

The EU Framework Programme
for Research and Innovation

HORIZON 2020



H2020 Programme Self-evaluation form

Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Research
and Innovation Staff Exchange (RISE)

Version 6.0 2020

5 December 2019

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	06.01.2015	▪ Initial 2015 version	-
2.0	08.12.2015	▪ Wording in sections 1, 2 and 3 adjusted to align with revised "aspects to be taken into account" under the three evaluation criteria (General Annex H)	-
3.0	01.12.2016	▪ Criterion under examination: update of the wording	3
4.0	22.11.2017	▪ Change of sub-criterion in criterion IMPACT	5
5.0	04.12.2018	▪ NA	-
6.0	05.12.2019	▪ Small changes of editorial nature	-

Self-evaluation form

Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Research and Innovation Staff Exchange (RISE)

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 on a scale from 0 to 5 points. Decimal points may be given.

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

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

An overall threshold of 70% will be applied to the total weighted score.

Proposal Number:	
Proposal Acronym:	
Scientific Panel:	

1. EXCELLENCE (50%)	
The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion: □ Quality and credibility of the research/innovation project; level of novelty and appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and gender aspects □ Quality and appropriateness of knowledge sharing among the participating organisations in light of the research and innovation objectives □ Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations	
<u>Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):</u> ▪ ▪ ▪	
<u>Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):</u> ▪ ▪ ▪	
Score 1 (out of 5):	

2. IMPACT (30%)	
The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion: □ Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the staff members □ Developing new and lasting research collaborations, achieving transfer of knowledge between participating organisations and contribution to improving research and innovation potential at the European and global levels □ 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	
<u>Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):</u> ▪ ▪ ▪	
<u>Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):</u> ▪ ▪ ▪	
Score 2 (out of 5):	

3. QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION (20%)	
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 quality management and risk management □ Appropriateness of the institutional environment (hosting arrangements, infrastructure) □ Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and their commitment to the project	
<u>Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):</u> ▪ ▪ ▪	
<u>Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):</u> ▪ ▪ ▪	
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 100 (threshold 70%)			