

Selection May 2009

EXPERT ASSESSMENT MANUAL

for the assessment of proposals for
**Erasmus Mundus Joint Doctorate
Courses (Action 1)**
submitted under the
Erasmus Mundus programme

Document prepared by the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, Unit P4

Content

1.	Assessment and Selection Procedure	p. 4
2.	Description of the Actions.....	p. 10
3.	Eligibility and Selection Criteria.....	p. 13
4.	Award Criteria.....	p. 14
5.	Assessment against award criteria - Checklist	p. 17
6.	On-line Assessment form	p. 21
7.	Ethical and security/safety/sensitive issues table	p. 26
8.	Using the online assessment tool.....	p. 28

ANNEXES

For the assessment

- A. Erasmus Mundus 2009-2013 Programme Guide, Call for Proposals and Application Form
- B. EC Decision N° 1298/2008

This information is available at:

http://ec.europa.eu/education/external-relation-programmes/doc1387_en.htm.

Assisting tools and bibliography on Doctorate studies in Europe

- C. Examples of good practice based on the quality assessment of Erasmus Mundus activities so far
- D. European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers (especially section 2) under:
http://ec.europa.eu/eracareers/pdf/am509774CEE_EN_E4.pdf
- E. EUA (European University Association) Information material on joint doctorate developments in Europe under:
http://www.eua.be/fileadmin/user_upload/files/Publications/Doctoral_Programmes_in_Europe_s_Universities.pdf

- F. Bologna Seminar on “Doctoral Programmes for the European Knowledge Society” (Salzburg, 3-5 February 2005) CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS under:http://www.bmwf.gv.at/fileadmin/user_upload/europa/bologna/SalzburgConclusions.pdf

1. Assessment and Selection Procedure

1.1. Introduction

The programme's aim is to promote European higher education, to help improve and enhance the career prospects of students and to promote intercultural understanding through cooperation with Third Countries, in accordance with EU external policy objectives in order to contribute to the sustainable development of Third Countries in the field of higher education.

Proposals for Joint Doctorate Courses (Action 1) were submitted by 30 April 2009 under the Erasmus Mundus Programme Guide 2009-2013 and the Call for Proposals EAC04/09 relating to the academic year 2010-2011; selected Joint Doctorates will thus start in the academic year 2010-2011

1.2. Selection Procedure

Proposals are selected through a competitive system based on their academic quality, and all candidates are subject to the same application rules. The evaluation of the applications submitted under this call will undergo a five-step selection procedure:

1. Administrative eligibility Check of the submitted applications
2. Verification of the applicants and partners compliance with the Selection Criteria
3. Assessment of the applications following the Award Criteria
4. Review of the assessments by the Selection Board
5. Evaluation Committee

The administrative eligibility check and the verification of the compliance with the Selection Criteria (step 1 and 2) will be performed by the Agency and the Erasmus Mundus National Structures.

The quality assessment of each eligible application against a set of Award Criteria (step 3) will be performed by independent experts. As regards the role of the Selection Board (step 4) and the evaluation committee (step 5) see below 1.5 and 1.6.

1.3. Role of the Independent Experts

Independent academic experts have been appointed to assist the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (the "Agency") in the assessment of proposals for Erasmus Mundus Joint Doctorates. This Manual describes the assessment process in practical detail and the tasks experts are invited to perform. It has been prepared on the basis of the Erasmus Mundus Programme Guide and Call for Proposals, the application form and the programme decision. Experts need to be familiar with these three documents in order to assess proposals.

The role of the independent experts is twofold:

- To provide the Agency and the Selection Board with an opinion on the proposals which have been submitted and
- To give recommendations to the applicants. Experts should note that their comments and recommendations will be sent to the applicants as feedback (the experts' identity will, however, remain confidential), and experts are therefore requested to draft them with accuracy and care.

Each expert should read carefully each proposal attributed to him/her (including corresponding annexes) and assess these proposals against the set of award criteria listed in the EM Programme Guide and reported in section 4 of the present manual. They should record their individual assessments by using the online assessment tool (see section 6 and 8).

Experts perform assessments on a personal basis, not as representatives of their employer, their country or any other entity. They must be independent, impartial and objective, and are expected to behave in a professional manner throughout the assessment process.

Three experts with a longstanding experience in assessing European cooperation projects will be appointed as "lead experts", in the following fields:

- hard sciences
- life sciences
- social sciences and humanities

Apart from assessing proposals themselves, they will also monitor progress of the individual assessments, participate in difficult consensus discussions to facilitate compromises (see 1.4.2 below), carry out third assessments (if necessary), chair the sectoral panel discussions, report back to the general panel of experts and assist the Selection Board as resource persons (see points 1.4 and 1.5 below for more details).

All the information made available to experts is to be treated as strictly confidential. No information on the proposals submitted or on the provisional results of the assessment or selection may be divulged to third parties. **Under no circumstances may experts contact an applicant on their own account.**

Experts should also check to see that they have no potential interest in any of the proposals they are invited to assess. Examples of conflict of interest are: the expert is involved in a contract or collaboration with the applicant; the expert was involved in the preparation of the proposal; the expert is personally related to the applicant (family/friend relations) or is related to the applicant's work (professional relations); the expert would benefit directly from the proposal being funded or not funded. If experts have a conflict of interest, or in case of doubt, they have to inform one of the Agency's staff members without delay the day of the distribution of the proposals to assess, so that the proposals concerned can be allocated to another expert. **Experts will be requested to sign a declaration to certify absence of any conflict of interest with the proposal concerned for each individual assessment performed.**

1.4. Assessment Procedure

All proposals will be assessed by two experts ("expert one" and "expert two"). The assessment will be done remotely via and recorded on the online assessment tool. As from the third week of the assessment the experts that will assess the same proposal will be provided with each other contact details in order to be able to communicate during the consensus discussions (see 1.4.2). The work and the performance of the of the experts will be monitored online daily by the staff of the Agency. The table below shows the key dates of the assessment procedure:

From 27/05 to 26/06	"Remote" individual assessment
From 22/06 to 26/06	Start of the "remote" consensus discussions
29/06	Finalisation of the consensus discussions and sectoral panels
30/06	General panel and debriefing

Each expert will be allocated a number of proposals to assess. Proposals will be allocated in a way to match the disciplines of the proposals with the experts' professional and research background and work experience. The experts will focus both on issues regarding the specialised research area and integration aspects of the proposal.

The proposals will be assessed against a set of award criteria listed in the Programme Guide and Call for Proposal (see Section 4). No other assessment criteria may be applied.

Experts are not obliged to visit web site references referred to in the proposals. The necessary information must be present in the proposal if it is to be taken into account. Experts may visit web sites in order to verify the legitimacy of claims within the proposal, but they should not base their assessments on additional technical information found on a web site and not contained within the proposal.

1.4.1. Individual Assessments

The assessment process must be completed within the period which has been communicated to the experts. The timing has been carefully planned and the timetable must be adhered to by all persons concerned.

During the individual assessment phase, experts are acting individually and independently. They do not discuss individual proposals with their fellow experts. The experts record their individual assessments by using the online assessment tool (see Section 6).

The individual assessment will include

- => mandatory comments and recommendations to the applicant;
- => comments to the Agency, if applicable;
- => global recommendations on the proposal;
- => individual scores – from 0 to 5 – per issue addressed under each award criteria
- => global score – from 0 to 100 – resulting from the sum of individual scores, weighted in accordance with the importance of the relevant award criteria

1.4.2. Consensus Discussions and Consolidated Assessment

Once the two individual assessments have been finalised the two experts will have to contact each other and discuss their assessment of the proposal. Generally speaking, this consensus discussion serves the purpose of assuring that

=> the experts have a common understanding of all aspects

=> their comments and scores provided to each individual award criteria are coherent

In order to prepare this consensus discussion both experts are expected to read carefully each other's assessment in comparison with their own assessment. This work will be done remotely in order for the experts to arrive to a consolidated version before the **final consensus meeting** in Brussels. At the end of this phase, two different situations can occur:

- A. There is **no significant divergence** in scores and comments between the individual assessments. In this case both experts will endorse his/her assessment in the online assessment tool and "expert one" will be able to access a new consolidated assessment form that includes the two individual assessments. The two experts will then work together in order to draft a common assessment that includes the most relevant/appropriate elements of both individual assessment. They will also have to score this common assessment, taking into account their common comments and initial individual scores.

The "expert one" will have to submit a **draft version** of the consolidated assessment in the online assessment tool. The consolidated assessment will be confirmed and endorsed/submitted the day of the final consensus meeting in Brussels and prior to the sectoral and general panel meeting. At this day the two experts will have, then, to print and sign the consolidated assessment and return it to the Agency.

- B. There is **a divergence of more than 20 points** between the final score of the two individual assessments. In this case the consensus discussion will serve to the purpose to clarify the discrepancies/differences between the two assessments and try to bring them closer to each other.

If both experts agree on solving these differences and reducing the divergence between their scores they will have to do this in their individual assessment before submitting and endorsing it in the online assessment tool. As from there the procedure described under A) above will apply.

If no common agreement can be reached, a third expert will be asked to perform an individual assessment of the proposal. The expert who has given the middle final score will act as "expert one" and will draft the "consolidated assessment" on behalf of the three experts who will be asked to endorse and sign the final "consolidated assessment" form in accordance with the procedure described under A) above.

For reasons of availability of experts, resources and time, third assessments should represent the rare exception to the rule.

After the consensus discussion and the endorsement of the "consolidated assessment form" the comments recommendations and scores can no longer be changed.

Experts should make sure that all their comments and recommendations are **clear, objective, transparent, detailed, instructive, complete and in accordance with the scoring.**

Comments and recommendations in the consolidated assessment form must be in line and not contradictory.

When assessing the proposals, the experts' must assure the quality, accuracy and coherence of their comments and recommendations. **Experts are reminded that their comments, recommendations and scoring will be communicated to the applicants with the selection results.**

1.4.3. Panel Discussions

Sectoral panel discussions

The "top ranked" proposals will be discussed in the context of three sectoral panels (i.e. "hard sciences", "life sciences" and "social sciences and humanities ") chaired by the corresponding "lead expert". These panels include all the experts who have assessed the proposals in the thematic areas concerned

The purpose of these sectoral panel discussions is to ensure coherence and consistency across the expert assessments as well as to carry out an additional quality check of the proposals.

General Panel Discussion

The three lead experts will report back from the sectoral panel discussions to the general panel, composed by all experts. The general panel will concentrate on the top ranked proposals with the objective of:

- => comparing the relative merits of proposals with similar/identical scores
- => elaborating arguments in favour or against ex-aequo proposals
- => discussing individual or generic case that may need to be brought to the attention of the Selection Board and may be used to define their final selection proposal (see below).

In the context of the panel discussions, the experts can decide, if they consider it appropriate, **to alter the final score of a proposal by 1 to 5 points maximum.** Decisions to alter a proposal's score have to be documented in the minutes of the panel discussion. They are taken by a simple majority vote of the experts present.

The Agency will establish the final score of each proposal taking into account possible score changes following the panel discussions.

1.5. Selection Board

The Selection Board is composed of twelve high standing personalities from the academic world who are representative of the diversity of higher education in the European Union and have a longstanding experience of higher education policy and its European dimension. Members of the Selection Board are proposed on a yearly basis by the Member States and selected by the Commission. The Selection Board advises the Agency on the selection of Erasmus Mundus Joint Doctorates with a view to ensuring the highest academic quality.

The Selection Board will meet shortly after the experts have assessed the proposals. A shortlist of proposals, ranked in accordance with the experts' assessments, will be submitted to the Selection Board which reviews the proposals on the basis of the experts' assessments and the transcript of records from the panel discussions.

Selection Board members will make a comparative assessment of the short-listed proposals by looking in particular at the consistency of the experts' assessments, the European added value of the proposals and their relevance in the light of the objectives of the programme and of the priorities (if any) indicated in the Programme Guide and Call for Proposals.

All three lead experts will participate in the Selection Board meeting to provide assistance to the Board members.

1.6. Evaluation Committee

On the basis of the outcome of the Selection Board meeting, an evaluation committee including staff members of the Commission and the Agency submits a list of proposals to the authorising officer of the Agency for funding. This list is based on:

- the relative quality of the proposal in comparison with the other proposals received;
- the budget available;
- the priorities (if any) indicated in the Call for Proposals.

2. Description of the Action

- The description below consists of excerpt from the Programme Guide 2009-2013 –

The primary aim of EMJDs is to develop structured and integrated cooperation in higher education, in order to design and implement common doctoral programmes that lead to the award of mutually recognised joint, double or multiple doctorate degrees.

In this context, EMJDs should:

- ✓ contribute to the advancement of knowledge, including in its professional context, through original and independent research;
- ✓ address new challenges in scientific but also in socio-economic terms;
- ✓ contribute to reinforcing the links between universities/research organisations and other sectors (including industry, commerce and the service sector) in order to strengthen the transmission and exploitation of knowledge and to enhance the innovation process;
- ✓ become a reference at European level and thus contribute to improving the overall quality of doctoral education and research in Europe.

From the point of view of doctoral candidates, the EMJDs should explicitly address the issue of employability and therefore:

- ✓ provide appropriate professional career development opportunities beyond academia, towards a wider employment market;
- ✓ provide appropriate incentives for candidates from developing countries to return home and exploit their experience for the benefit of their country.

From a practical point of view, EMJDs are implemented on a similar basis as EMMCs. Selected EMJD consortia are offered financial support for the implementation and management of their doctoral programme for five consecutive years. Each year a certain number of fellowships are offered to European and Third- Country doctoral candidates selected by the consortium.

EMJDs are designed and implemented by consortia of HEIs and socio-economic partners from Europe and any other parts of the world. Enrolled doctoral candidates will receive high-quality training and carry out their research activities in at least two different countries; after the successful completion of the programme, they will be awarded, on behalf of the consortium, a double, multiple or joint doctorate degree.

An EMJD must:

- Be designed as a training and research programme that will be completed by the candidates within a maximum period of 4 years.
- Be fully developed at the time of the application and be ready to run for at least five consecutive editions as of the academic year following the application year (e.g. an EMJD application submitted in April of year “n - 1” must be able to start the first edition of the joint programme as from August/September of year “n”).

- Involve doctoral candidates from Europe and Third Countries and reserve every year a certain number of places for Erasmus Mundus fellowship holders; this number will vary from one year to another and will be communicated to selected EMJD consortia in the autumn of the year preceding the following edition of the joint programme.
- Ensure that, on a yearly basis, all recruited candidates start their doctorate activities between August “year n” and March “year n+1” and that they complete these activities (including the thesis defence) at the latest by October of “year n + 4”.
- Have a joint governance structure with joint admission, selection, supervision, monitoring and assessment procedures.
- Agree whether or not to establish tuition fees, in accordance with its members' national legislation. When tuition fees are established, EMJD consortia should ensure that these fees are transparent and clear to doctoral candidates. In setting tuition fees, consortia should bear in mind the fixed contribution awarded to the consortium for the doctoral candidate participation costs. If the tuition fees established by the consortium are higher than this amount, the consortium should grant the Erasmus Mundus fellowship holders a fee waiver for any fee amount in excess of this fixed contribution.
- Include training/research periods in at least two different countries represented in the consortium. Each of these mobility periods must be instrumental to the fulfilment of the programme and lasts for at least 6 months (not necessarily consecutive).
- Ensure that candidates spend at least two thirds of their doctoral programme in Europe.
- Guarantee the award on behalf of the consortium of a joint, double or multiple degree(s) to all successful candidates; programmes resulting in the award of joint degrees will be promoted; this/these degree(s) must be fully recognised by the relevant authorities of the countries concerned.
- Guarantee social security coverage for the doctoral candidates, covering health insurance, work accident insurance and the provision of parental leave.
- Ensure that all the eligibility conditions applicable to Erasmus Mundus fellowship holders enrolled in the doctorate programme are fully met in accordance with the criteria defined under section 5.2.1 above.
- Be based on an EMJD Agreement signed by the appropriate authorities of the partner organisations and covering the most relevant aspects of the programme implementation and monitoring.
- Without prejudice to the language of instruction, provide for the use of at least two European languages spoken in the countries where the HEI involved in the EMJD are situated and, as appropriate, offer language preparation and assistance for doctoral candidates, in particular by means of courses organised by the institutions in question.

As a general rule, doctoral candidates should be appointed under an employment contract except in adequately documented cases (e.g. related to institutional or national practice) or where national regulation would prohibit this possibility.

Although all domains of research and technological development are eligible for funding, the scope of these domains should be clearly defined in the proposal in order to guarantee the implementation of innovative approaches and ensure that the Erasmus Mundus programme objectives and priorities are fully addressed.

The proposed EMJDs should cover identified and recognised areas of excellence in which new paradigms and new approaches are needed. Based on a bottom-up approach, the applicants will be free to identify these areas. If relevant, the annual Call for Proposals may define specific thematic priorities.

Doctoral candidates holding an Erasmus Mundus fellowship must:

- Commit to participate in the doctoral programme in accordance with the terms defined by the consortium in the ***Doctoral candidate agreement***. Failure to do so could lead to the cancellation of the fellowship;
- Perform their training/research periods in at least two different countries represented in the consortium; for Category B fellowship holders, these two countries must be different from the country in which the doctoral candidate has obtained his/her last university degree;
- Spend most of the doctorate period in the European countries represented in the consortium or among the associated partners. However, if the EMJD consortium includes Third-Country partners and/or associated members:
 - Category A fellowship holders can spend a training/research/ fieldwork period of a maximum duration of one semester (or 6 months, cumulative or consecutive) in these countries; periods in excess of this duration may not be covered by the EMJD fellowship;
 - Category B fellowship holders can spend up to one year (cumulative or consecutive) of their doctorate activities in these countries; periods in excess of this duration may not be covered by the EMJD fellowship.

3. Eligibility and Selection Criteria

During the administrative eligibility check, it will be verified that:

- the submission deadline has been respected.
- the application form satisfies all the criteria mentioned in the application form.
- the application procedures mentioned under section 3.1 and specific EMJD eligibility criteria mentioned under section 5.2 of the Programme Guide are respected.

Following the administrative check, the Agency will inform applicants having submitted proposals not in compliance with the eligible criteria. All the eligible proposals as well as the proposals for which the eligibility status is still pending, will be assessed by the experts.

The selection criteria are intended to help evaluate the applicants' financial and operational capacity to ensure that they:

- have stable and sufficient sources of finance to maintain their activity throughout the period during which the action is being carried out and, where appropriate, to participate in its funding;
- have the management capacity, professional competencies and qualifications required to successfully complete the proposed action. This also applies to any partner of the partnership

Any missing supporting document or any incoherence between the Declaration by the applicant and the supporting documents may lead to the automatic rejection of the proposal on that **sole** basis.

Please notice that in order to check the eligibility of the participating partners' university from the non EU countries, EC Delegations in the countries concerned will be consulted.

4. Award Criteria

ACTION 1 - ERASMUS MUNDUS JOINT DOCORATES (EMJDs)

- excerpt from the Programme Guide 2009-2013 –

The selection of EMJDs will be a competitive process organised by the Agency and based on the assessment of the quality of the proposal from the academic, research and organisational points of view. This assessment will be based on the **following 5 award criteria**:

Academic and Research quality (20% of the final mark)

Under this award criterion applicants will have to present the objectives of their EMJD proposal from an academic and research point of view and its possible contribution to the excellence, innovation and competitiveness of the European Higher Education and Research areas. In this context, the following aspects should be taken into account by the applicants:

- the relevance of the needs analysis (including a socio-economic perspective) and objectives of the EMJD (including those relating to inter/multi-disciplinary, inter-sectoral and/or newly emerging fields);
- the contribution of the EMJD to European education, research excellence and competitiveness; its added value, in terms of the themes and challenges addressed and its expected educational, scientific and innovative outcomes;
- the scientific quality of the education, training and research programme, including its originality and innovative aspects, notably as regards the research methodologies and approaches; in addition, due attention will be given to the existence of training activities in core and transferable skills, to the articulation between education/training activities and the research element, to the participation of industry where relevant, etc.;
- the extent to which the EMJD foresees inter-sectoral and inter-organisation collaboration and mobility (such as placements) to better address societal and economic needs and the issue of graduate employability.

Partnership experience and composition (20% of the final mark)

This award criterion will be used to assess the adequacy of the partnership to the objectives of the programme and in particular the scientific excellence of the consortium partners as well as their education, research and innovation capacities. It will address aspects such as:

- the partners (understood as both the institutions and their key academic, research and administrative staff) capacity, expertise and experience to achieve the EMJD objectives;
- the diversity (in terms of countries/regions and type of organisations), complementarities and synergy between partners/teams; their track records in joint cooperation activities (through their joint involvement in EU/international research and/or education projects) and their level of internationalisation;

- the appropriateness of industry (or other types of partners) participation in terms of activities (e.g. cofunding, co-supervision, intellectual property rights, publishing possibilities, quality assurance, etc.) and the extent to which these participations are formalised in agreements;
- if relevant, the level and appropriateness of the Third-Country partner(s) contribution to the EMJD content and objectives.

European integration and functioning of the programme (20% of the final mark)

This criterion will focus on issues related to the way the EMJD will be implemented in and between the partner institutions for what concerns the delivery of the doctoral programme itself. It will address aspects such as:

- the way the EMJD programme is organised in a structured and integrated way - exploiting current good practices relating to doctoral/graduate/research schools or “co-tutelle” arrangements, providing a strong research environment, ensuring full recognition through ECTS or other in-built mechanisms for all the training and research activities performed by the candidates, etc.;
- the relevance and appropriate organisation of the mandatory mobility periods of the candidates in the participating institutions;
- the quality of the joint mechanisms designed by the consortium for the selection, supervision/monitoring and assessment of doctoral candidates;
- the financial arrangements among the partner institutions, notably as regards the contribution of the Commission to the programme. This include the description/justification of the individual candidates participation costs to the EMJD and the way these participation costs are distributed and used between the consortium partners; the extent to which cofunding possibilities have been explored and secured, in particular to support doctoral candidates without EMJD fellowships.
- the nature of the degree(s) awarded and the extent to which the consortium aims to deliver fully recognised and accredited joint degrees; programmes resulting in the award of joint degrees will be promoted.

Provisions for EMJD candidates and fellowship holders (20% of the final mark)

This criterion will address aspects such as:

- the information or marketing strategy proposed by the consortium to reach out to potentially interested candidates and more particularly from Third Countries;
- the extent to which employment contracts are used to enrol candidates;
- the way the programme adheres to and implements the principles of the *European Charter for Researchers* and the *Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers*; the content and

coverage of the proposed Doctoral Candidate Agreement that will be signed by the candidate and the consortium, etc.;

- the proposed administrative arrangements to cover the fellowship holder's rights (e.g. health care, social security and pension rights, etc.), the mechanisms proposed for the delivery of the fellowship scheme and in particular the distribution of grantees between institutions; the financial management of fellowships, etc.;
- the adequacy of the services provided to EMJD candidates (housing facilities, coaching, , activities aimed at social integration, assistance with visas and social insurance), and whether services are provided for grantees with a family or with special needs; the language policy and linguistic facilities offered to the candidates allowing them to learn and use the national language of their host organisations;
- the arrangements taken to ensure the candidate's career prospects and to monitor his/her career development once graduated.

Programme Management and Quality Assurance of the EMJD (20% of the final mark)

This criterion will address aspects such as:

- the quality of the organisational arrangements and cooperation mechanisms within the consortium (degree of institutionalisation, volume of human resources allocated to the programme, existence of a management and supervisory board, existence of an EMJD agreement endorsed by the partners, etc.) and the specific role played by each of its members;
- the quality of the development and sustainability plan (within and beyond the envisaged contractual period), including an implementation timeline, enrolment projections, mid- and long-term potential benefits for the institutions involved;
- the extent to which appropriate internal evaluation (by the institutions themselves, student feed-back systems, etc.) and Quality Assurance (QA) mechanisms are in place and how stringent they are; the extent to which the QA of the EMJD is assured externally (by e.g. national, international or professional bodies);
- The way the EMJD addresses transversal issues such as the necessary gender balance among candidates and the programme's access for doctoral candidates disadvantaged (for economic, racial, religious or any other type of reason) and/or with special needs.

These criteria are weighted as follows:

Criteria	Weight
1. Academic and Research quality	20%
2. Partnership experience and composition	20%
3. European integration and functioning of the programme	20%
4. Provisions for EMJD candidates and fellowship holders	20%
5. Programme Management and Quality Assurance of the EMJD	20%

5. Assessment against award criteria –Checklist

Criterion 1 ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH QUALITY	
Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall score for this criterion: <u>A.1.1</u> the needs analysis (including in socio-economic terms) of the joint programme taking into account the current state of the art in science and technology terms; <u>A.1.2</u> the objectives of the EMJD (including in terms of inter/multi-disciplinary, intersectorial and/or newly emerging fields); <u>A.1.3</u> the joint programme's contribution to European education, research, excellence and competitiveness and its added value compared with existing programmes at national and international level; <u>A.1.4</u> the scientific quality of the education, training and research programme, including its originality and innovative aspects notably as regards research methodologies and approaches (incl. training activities in core and transferable skills, articulation between education / training activities and the research part, participation of industry/public sector, etc.); <u>A.1.5</u> the extent to which the programme includes inter-sectoral and inter-organisational collaboration and mobility (such as placements) to better address societal and economical needs as well the graduates' employability issue; <u>A.1.6</u> the nature and quality of the expected innovative educational, scientific and technological outcomes , including in terms of skills and competences acquired;	
Check-list: - Objectives and Needs analysis of the joint programme are clear and convincing. - The added value of the integrated study programme compared with courses at national and international level and its contribution to European education, research, excellence and competitiveness are clear and convincing - The scientific quality of the programme and its originality, innovative aspects as regards research methodologies approaches are clear and convincing - Provisions for inter-sectoral and inter-organisational collaboration including the graduate's employability issues are clear and convincing - The nature and quality of the expected innovative educational and scientific technological outcomes is clear and convincing	Checked <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Overall score out of 5:	

Criterion 2 PARTNERSHIP EXPERIENCE AND COMPOSITION	
Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall score for this criterion: <u>A.2.1</u> the partners' (understood as both the institutions and the key academic, research and administrative staff) recognised capacity, expertise and experience to achieve the EMJD objectives; <u>A.2.2</u> the diversity (in terms of countries / regions, types of organisation, etc.) and complementarity (in terms of education, training, research or dissemination/valorisation activities) of the consortium members; <u>A.2.3</u> the partnership track records in terms of networking and cooperation activities (through their joint involvement in EU/International research and/or education projects); if relevant, the added value of third-country organisations to the EMJD objectives and content; <u>A.2.4</u> the extent to which the research teams demonstrate a high level of internationalisation (international staff, international activities, etc.); <u>A.2.5</u> the role and appropriateness of the professional (/economic/scientific/cultural) sector	

participation in terms of activities and responsibilities, and the way this participation is formalised in specific arrangements and agreements covering issues such as co-funding, co-supervision, intellectual property rights, publishing possibilities, quality assurance, etc;

<p>Check-list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expertise, capacity and experience of the consortium to achieve the EMJD objectives are clear and convincing. - The diversity and the complementarity of the consortium partners is clear and convincing. - The networking and cooperation of the consortium partners and, where applicable, the added value of third-country organisations are clear and convincing - The level of internationalisation of the research teams is clear and convincing - The role, appropriateness and modalities of participation of the professional (economic/scientific/cultural) sector are clear and convincing 	<p>Checked</p> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Overall score out of 5:</p>	

<p>Criterion 3</p> <p>EUROPEAN INTEGRATION AND FUNCTIONING OF THE PROGRAMME</p>
--

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall score for this criterion:

A.3.1 the extent to which the EMJD programme is organised in a **structured and integrated way**; exploiting current good-practices in terms of doctoral/ graduate/research schools or co-tutelle arrangements; providing a strong research environment capable to enhance excellence and international collaboration; ensuring full recognition - through ECTS or other built-in mechanisms – for all the training and research activities performed by the candidates;

A.3.2 the relevance and appropriate organisation of the mandatory **mobility periods** of the candidates in the participating institutions;

A.3.3 the common standards and mechanisms developed by the consortium for the **application, selection, admission and examination of doctoral candidates** (European and Third-Country), in order to ensure recruiting the best candidates; the extent to which these mechanisms are transparent, fair and objective; the provisions to take into account the equity issues, exploring alternative ways of recruitment and considering the Life Long Learning requirements;

A.3.4 the quality of the joint mechanisms envisaged to ensure a high quality **supervision and monitoring** of the candidate activities;

A.3.5 the appropriateness of the **joint assessment procedures** (including the exams for the taught part and the assessment and defence of the thesis) to ensure the highest quality of the outcomes; if relevant, the extent to which assessment committees include external representation chosen at international level and/or non academic experts; the extent to which assessment criteria include compulsory publication requirements and/or an evaluation of the potential contribution of the candidate's work to innovation;

A.3.6 the kind and nature of the **degree(s)** awarded and, if applicable, the measure taken or envisaged by the consortium to deliver a fully accredited and recognised **joint degree**;

<p>Check-list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed EMJD programme is structure in an integrated way i.e. there are no national parallel courses - The proposal seeks to exploit good practices in terms of doctoral/graduate/research, to provide a strong research environment and to fully recognise all the performed activities by the candidates - The organisation of the mobility periods in the participating institutions is clear and convincing. - The common application, selection, admission and examination standards of doctoral candidates are clear, transparent, fair and convincing. - The provisions to take into account equity issues and the way to explore alternative ways of recruitment and the consideration of Life Long learning requirements are clear and convincing - The quality of the joint mechanisms for a high quality supervision and monitoring of the candidate activities are clear and convincing - The appropriateness of the joint assessment procedures is clear and convincing 	<p>Checked</p> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---

- Provisions for the inclusion of external representation in assessment committees and compulsory publication requirements and/or evaluation of the potential contribution of the candidate's work to innovation are clear and convincing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall score out of 5:	

Criterion 4 PROVISIONS FOR EMJD CANDIDATES AND FELLOWSHIP HOLDERS	
Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall score for this criterion:	
<p><u>A.4.1</u> the information and promotion strategy envisaged by the consortium to reach out potentially interested candidates in particular those from third-countries;</p> <p><u>A.4.2</u> the quality and nature of the services provided by the consortium to host doctoral candidates (housing facilities, coaching, language courses, activities aimed at social integration, assistance with visas and social insurance); the extent to which specific services are available for grantees with a family or with special needs;</p> <p><u>A.4.3</u> the way the linguistic aspects of candidates' mobility have been addressed (e.g. training facilities, mentorship, local language learning, etc.) and the specific language policy in place in the joint programme (e.g. integration, availability, costs coverage, recognition of the language courses in the joint programme); the way the consortium intends to meet the objective to offer candidates the possibility to use at least two different European language;</p> <p><u>A.4.4</u> the extent to which administrative arrangements are foreseen to address the candidates' rights (including health care, social security and pension rights) and the extent to which employment contracts are used to appoint the candidates;</p> <p><u>A.4.5</u> the relevance of the measures taken to deliver the fellowship scheme, and in particular for the distribution of grantees between institutions and the financial management of fellowships;</p> <p><u>A.4.6</u> the measures taken by the consortium to ensure the candidate's career prospects and to monitor his/her career development once graduated;</p> <p><u>A.4.7</u> the nature and comprehensiveness of the Doctoral Candidate Agreement defining the joint course implementation rules and mechanisms as well as the mutual rights, obligations and responsibilities of the two parties for what concerns the academic, research, administrative and financial aspects of the candidate's participation in the joint programme; the extent to which the consortium adheres to and implements the <i>European Charter for Researchers</i> and the <i>Code of Good Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers</i>;</p>	
<p>Check-list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The information and promotion strategy is clear and convincing. - The quality and nature of services provided by the consortium to host doctoral candidates and the inclusion specific services for grantees with family or special needs are clear and convincing. - The provisions on the language policy of the consortium are clear and convincing. - The provisions to address the candidate rights and use employment contracts are clear and convincing - The foreseen measures for the delivery of the fellowship scheme and the distribution of grantees among institutions and the financial management are clear and convincing - The foreseen measures for the career prospects and development are clear and convincing - The provisions for the Doctoral Candidate Agreement and the way they adhere to the <i>European Charter for Researchers</i> and the <i>Code of Good Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers</i> are clear and convincing 	<p>Checked</p> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Overall score out of 5:	

Criterion 5 PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT AND QUALITY ASSURANCE
--

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall score for this criterion:

A.5.1 the quality of the **organisational arrangements and cooperation mechanisms** within the consortium (degree of institutionalisation, financial and human resources allocated to the programme, existence of management and supervision board, clearly defined and active role of all partners, established feed-back system, existence of detailed partnership agreements covering the academic, scientific and administrative aspects of the Programme, etc.) and the specific role played by each of its members;

A.5.2 The way **participations costs** in the joint programme have been calculated; if differences exist between Third-Country and European candidates, the reasons for such differences; the way in which these costs will be distributed among the participating institutions;

A.5.3 the consortium **development and sustainability plan** designed to ensure the proper implementation and continuity of the joint programme beyond Community funding (including implementation timeline, enrolment projections, mid- and long-term potential benefits for the institutions involved, etc.); the way this plan involves not only the consortium members but also other public and/or private organisations in the countries concerned (and in particular associated members);

A.5.4 the nature of the **internal evaluation** (by the institutions themselves, through candidates/scholars feed-back systems, etc.) and external quality assessment (by e.g. national, international or professional bodies) envisaged;

A.5.5 the extent to which **complementary funding** possibilities have been explored and secured, in particular to provide additional (full or partial) fellowships to additional doctoral candidates and, if applicable, to top up the difference between the fixed programme contribution to the candidates participation costs and the actual cost for the consortium;

A.5.6 the way the consortium intends to address issues such as **gender balance** and the access to the programme by candidates with **special needs**;

Check-list:

- The organisational arrangements and cooperation mechanisms and the specific role played by each of its members are clear and convincing.
- The calculation method of the participation costs in the joint programme, the description of any differences between third-country and European candidates and the distribution of the costs among the participating institutions are clear and convincing.
- The foreseen development and sustainability plan of the consortium to ensure a proper implementation and continuity of the programme beyond Community funding and the way it involves other actors except the consortium members (public/private organisations) are clear and convincing
- The internal evaluation and external quality assessment measures are clear and convincing
- The provisions of complementary funding possibilities for additional fellowships and/or for topping up the difference between the fixed programme contribution to the candidates participation costs and the actual cost of the consortium are clear and convincing
- The address of gender balance issues and access to the programme by candidates with special needs are clear and convincing

Checked

Overall score out of 5:

6. On-line Assessment Form

ON LINE ASSESSEMENT
ERASMUS MUNDUS JOINT DOCTORATES (EMJD)

Proposal number:
Proposal title:
Coordinator:
Applicant organisation:

A.1 Academic and Research quality (20% of the max. score)

Award Criteria	Score	Max
A.1.1 the needs analysis (including in socio-economic terms) of the joint programme taking into account the current state of the art in science and technology terms;		5
A.1.2 the objectives of the EMJD (including in terms of inter/multi-disciplinary, intersectorial and/or newly emerging fields);		5
A.1.3 the joint programme's contribution to European education, research, excellence and competitiveness and its added value compared with existing programmes at national and international level;		5
A.1.4 the scientific quality of the education, training and research programme, including its originality and innovative aspects notably as regards research methodologies and approaches (incl. training activities in core and transferable skills, articulation between education / training activities and the research part, participation of industry/public sector, etc.);		5
A.1.5 the extent to which the programme includes inter-sectoral and inter-organisational collaboration and mobility (such as placements) to better address societal and economical needs as well the graduates' employability issue;		5
A.1.6 the nature and quality of the expected innovative educational, scientific and technological outcomes , including in terms of skills and competences acquired;;		5
Comment:		

Total: Academic and Research Quality (20%)		30
---	--	-----------

A.2 Partnership experience and composition (20% of the max. score)

Award Criteria	Score	Max
A.2.1 the partners' (understood as both the institutions and the key academic, research and administrative staff) recognised capacity ,		5

	expertise and experience to achieve the EMJD objectives		
A.2.2	the diversity (in terms of countries / regions, types of organisation, etc.) and complementarity (in terms of education, training, research or dissemination/valorisation activities) of the consortium members;		5
A.2.3	the partnership track records in terms of networking and cooperation activities (through their joint involvement in EU/International research and/or education projects); if relevant, the added value of third-country organisations to the EMJD objectives and content;		5
A.2.4	the extent to which the research teams demonstrate a high level of internationalisation (international staff, international activities, etc.);		5
A.2.5	the role and appropriateness of the professional (/economic/scientific/cultural) sector participation in terms of activities and responsibilities, and the way this participation is formalised in specific arrangements and agreements covering issues such as co-funding, co-supervision, intellectual property rights, publishing possibilities, quality assurance, etc;		5
Comment:			

Total: Partnership experience and composition (20%)		25
--	--	-----------

A.3 European integration and functioning of the programme (20% of the max. score)

Award Criteria	Score	Max
A.3.1 the extent to which the EMJD programme is organised in a structured and integrated way ; exploiting current good-practices in terms of doctoral/ graduate/research schools or co-tutelle arrangements; providing a strong research environment capable to enhance excellence and international collaboration; ensuring full recognition - through ECTS or other built-in mechanisms – for all the training and research activities performed by the candidates;		5
A.3.2 the relevance and appropriate organisation of the mandatory mobility periods of the candidates in the participating institutions;		5
A.3.3 the common standards and mechanisms developed by the consortium for the application, selection, admission and examination of doctoral candidates (European and Third-Country), in order to ensure recruiting the best candidates; the extent to which these mechanisms are transparent, fair and objective; the provisions to take into account the equity issues, exploring alternative ways of recruitment and considering the Life		5

	Long Learning requirements;		
A.3.4	the quality of the joint mechanisms envisaged to ensure a high quality supervision and monitoring of the candidate activities;		5
A.3.5	the appropriateness of the joint assessment procedures (including the exams for the taught part and the assessment and defence of the thesis) to ensure the highest quality of the outcomes; if relevant, the extent to which assessment committees include external representation chosen at international level and/or non academic experts; the extent to which assessment criteria include compulsory publication requirements and/or an evaluation of the potential contribution of the candidate's work to innovation;		5
A.3.6	the kind and nature of the degree(s) awarded and, if applicable, the measure taken or envisaged by the consortium to deliver a fully accredited and recognised joint degree ;		5
Comment:			

Total: European integration and functioning of the programme (20%)		30
---	--	-----------

A.4 Provisions for EMJD candidates and fellowship holders (20% of the max. score)

Award Criteria	Score	Max
A.4.1 the information and promotion strategy envisaged by the consortium to reach out potentially interested candidates in particular those from third-countries;		5
A.4.2 the quality and nature of the services provided by the consortium to host doctoral candidates (housing facilities, coaching, language courses, activities aimed at social integration, assistance with visas and social insurance); the extent to which specific services are available for grantees with a family or with special needs;		5
A.4.3 the way the linguistic aspects of candidates' mobility have been addressed (e.g. training facilities, mentorship, local language learning, etc.) and the specific language policy in place in the joint programme (e.g. integration, availability, costs coverage, recognition of the language courses in the joint programme); the way the consortium intends to meet the objective to offer candidates the possibility to use at least two different European languages;		5
A.4.4 the extent to which administrative arrangements are foreseen to address the candidates' rights (including health care, social security and pension rights) and the extent to which employment contracts are used to appoint the candidates;		5

A.4.5	the relevance of the measures taken to deliver the fellowship scheme , and in particular for the distribution of grantees between institutions and the financial management of fellowships;		5
A.4.6	the measures taken by the consortium to ensure the candidate's career prospects and to monitor his/her career development once graduated;		5
A.4.7	the nature and comprehensiveness of the Doctoral Candidate Agreement defining the joint course implementation rules and mechanisms as well as the mutual rights, obligations and responsibilities of the two parties for what concerns the academic, research, administrative and financial aspects of the candidate's participation in the joint programme; the extent to which the consortium adheres to and implements the <i>European Charter for Researchers</i> and the <i>Code of Good Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers</i> ;		5
Comment:			

Total: Provisions for EMJD candidates and fellowship holders (20%)		35
---	--	-----------

A.5 Programme Management and Quality Assurance (20% of the max. score)

Award Criteria	Score	Max
A.5.1 the quality of the organisational arrangements and cooperation mechanisms within the consortium (degree of institutionalisation, financial and human resources allocated to the programme, existence of management and supervision board, clearly defined and active role of all partners, established feed-back system, existence of detailed partnership agreements covering the academic, scientific and administrative aspects of the Programme, etc.) and the specific role played by each of its members;		5
A.5.2 The way participations costs in the joint programme have been calculated; if differences exist between Third-Country and European candidates, the reasons for such differences; the way in which these costs will be distributed among the participating institutions;		5
A.5.3 the consortium development and sustainability plan designed to ensure the proper implementation and continuity of the joint programme beyond Community funding (including implementation timeline, enrolment projections, mid- and long-term potential benefits for the institutions involved, etc.); the way this plan involves not only the consortium members but also other public and/or private organisations in the countries concerned (and in particular associated members);		5

A.5.4	the nature of the internal evaluation (by the institutions themselves, through candidates/scholars feed-back systems, etc.) and external quality assessment (by e.g. national, international or professional bodies) envisaged;		5
A.5.5	the extent to which complementary funding possibilities have been explored and secured, in particular to provide additional (full or partial) fellowships to additional doctoral candidates and, if applicable, to top up the difference between the fixed programme contribution to the candidates participation costs and the actual cost for the consortium;		5
A.5.6	the way the consortium intends to address issues such as gender balance and the access to the programme by candidates with special needs ;		5
Comment:			

Total: Programme Management and Quality Assurance (20%)		30
--	--	-----------

Total:		100
---------------	--	------------

Comment to the Agency

7. Ethical and security/safety/sensitive issues table

A crosscheck will be done by the experts whether any of the proposals concern any research ethical issue or security/safety/sensitive issues area (as these are described in the Guide of Applicants for Marie Curie Actions, reference: FP7-PEOPLE-2009-IIF and rules for submission of proposals and the related evaluation, selection and award procedures reference: COM(2008)4617). For this reason the experts will have to identify any of these areas during the assessment on the basis the table below and inform the Agency (see section 8.5 of this manual):

ETHICAL ISSUES TABLE

Research on Human Embryo/Foetus	
Does the proposed research involve human Embryos?	
Does the proposed research involve human Foetal Tissues/Cells?	
Does the proposed research involve human Embryonic Stem Cells (hESCs)?	
Does the proposed research on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve cells in culture?	
Does the proposed research on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve derivation of cells from Embryos?	
Research on Humans	
Does the proposed research involve children?	
Does the proposed research involve patients?	
Does the proposed research involve persons not able to give consent?	
Does the proposed research involve adult healthy volunteers?	
Does the proposed research involve Human genetic material?	
Does the proposed research involve Human biological samples?	
Does the proposed research involve Human data collection?	
Privacy	
Does the proposed research involve processing of genetic information or personal data (e.g. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)?	
Does the proposed research involve tracking the location or observation of people?	
Research on Animals	
Does the proposed research involve research on animals?	
Are those animals transgenic small laboratory animals?	
Are those animals transgenic farm animals?	
Are those animals non-human primates?	
Are those animals cloned farm animals?	
Research Involving Developing Countries	
Does the proposed research involve the use of local resources (genetic, animal, plant, etc)?	
Is the proposed research of benefit to local communities (e.g. capacity building, access to healthcare, education, etc)?	
Dual Use	
Research having direct military use	
Research having the potential for terrorist abuse	

SECURITY/SAFETY/SENSITIVE ISSUES TABLE

Does the proposed research involve nano-sciences, nano-technologies research and new production technologies?	
Does the proposed research involve deliberate intrusion of nano-objects into the human body, their inclusion in food (especially in food for babies), feed, toys, cosmetics and other products that may lead to exposure to humans and the environment?	
Does the proposed research involve radioactive waste management and the disposal of the radioactive waste, long-term waste management and the behaviour of waste packages in the long-term and storage and waste processing?	
Does the proposed research involve reactor systems?	
Does the proposed research involve nuclear physics, nuclear safety, nuclear security, nuclear fission and radiation protection?	
Does the proposed research involve fusion energy?	
Does the proposed research involve dangerous biological, chemical, radioactive or nuclear materials?	
Does the proposed research involve genetics and epidemiology studies on effects of low dose exposures and the impact of climate change and other long-term issues?	
Does the proposed research involve biotechnology?	

8. Using the online assessment tool

8.1. General remarks

Specific instructions on the way to use the online assessment tool will be provided to the experts in the context of the briefing meeting organised at the beginning of the assessment period.

Experts should not forget to print, sign and date the final version of their
=> individual and consolidated assessment form after the consensus discussion and prior to the preparation of the "consolidated assessment"
=> "consolidated assessment" form

The signed assessments must be handed over to the Agency representatives prior to the panels.

8.2. Assessment Summary

Each criterion has a relative weight which is marked on the summary table. The total score of the assessment will be calculated on the basis of specific formula taking into account the relative weight of each criterion. The total score will be a figure between 0 and 100.

8.3. Recommendation

Experts should indicate their selection recommendation by ticking the appropriate box.

Each proposal must be either "highly recommended", "recommended" or "not recommended".

Although the selection recommendation must be in accordance with the total score given to the proposal, it is not an automatic (/mathematical) reflection of the total score in that it can be used to either reinforce the funding recommendation on a proposal that did not score very high, or on the contrary express some reservations on a proposal despite of its very high score. In these cases, the experts are invited to justify the recommendation in the "Comments to the Agency" section (see 8.5 below)

8.4. Comments and Recommendations to the applicants

In their consolidated form experts should write their comments, justifying the score and their recommendations to the applicant.

The experts' comments and recommendations should give the necessary information to the Agency, the Selection Board and the applicant to understand the experts' opinion. In case of unsuccessful proposals, the comments and recommendations should also help the applicant to prepare a new proposal.

Experts should remember that **this part of their assessments along with the final score will be sent to the applicants exactly as they have written it.** Experts should make sure that all

their comments and recommendations are explicit, transparent, detailed, instructive, complete and in accordance with the scoring and the selection recommendation.

Comments should consist of judgements and not of simple summaries of the proposal and should be helpful to applicants. They should be tailored to the assessment of each proposal and therefore not be based on a copy-paste approach from one assessment to another.

In order for the experts' comments to be as instructive and complete as possible, the amount of text to be written per award criteria is about 15 to 20 lines.

Comments and recommendations should relate to the experts' assessment of the strengths, weaknesses and potential of the proposal, relative to the award criteria. All aspects of the proposal, relative to the award criteria, should be commented on.

8.5 Additional comments to the Agency

In addition to the comments and recommendations that will be communicated to the applicant in the context of the selection results notification letter, the online assessment tool contains also a specific comments section in which the experts will be able to bring to the attention of the Agency, sectoral or general panels and/or Selection Board only issues or aspects of the application that may be used during the selection process or the monitoring of the project, once approved. **This box will also be used for cases of where ethical and sensitive areas have been identified by the experts.**

8.6 Assessment of the proposal against the award criteria

Experts should indicate their score for each of the criteria. The following scores can be given: 0, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5. It is not envisaged to give any other score (i.e. neither 0.5, nor other decimals than .5).

The scores must be justified and the comments should be consistent with the scores given for this criterion. There need to be comments on each assessment criterion.

The assessment criteria correspond to the award criteria listed in the Programme Guide and the application form. The "issues to be addressed" in Section 5 – which are based on the questions of the application form- above help the experts understand the full meaning and dimension of a criterion and highlight it from all possible angles.

There is also a check list underneath each award criterion. It is a useful tool for experts to arrive at a final score for a specific criterion and it helps experts to make sure that no aspect of the criterion in question is overlooked. Ticking a box simply means that the proposal has been checked for the issue in question, but it does not imply that the proposal actually respects the issue. Again, this check list refers to the questions asked in the application form and to provisions contained in the Programme Guide.

8.7 Guidance on scores

When attributing a score to the various criteria, the experts should apply the following guidelines:

Score	Guidance
0 – the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information	A score of 0 should be given for a criterion if the information detailed in the Call for Proposals would reasonably have been expected by the expert and is not present in the proposal. The specific information missing should be entered in the comments' section. It is not anticipated that the score of 0.5 will be given.
1 – poor	A score of 1.0 or 1.5 should be awarded if the proposal is of poor quality for the criterion in question. This may be because information is incomplete in the view of the expert, not clear or not convincing. Assessment comments for proposals in this category should indicate the areas where the proposal is lacking or is of poor quality and could be improved if subsequently re-submitted.
2 – fair	A score of 2.0 or 2.5 should be awarded where the content of the criterion in question is at a level consistent with that routinely produced by the universities across Europe. There may be some strong and relevant points within the proposal, but there may also be weaknesses and in particular there may be no specific details brought out which singles out the proposal from others. Assessment comments for proposals awarded scores in this range should indicate the areas where the proposal could be improved if subsequently re-submitted.
3 – good	Scores of 3.0 or 3.5 should reflect that the proposal demonstrates overall good features with regard to the award criterion in question (even though it may contain some notable weaknesses) or does not contain features that set it apart from many other good proposals being assessed.
4 – very good	Scores of 4.0 or 4.5 should reflect that the proposal has identifiable features which demonstrate that the proposal is of a high quality with regard to the award criterion in question. There should be features that set the proposal apart from other good quality proposals within the assessment.
5 – excellent	In general, experts should not use the score of 5 unless they feel that the content of the proposal could not be improved. In cases where a score of 5 is awarded, the expert should feel confident that there would be a high level of consensus from all experts.

See separate document and links