



# DocFam+

**Guide for Evaluators Call 1**

**May 2023**



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No

10181337



## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>About DocFam+ .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Purpose of the Guide for Evaluators.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Evaluation &amp; Selection.....</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	Selection Process.....	3
3.2	Call 1 timeline.....	5
	<i><b>Table 1: Timeline .....</b></i>	<i><b>5</b></i>
3.3	Evaluation Criteria .....	6
	<i><b>Table 2: Evaluation Criteria .....</b></i>	<i><b>6</b></i>
<b>4</b>	<b>Appointment of Evaluators.....</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1	Selection of Evaluators .....	7
4.2	The Panel Chair and the ESR .....	8
4.3	Conflict of Interests & Confidentiality.....	8
4.4	Redress.....	8
4.5	Reporting .....	9
4.6	Good Practices .....	9
	<b>Application Package.....</b>	<b>10</b>



## 1 About DocFam+

**DocFam+** is a 5-years excellence **DOC**toral training programme in **F**unctional **A**dvanced **M**aterials presented by the Spanish National Research Council (CSIC) and coordinated through the **I**nstitute of **M**aterials **S**cience of **B**arcelona (**ICMAB-CSIC**) in collaboration with several partner research Institutions from the area, six of them contributing to the co-funding of the programme: **I**nstitute of **M**icroelectronics of **B**arcelona (**IMB-CNM-CSIC**), **C**atalan **I**nstitute of **N**anoscience and **N**anotechnology (**ICN2**), **C**atalonia **I**nstitute for **E**nergy **R**esearch (**IREC**), **H**igh **E**nergy **P**hysics **I**nstitute (**IFAE**), **A**utonomous **U**niversity of **B**arcelona (**UAB**) and **A**LBA-CELLS **S**ynchrotron (**ALBA**).

**Beneficiary:**



**Coordinator\*:**



**Implementing and recruiting partners\* :**



\*ICMAB and IMB-CNM belong to CSIC



## 2 Purpose of the Guide for Evaluators

This “**Guide for Evaluators**” is addressed to the **evaluators** participating in the DocFam+ Selection Process. It includes general information about the programme, the application process and the criteria to evaluate the individual candidates applying to the programme. The Guide is part of the **application package**, which means that the information included is available to prospective applicants, fulfilling the principle of transparency. If you are an **applicant**, please use this document as a checklist to ensure the quality of your proposal. If you are an **evaluator**, you are welcome to check the “**Guide for Applicants**” for additional information. All the information about the programme can be found at:

[docfam.icmab.es](http://docfam.icmab.es)

## 3 Evaluation & Selection

### 3.1 Selection Process

The selection process consists of 5 phases:

#### Phase 1: ELIGIBILITY CHECK

After the deadline, the Management Team will examine each application and perform an eligibility check. Each application will be carefully checked against the mobility and DC rules first; and later against the rest of the eligibility criteria. Applications considered ineligible will be excluded from the process.

#### Phase 2: EVALUATION OF MERITS

The Scientific Evaluation Committee (SEC) will evaluate each eligible application through a peer-review system carried out by **panels of independent experts**. Each application will be reviewed by **5 individuals**: 1 representative of the coordinator ICMAB, 1 representative from the organisation selected by the candidate as first choice, and **3 external experts** in the field selected from the panels.



SEC members will **score** the applications and prepare a **summary report**, including strengths/weaknesses and comments for each criterion. Later, the Management Team will examine the **evaluation forms** and either accept or ask the evaluators for additional information. From the 5 evaluations for each application, those scoring highest and lowest will be discarded. The **3 remaining scores** will be averaged, providing the **Final Evaluation Score**. The **26** best-scored candidates will go through to the next phase.

### Phase 3: INTERVIEWS

The **26** short-listed candidates will be invited to a **remote 20'** interview. In the **first** half, the candidates will deliver an **oral presentation** of their merits (the use of presentation tools such as PowerPoint or Canva is encouraged). In the **second** half, an **Interactive Q&A** session will take place to get further insights from the candidate (interest in the programme, level of independence, potential as a future leading researcher, self-identification of strengths and weaknesses, etc.). Afterwards, the Management Team will write an **individual report**.

### Phase 4: FINAL SCORING & RANKING

The Management Team will compose the final ranking using the scorings from the **Evaluation of Merits (60%)** and the **Interview (40%)**. Also, they will send an **Evaluation Summary Report (ESR)** to all eligible applicants. The report intends to inform of the final decision and be useful for future application processes. Once the list is generated, the candidates will make their **final selection** by **ranking position**. If a candidate selects a project already taken by another candidate **higher in the ranking**, they will have to change their selection until all the fellowships offered are covered.



### 3.2 Call 1 timeline

**Table 1: Timeline**

Step	Description	Timeframe
Application Period	Applicants must submit their applications through the online platform.	15 <sup>th</sup> May - 15 <sup>th</sup> Jul'23
Elegibility Check	The Management Team (MT) will check all the required information and documents are submitted. Then, each application will be checked against the DC and Mobility rules.	By the 15 <sup>th</sup> Aug'23
Evaluation of Merits	The Scientific Evaluation Committee (SEC) will evaluate the eligible applications.	By the 1 <sup>st</sup> Nov'23
Interviews	Shortlisted candidates will be interviewed remotely.	Mid-End Nov'23
Final Ranking	The MT will compose the final ranking using the scorings from the Evaluation of Merits & the Interview	Beginning of Dec'23

### 3.3 Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria are summarised in **Table 2**, alongside the scoring and thresholds. The evaluation takes into account not only educational aspects but also other activities in the context of career progression and the development of personal skills.

**Table 2: Evaluation Criteria**

Step	Criteria	Scoring (0 - 100)	Threshold	Priority (in case of ex-aequo)
<b>Elegibility Check (Phase 1)</b>	Application submitted before the deadline / All required documents included / Mobility & ESR rules fulfilled / Academic & English requirements satisfied	To move to the next phase, applicants must fulfil all the criteria.		
<b>Evaluation of Merits (Phase 2)</b>	<b>Education:</b> graduate and postgraduate education (Masters) (0-30). <b>Research &amp; Professional Experience:</b> research experience, publications, attendance to conferences and events, patents, research skills and competencies, support letters (0- 20). <b>Others:</b> mobility (research stays), public awareness, English level, suitability of the profile to the programme, and industrial experience (0-10).	60	30	2
<b>Interviews (Phase 3)</b>	<b>Research Skills:</b> scientific excellence, level of independence, motivation and potential as a future lead researcher, scientific quality of the presentation and answers during the Q&A session (0-20). <b>Communication Skills:</b> English skills & oral communication skills (0-10). <b>Interpersonal Skills:</b> professional attitude, team player, reliability, motivation etc. (0-10).	40	25	1



## 4 Appointment of Evaluators

An evaluator is someone **responsible** for assess the **scientific** and **non-scientific merits** of individual candidates applying to the programme. Evaluators of DocFam+ are selected based on their **expertise** in the topics of the doctoral programme. In this section, you will find information about how the evaluators are selected, what is expected from them, and the reporting, among others.

### 4.1 Selection of Evaluators

For DocFam+'s Selection Process, the Management Team, with the collaboration of partners' representatives, draws up a list of appropriate independent evaluators to constitute the **Scientific Evaluation Committee (SEC)**.

The SEC consists of 3 **Panels** (of at least 30 experts each) belonging to the programme research topics: **Energy**, **Nanomedicine**, and **Electronics**. These Panels are a pool of external experts who will participate in the Selection Process. For the evaluation of each **application** and, later, for the **interview**, **two experts** will be selected, taking into account the background and research experience of the applicant.

The **criteria selection** of the external experts is:

- Academic experts will have extensive **knowledge of the field** of research (a minimum of 15 publications and an h-index >10).
- At least 40% of the external experts will be female, ensuring a **gender-balanced** pool.
- At least 25% of the experts will belong to the **non-academic sector**.
- At least 30% of the experts will belong to **international** institutions.





## 4.2 The Panel Chair and the ESR

In the Evaluation of Merits and the Interview phases, the **Panel Chair** is responsible for examining all evaluators' reports and composing the **ESR**. This report is the document that **all eligible candidates**, including those not awarded a fellowship, will receive. The ESR contains the **final score**, the **funding decision** and a summary of **strengths and weaknesses**. The ESR should not be a copy-paste of the individual reports but a standalone document that **summarizes** the weak and strong points for **every criterion** in consistency with the scores given by the individual evaluators.

## 4.3 Conflict of Interests & Confidentiality

The Management Team must ensure that the evaluation process fulfils the **requirements** set in the call and the **principles** of the **Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers**. Therefore, anyone participating in the evaluation process, including the **external experts**, must sign a letter confirming that they do not have any **conflict of interest** with the application they have been asked to evaluate, in particular, related to any existing relationship with the candidate (shared publications, projects, and other collaborations). If a conflict of interest is detected, the evaluator will be **removed** from the process and the application will be handled by a different evaluator. Also, evaluators must sign a letter confirming that they will keep **confidential** any information shared with them. On the other hand, the **list of experts** will also remain confidential throughout the process. Any possible **contact** between the evaluator and the applicant is absolutely **forbidden**.

## 4.4 Redress

**Applicants** may submit a redress if they believe the evaluation provided is **incorrect** in any form. A redress is applicable when, for instance, a document provided has not been counted in the evaluation score. Applicants will be notified **three times** during the Selection Process: After the Eligibility Check; after the Interviews have concluded (ESR); and after the final list is made. It is after those notifications that submissions for redress are expected. Applicants have a period of **7 days** to send a redress after each notification.



## 4.5 Reporting

Evaluators must ensure that the reports are completed in **due time** as requested by the Panel Chair and the Management Team. Also, the information included in the report must be based only on the **criteria, scoring and thresholds** mentioned in **Section 3.3**. As an evaluator, you must form an opinion based exclusively on the **information provided** in the application; if there is any **missing information** or you need **further clarification**, please contact the Management Team. **Do not contact** the **candidate** under any circumstances.

## 4.6 Good Practices

- If you are asked to score **more than one application**, please be consistent with the scores and **double-check** your evaluations before sending them to the Management Team.
- Focus on the **evaluation criteria** and provide enough **evidence** for your scores by adding some comments for each criterion using **full and clear sentences**.
- Focus on **strong and weak points** rather than giving general comments, the scores should be consistent with the comments provided.
- **Avoid** personal comments.
- Consider only the information included in the application. For the **complementary training**, only the activities supported by **certificates** can be considered valid.
- Please properly consider research **career breaks**, career breaks **should not penalize**.



## Application Package

This Guide is part of the Application Package. You can find it on the [DocFam+ website](#).

It contains the following documents:

- Guide for Evaluators
- Guide for Applicants
- Europass CV Template
- Motivation Letter Template
- Redress Template