



The EU Framework Programme  
for Research and Innovation

# HORIZON 2020



## Self-evaluation form

Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions  
Co-funding of regional, national and  
international programmes (COFUND)

Version 2.0  
15 February 2016

*Research and  
Innovation*

## History of changes

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>Page</b>
2.0	15.02.2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Wording in sections 1, 2 and 3 adjusted to align with revised "aspects to be taken into account" under the three evaluation criteria (re General Annex H)</li></ul>	

## Self-evaluation form

### Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Co-funding of regional, national and international programmes (COFUND)

This form is made available to applicants who may themselves wish to arrange an evaluation of their proposal (e.g. by an impartial colleague) prior to final editing, submission and deadline. The aim is to help applicants identify ways to improve their proposals. The forms used by the experts for their evaluation reports will be broadly similar, although the detail and layout may differ. A self-evaluation, if carried out, is not to be submitted to the Commission, and has no bearing whatsoever on the conduct of the evaluation.

Please remember that in the real evaluation, evaluators will be asked to score proposals as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes were to be made. When an evaluator identifies significant shortcomings, he or she must reflect this by awarding a lower score for the criterion concerned

Each criterion will be scored out of 5. Decimal points will be given.

The scores indicate the following with respect to the criterion under examination:

- |  |
|--|
| 0 – <b>The proposal fails</b> to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.       |
| 1 – <b>Poor.</b> The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.                          |
| 2 – <b>Fair.</b> The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.                         |
| 3 – <b>Good.</b> The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.                        |
| 4 – <b>Very good.</b> The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.        |
| 5 – <b>Excellent.</b> The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor. |

<b>Proposal Number:</b>	
<b>Proposal Acronym:</b>	
<b>Panel:</b>	

<b>1. EXCELLENCE</b>	
<i>The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion:</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Quality of the selection / recruitment process for the researchers</b> (transparency, composition and organisation of selection committees, evaluation criteria, equal opportunity)	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Quality of the research options offered by the programme</b> in terms of science, interdisciplinarity, intersectorality and level of transnational mobility	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Quality of career guidance and training</b> , including supervision arrangements, training in transferable skills	
<u>Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<u>Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	
<b>Score Criterion 1 (out of 5):</b>	

## 2. IMPACT

*The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion:*

- Enhancing the **potential and future career perspectives** of researchers; **Strengthening human resources** on regional, national or international level
- Aligning practices of participating organisations with the principles set out by the EU for human resources development in research and innovation**
- Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and **disseminate** the results
- Quality of the proposed measures to **communicate** the results to different target audiences

Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):

- 
- 
- 

Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):

- 
- 
- 

**Score Criterion 2  
(out of 5):**

### 3. IMPLEMENTATION

*The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion:*

- Coherence, effectiveness and appropriateness of the work plan**
- Appointment conditions of researchers**
- Competence of the participant** to implement the programme

Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):

- 
- 
- 

Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):

- 
- 
- 

**Score Criterion 3  
(out of 5):**

**Summary of scores**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted score</b>
1. EXCELLENCE		50%	
2. IMPACT		30%	
3. IMPLEMENTATION		20%	
Total score expressed out of 5			
Total score expressed out of 100 (threshold 70%)			