



Evaluation of the Marie Skłodowska Curie Actions Doctoral Networks

Criterion 2: IMPACT

(30% weight)

Liene Ekša
Latvian Council of Science
MSCA NCP
Liene.eksa@lzp.gov.lv



Evaluation questions on *Impact* #keywords

- 1.** Contribution to structuring doctoral training at the **European level** and to strengthening **European innovation capacity**, including the potential for:
 - meaningful contribution of the **non-academic sector** to the doctoral training, as appropriate to the implementation mode and research field;
 - developing **sustainable elements** of doctoral programmes.
- 2.** Credibility of the measures to enhance the **career perspectives and employability** of researchers and contribution to their skills;
- 3.** Suitability and quality of the measures **to maximise expected outcomes and impacts**, as set out in the **dissemination and exploitation plan**, including communication activities development.
- 4.** The magnitude and importance of the **project's contribution to the expected scientific, societal and economic impacts.**



#European level, #European Innovation capacity #Non-academic sector

Strengths

- *The **contribution of the proposal in strengthening the European innovation capacity in the field [...] is very well-demonstrated.***
- *The proposal is based on enhancing the **synergies between the academic and the non-academic world** and this is reflected in training, supervision and research.*
- *The proposal convincingly demonstrates **how it will help to bridge the gap between industry and academia.***
- *The project can contribute to the **development of future multi-disciplinary doctoral trainings in the fields of [...]***

Weaknesses

- *The proposal is not sufficiently clear of the structuring effect of the doctoral training at the **European level beyond the consortium's framework and in the long-term,***
- *proposal fails to explain adequately how the project will **contribute to increasing Europe's innovativeness.***
- *The proposal **fails to provide a clear strategy link with the industry,** since the non-academic partners are not representative of the industry.*
- *The proposal does not include a convincing strategy to sustain the proposed programme and ensure its **sustainability in the future.***



#Career perspective #Employability

Strengths

- *The proposal demonstrates in an exceptional way how it will **have a short-term and long-term impact on the careers of the researchers** [...] it convincingly illustrates how the specific skills acquired in the programme will enhance the future career development of researchers in academic and non-academic environments, including NGOs, international organisations and the private business sector.*
- ***Career development plan** for the doctoral candidates is defined and sound.*

Weaknesses

- *Very little emphasis is given to improving their **methodological skills**.*
- *The **future scientific direction** to be followed by fellows [x] and [y] is not clear, based on the description of the researchers' PhD topics.*
- *The **long-term career options** of the researchers are not sufficiently defined.*
- *The added-value of the doctorate is described **in a generic way** and is **not clearly linked to the particular objectives** of the proposal.*



#Exploitation #Dissemination #Communication

Strengths

- **Credible and structured plan** for the exploitation and dissemination of outputs, based on the effective use of appropriate **on and offline tools to target different audiences and relevant performance indicators.**
- The proposal presents a well-structured plan for **dissemination and exploitation**. It includes a **detailed strategy** for open access publications, presentations at industry fairs, workshops, conferences, organizing symposia and training courses open to external participants.
- The proposal is very clear **on the communication of research**, for instance it will target policy makers and the general public through **policy briefs, website, and social media**. The dissemination plan is suitably detailed with measurable **key performance indicators included**.
- **All partners** have well-defined exploitation drivers and plans.

Weaknesses

- The proposal **does not offer** a strategy for the management of intellectual property.
- The proposal is not sufficiently clear on the **involvement of doctoral candidates** in the dissemination and communication activities,
- The proposal is not sufficiently clear on **the engagement with the public**,
- The exploitation plan of the project outcomes is **neither sufficiently developed nor linked to tangible research outcomes**.



#Societal #Scientific #Economic #Impact

Strengths

- *The foreseen impacts are very well tailored on project results and the qualitative evaluation of their magnitude/importance seems credible. **A broad scale of expected scientific, societal and economic impacts is presented and convincingly detailed.** Their magnitude/importance are pre-evaluated accordingly.*
- *Expected results that might be exploited and strategy for the **management of intellectual property** are well defined in the proposal.*
- *The **scientific and economic impact** of the proposal could be foreseen, with especially strong and realistic impact in **generation of new devices** such as [...].*
- *The expected **scientific, economic and societal impacts are convincingly described** in the proposal*

Weaknesses

- *The **societal impact** related to social diversity (gender, the LGBT community, other diversity groups) are not addressed in sufficient detail,*
- *The **societal impact is uncertain** as direct implementation of t[...] is overestimated.*



Thank You!

Liene Ekša
Latvian Council of Science
MSCA NCP
Liene.eksa@lzp.gov.lv