

LE GIORNATE REGIONALI SOCI APRE EMILIA-ROMAGNA

I BANDI MARIE SKŁODOWSKA-CURIE
INDIVIDUAL FELLOWSHIPS:
COME SCRIVERE UNA PROPOSTA DI SUCCESSO

Ferrara, 14 maggio 2019
Università degli Studi di Ferrara
Aula Magna IUSS
Corso Porta Mare, 2

Docente:
Angelo D'Agostino H2020 NCP - Marie Skłodowska Curie Actions

Esercitazione su proposta progettuale

- Divisione in Gruppi
 - Gruppo 1: Excellence
 - Gruppo 2: Impact
 - Gruppo 3: Implementation
- 10 min. per leggere il criterio di valutazione e compilare il *Self evaluation form*
- 30 min. per nominare un *Rapporteur* e finalizzare il *Consensus Report*
- 10 min. per presentazione finale

Self evaluation form

1. EXCELLENCE	
<i>The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion:</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Quality and credibility of the research/innovation project (level of novelty, appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary and gender aspects)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host	
<input type="checkbox"/> Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team/institution	
<input type="checkbox"/> Potential of the researcher to reach or re-enforce professional maturity/independence during the fellowship	
<u>Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•••	
<u>Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•••	
<u>Overall comments:</u> (reflecting the relative importance of the above-mentioned strengths and weaknesses) <ul style="list-style-type: none">•••	
Score Criterion 1 (out of 5):	

Consensus Report

Summary of scores

Criterion	Score	Weight	Weighted score
1. EXCELLENCE		50%	
2. IMPACT		30%	
3. IMPLEMENTATION		20%	
Total score expressed out of 100 (threshold 70%)			

Consensus Report

Excellence:	
Impact:	
Implementation:	

Evaluation Summary Report

Evaluation Result

Total score: 93.20% (Threshold: 70/100.00)

Criterion 1 - Excellence

Score: **4.70** (Threshold: 0/5.00 , Weight: 50.00%)

- **Quality and credibility of the research/innovation project; level of novelty, appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary and gender aspects**
- **Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host**
- **Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team/institution**
- **Potential of the researcher to reach or re-enforce professional maturity/independence during the fellowship**

Strengths

- *The proposal is novel, and has an appropriate level of inter/multidisciplinary aspects.*
- *The state of the art is well presented with respect to existing instruments and methods required for an automated, non-destructive approach of image acquisition and analysis.*

However, see below.

- *The proposal provides clear and credible objectives with a good overview of the action.*
- *The methodological approach is credible and presented with very high quality .*
- *The training plan is outstanding, as well as the two-way knowledge transfer. Details provided are relevant and add up very well with the proposal objectives.*
- *The supervisor of the main host institution has an outstanding research track record and proven experience in supervising academic careers.*
- *The application shows a very good match between the researcher's profile and track record with the project.*
- *The new complementary research skills in the field of analytical chemistry and climate Analysis, which can be gained during the fellowship, improve the researcher's scientific profile and help to re-enforce professional maturity.*

Weaknesses

- *The description of the advance in machine learning algorithms and the specific challenges or limitations are not fully provided.*

Criterion 2 - Impact

Score: **4.70** (Threshold: 0/5.00 , Weight: 30.00%)

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

Strengths

- *The project will strengthen the collaboration between both host institutions and their communities.*
- *The proposal highlights clearly and precisely how, when and where the project will enhance the career prospects of the researcher.*
- *The measures proposed for dissemination of research results among scientific community are credible and effective.*
- *The exploitation plan of the project results is appropriately described.*
- *The communication actions are clearly defined.*

Weaknesses

- *The dissemination strategy directed to audiences other than the scientific community is not well explained.*

Criterion 3 - implementation

Score: **4.50** (Threshold: 0/5.00 , Weight: 20.00%)

- **Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources**
- **Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management**
- **Appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructure)**

Strengths

- *The work planning for management, reporting activities, as well as dissemination and communication activities is realistically designed.*
- *Procedures for monitoring the quality and the progress of the fellowship are very appropriate and very effective.*
- *The major scientific risks that might endanger the project objectives are identified and risk mitigation activities are very well described.*
- *The financial and administrative management of the project is very good.*
- *The institutional environment of the host is outstanding.*
- *The proposal very well describes the excellent infrastructure that will be made available for the researcher.*

Weaknesses

- *The allocated time for the technical work package is not well justified.*
- *The WPs are not clearly represented in the Gantt chart.*