



The EU Framework Programme
for Research and Innovation

HORIZON 2020



H2020 Programme

Self-evaluation form MSCA Innovative Training Networks (ITN)

Version 1.0
12 October 2017

Disclaimer

This guide aims to facilitate potential applicants. It is provided for information purposes only and is not intended to replace consultation of any applicable legal sources. Neither the European Commission nor the Research Executive Agency (or any person acting on their behalf) can be held responsible for the use made of this guidance document. The guidance provided in the Annotated Model Grant Agreement shall prevail in case of discrepancies.



History of changes

Version	Date	Change	Page
1.0	12.10.2017	▪ Initial version for 2018-2020	

Self-evaluation form

Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Innovative Training Networks (ITN)

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

Proposal Number:	
Proposal Acronym:	
Scientific Panel:	
Type of Action (ETN/EID/EJD):	

1. EXCELLENCE	
<i>The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion:</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Quality, innovative aspects and credibility of the research programme (including inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and, where appropriate, gender aspects)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Quality and innovative aspects of the training programme (including transferable skills, inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and, where appropriate, gender aspects)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Quality of the supervision (including mandatory joint supervision for EID and EJD projects)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations	
<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"> • • • 	
Score 1 (out of 5):	

2. IMPACT

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

- Enhancing the career perspectives and employability of researchers and contribution to their skills development
- Contribution to structuring doctoral / early-stage research training at the European level and to strengthening European innovation capacity, including the potential for:
 - a) meaningful contribution of the non-academic sector to the doctoral/research training, as appropriate to the implementation mode and research field
 - b) developing sustainable joint doctoral degree structures (for EJD projects only)
- 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):

-
-
-

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

3. Quality and efficiency of the 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, (including awarding of the doctoral degrees for EID and EJD projects)
- Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management (with a mandatory joint governing structure for EID and EJD projects)
- Appropriateness of the infrastructure of the participating organisations
- Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and their commitment to the programme

Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):

-
-
-

Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):

-
-
-

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

Summary of scores

Criterion	Score	Weight	Weighted score
1. EXCELLENCE		50%	
2. IMPACT		30%	
3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation		20%	
Total score expressed out of 5 (threshold 3.5)			
Total score expressed out of 100 (threshold 70%)			