



European
Commission

The EU Framework Programme
for Research and Innovation

HORIZON 2020



H2020 Programme

Self-evaluation form

Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions - Individual Fellowships (IF)

Version 1.0
12 April 2018



History of changes

Version	Date	Change	Page
1.0	12.04.2018	▪ Initial version	

Self-evaluation form

Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Individual Fellowships (IF)

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 - The **proposal fails to address the criterion** or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1 - **Poor**. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- 2 - **Fair**. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, 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.

Proposal Number:	
Proposal Acronym:	
Scientific Panel:	

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	
<hr/>	
<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"> • • • 	
<hr/>	
Score Criterion 1 (out of 5):	

2. IMPACT

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

- 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 of the proposal (in bullet point format):

-
-
-

Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):

-
-
-

Overall comments:

(reflecting the relative importance of the above-mentioned strengths and weaknesses)

-
-
-

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

3. IMPLEMENTATION

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

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

Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):

-
-
-

Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):

-
-
-

Overall comments:

(reflecting the relative importance of the above-mentioned strengths and weaknesses)

-
-
-

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

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%)			