional maturity

2. Impact – peso 30%:

- Enhancing the potential and future **career prospects** of the researcher
- Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results
- Quality of the proposed measures to **communicate the action activities** to different target audiences

3. Implementation – peso 20%:

- Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan
- Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources
- Appropriateness of the **management structure and procedures** & risk management
- **Appropriateness of the institutional environment**



1. EXCELLENCE

1. Excellence

- Quality and credibility of the research (level of novelty, multidisciplinary, gender aspects)
- Quality and appropriateness of the **training** and of the two way transfer of knowledge
- Quality of the **supervision and of the integration in the team/institution**
- Capacity of the researcher to reach/re-enforce a position of professional maturity

ESEMPI di «Weaknesses»



1.2

- The project does not describe in detail the specific **training** initiatives that will be adopted - **Complementary training** is mentioned in concise manner. - The transfer of knowledge from the applicant to the host is described very superficially

1.3

Weaknesses: -It has not been demonstrated in sufficient detail that the Supervisor has the background expertise

in training advanced level researchers. -**The arrangements of the host institution to provide local facilities, accommodation and mentoring/tutoring activities is not well documented** -**The practical hosting arrangements are not sufficiently detailed** -**Complementary training is not described.**

1. Excellence

- Quality and credibility of the research (level of novelty, multidisciplinary, gender aspects)
- Quality and appropriateness of the **training** and of the two way transfer of knowledge
- Quality of the **supervision and of the integration in the team/institution**
- Capacity of the researcher to reach/re-enforce a position of professional maturity

Non sottovalutare training in complementary skills (inclusa IP se coerente)



2. IMPACT

2. Impact:

- Enhancing the potential and future **career prospects** of the researcher
- Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results
- Quality of the proposed measures to **communicate the action activities** to different target audiences

Esempi di WEAKNESSES: 

- The outreach activities are only briefly discussed and include very basic measures, unlikely to have an impact on the social awareness of the present research results.
- The career development plan is too generic, providing a list of expectations and no definite action to realize them.

2. Impact:

- Enhancing the potential and future **career prospects** of the researcher
- Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results
- Quality of the proposed measures to **communicate the action activities** to different target audiences

Non sottovalutare career plan e communication & outreach



3. IMPLEMENTATION

3. Implementation:

- Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan
- Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources
- Appropriateness of the **management structure and procedures** & risk management
- Appropriateness of the **institutional environment**

Esempi di WEAKNESSES:



- The WP is very general and misses essential technical details, that substantially reduces its credibility.
- The tasks are not adequately detailed.
- The work plan is coherent but dense and loaded with extremely time-consuming asides making the release of six milestones, three of them consecutively in the last three months of the project, overly optimistic.
- The number and complexity of the goals is not proportionate to the resources that the project will provide.
- The risk assessment and the measures to mitigate their impact on project achievements are not sufficiently detailed

3. Implementation:

- Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan
- Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources
- Appropriateness of the **management structure and procedures** & risk management
- Appropriateness of the **institutional environment**

Non sottovalutare risk assessment

AZIONI

1. Mettere a punto descrizioni puntuali delle attività di UNIMORE che ne certifichino

- *Appropriateness of the institutional environment*
- *Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures*
- *Extensive experience in the management of educational Programmes*
- *Training in complementary skills*
- *Support for administrative and financial management of the grant.*
- *Help in defining a Career plan*
- *Hosting arrangements*

2. Consulenza personalizzata a chi intende presentare un progetto MSC da parte di valutatori/esperti locali

L'agenzia APRE offre un servizio di consulenza "generalista".

I valutatori locali possono intervenire sugli aspetti specifici di area.