

MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE WITH MARIE-SKŁODOWSKA CURIE FELLOWSHIP

Basmah Riaz

MSC Fellow, Center for Astrochemical studies, MPE

MSCA Workshop, August 2016



Why Marie Curie Fellowship?

- Flexibility
 - Research (Group) Areas
 - Countries
- Reputation
 - Prestigious Fellowship-Good for your CV
 - Boost Your Career
- Independence
 - Research
 - Financial (No need for your host to have funds)
- Experience
 - Writing a Grant Application
 - Managing a Research Grant

My Experience (IIF 2014)

- **Strategic Choice of Host Group**
 - World's Leading Group
 - Choice of research topic: **novel, timely**, in line with host research
 - Highlight the points that **complement** your project
 - must provide **new knowledge, expertise and training**
 - resources available for successful **implementation**
 - Combination of my expertise + host. What will the host gain from you?
- **Plan Very Well in Advance (4 – 6 weeks)**
 - Discussions with host group
 - Collecting and reading examples (host specific)
 - **Mock Reviews** (I sent to 4 reviewers)
 - Scientific Plan → ask related experts in the field
 - Overall application → non-experts, experienced in grant writing

Scientific Part – Tips

- Subdivide Your Research Problem (WPs)
 - **High Risk – High Gain** Component
 - Novel component, **new** field of research
 - **Learning** Component – Complimentary Expertise from Host
- Anticipate the outcomes (**Deliverables**)
- Highlight the **Multi-Disciplinary** Angle
- Clearly Spell out the **Risks** – Indicate Alternative Strategies
- Transfer of knowledge
 - List your collaborators
 - Your experience in research **areas not covered by host**
- Your past track record (list publications) and what is “**missing**” in your professional career? (Which you will get from this project)

Quality of Researcher – CV

- DO NOT be modest (Be honest)
- Think about your past (Not just academic) – Make a list
- Turn everything into positive – Make it relevant to this project
- Academic **accomplishments** – exhaustive
- Validate your “claims” with evidences – References
- What is “unique” in you? Your **skills and experience**
- Why are YOU the most suitable person to do this project?

Training – Host

- Host should participate – Actively
- DO NOT COPY & PASTE from the website!!!!
- Contact the European office (Host) – Study examples
- Tailor the expertise – Relevant to the project
- Think about complimentary (non-scientific) training
Management / Career Development
- DO NOT make generic statements!!!!

Implementation

- How are you going to Implement this project?
 - Scientific Aspects
 - Practical Aspects
- Clear **Work Plan**
 - Consistent with Objectives and WPs (no extra element here)
 - Milestones / Deliverables / Gantt Chart (Important)
 - Time frame is important – Be practical
 - Is the host capable of supporting your career plan?
 - Risk Factors
- Visa / Work Permit related issues
- European grant management – support
- Language learning / support
- Work desk / computers / laboratory space etc.,

Impact

- How will this fellowship / project contribute to your career development? (Diverse research profile, Professional maturity)
- Does your project support some existing EU projects (preferably with the host)? Highlight the relevant European Research Area
- What will be the benefit to Europe? Society in general
- Think of a bigger picture (really a big one)

Evaluation Summary Report

Criterion 1 – Excellence

- Score: 4.60 (Threshold: 0.00/5.00 , Weight: 50.00%)
- Quality, innovative aspects and credibility of the research (including inter/multidisciplinary aspects)
- Clarity and quality of transfer of knowledge/training for the development of researcher in light of the research objectives
- Quality of the supervision and the hosting arrangements
- Capacity of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity in research

Criterion 1 – Excellence

• STRENGTHS

- + The project is **multidisciplinary**, combining multi-wavelength observations and theoretical physics and chemistry modelling in order to investigate brown dwarfs and low-mass stars.
- + The **research objectives** of this project, the state of the art of research in the field, and the expected results of the planned work are **clearly outlined**.
- + The **research programme is timely** in relation to state-of-the-art observations and computational models.
- + The applicant brings with her an excellent observational **background** at various wavelengths.
- + The **researcher is well prepared** to carry out the proposed work. Large amounts of the data that are needed to achieve the project's scientific goals have already been secured, which increases credibility of the project.
- + The **host scientist** and her group have carried out important research in the chemistry of dense molecular gas and protostellar cores which is of **direct relevance** for this project.
- + The **host group would benefit** from the extensive international network of collaborators of the applicant.
- + The **host institute has sound structures** of support for visiting scientists of all levels of seniority.
- + The researcher is experienced in teaching and supervising students. She has also a solid track **record of publications**, contributions to conferences, and successful telescope-time applications.
- + Her unusually high fraction of **first-author papers** demonstrates her outstanding ability to lead research.

• WEAKNESSES

The proposal has not demonstrated the relevance of astrochemistry to the overall stages of early brown dwarf evolution, which extend for many millions of years, nor how astrochemical factors influence the early evolution of brown dwarfs.

Evaluation Summary Report

Criterion 1 – Impact

- Score: 4.70 (Threshold: 0.00/5.00 , Weight: 30.00%)
- Enhancing research- and innovation-related human resources, skills, and working conditions to realize the potential of individuals and to provide new career perspectives
- Effectiveness of the proposed measures for communication and results dissemination

Evaluation Summary Report

Criterion 1 – Impact

- **STRENGTHS**

- + This project will reinforce the **applicant's professional maturity** and contribute to her career development.
- + The project will also enable the applicant to **acquire skills in indirectly related fields**, such as intellectual property matters, which will round up her portfolio of skills beyond strictly scientific ones and thus **diversify** her career perspectives.
- + The presence of an **interdisciplinary research** community at the host institution will facilitate collaborations with scientists in many areas.
- + A **credible plan** for the publication of the results obtained and for the attendance of international conferences has been presented.
- + The **Open Access policy** of the Horizon 2020 programme has been addressed.
- + The researcher has been very **active in communicating the results** of her work to the public since the beginning of her scientific career. She has provided a detailed plan of future activities in that area, which take advantage of the facilities available at the host institution.

Evaluation Summary Report

Criterion 1 – Implementation

- Score: 4.60 (Threshold: 0.00/5.00 , Weight: 20.00%)
- Overall 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 (infrastructure)
- Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and institutional commitment

Evaluation Summary Report

Criterion 1 – Implementation

- **STRENGTHS**

- + The implementation plan is described in detail, and the resources allocated are adequate.
- + The modeling and observational background of the supervisor is well established.
- + The project exploits algorithms that have already been developed by the host scientist for other projects.
- + Practical details of the management of the program are clearly stated, which adds credibility to the proposal.
- + The host institution has the demonstrated capability to support post-docs and is involved in many international collaborations. + The appropriateness of the institutional environment and infrastructure has been evidenced.

- **WEAKNESSES**

Part of the project consists in the preparation of observing proposals, which may not be granted time or may be delayed. Contingency plans should have been discussed for that eventuality.

Evaluation Results

- Total score: 92.60% (Threshold: 70.0/100.00)
- Interpretation of the scores (range 0-5):
- **4– Very good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- **5– Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

Good Luck !!!