Proposal Evaluation Form

EUROPEAN COMMISSION 7 th Framework Programme for Research		**Evaluation Summary Report**

Call:	FP7-PEOPLE-2013-ITN
Funding scheme:	Initial Training Networks (ITN)
Proposal number:	607279
Proposal acronym:	SoReComJointIDP
Duration (months):	48
Proposal title:	The European Joint Doctorate on Social Representations and Communication: an innovative doctoral program in a networked international research training environment
Activity:	SOC

N.	Proposer name	Country	Total Cost	%	Grant Requested	%
1	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI ROMA LA SAPIENZA	IT	-	-	-	-
	Total:		0		0	

Abstract:

Built on the experience of both the European PhD on Social Representations and Communication, awarding a recognised joint degree since 1996 (http://www.europhd.eu), and the EU approved So.Re.Com. THEmatic NETwork, this international joint doctoral programme includes 11 universities, 2 private companies and 1 public research institute in 8 European countries (AT, CH, CZ, ES, FR, IT, RO, SE), and 6 universities in United States, Canada, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico and China. The goal is to provide doctoral training in Social Representations and Communication, a supra-disciplinary research area of the social sciences that studies the social construction of everyday knowledge in social spheres and media, disseminating European excellence beyond the EU boundaries and attracting the best ESR from abroad. Structured into transnational teams by common research area and complementary multimethodological approaches, this SoReComJointIDP guarantees a well tested training structure including: a) an innovative integrated physical and virtual campus, where world-class academic scientists, internationally recognised experts, experienced researchers and ESR cooperate face-to face and on-line "for" and "by" research; b) multiple supervision via tutoring and co-tutoring by at least three tutors in different countries; c) individual mobility for ESR at research centres for secondments; d) collective international mobility of trainees and teaching staff during International Summer Schools and Lab meetings; e) learning by doing (including transferable skills) in academic and non academic settings; f) worldwide access to common web platform, as tool for documentation, networking, training and monitoring trainees' progress; g) high tech infrastructure and lab facilities; h) quality evaluation system; i) officialisation of the joint degree; l) active integration in the world-wide SoReCom THEmatic NETwork; m) enhancement of career prospects both in and outside academia

Evaluation Summary Report

Evaluation Result

Total score: 98.80% (Threshold: 70/100.00)

Form information

SCORING *Scores must be in the range 0-5. Decimal scores can be used.*

Interpretation of the score:

> *0 - The **proposal fails to address the criterion** under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.*

> *1 - Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.*

> *2 - Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.*

> *3 - Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.*

> *4 - Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.*

> *5 - Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.*

Criterion 1 - S&T QUALITY

Score: **5.00** (Threshold: 3.00/5.00 , Weight: 0.30)

Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths
• *The research topic is clearly defined and the research objectives are well outlined in the proposed project.*
• *The proposal has a broad perspective and involves many aspects of social science.*
• *The proposal includes the interdisciplinary methodology to emerge supra-disciplinary fields.*
• *The research training programme and research methodology are clearly presented in the proposal.*
• *The originality of the proposal is evidently presented.*
• *The innovative contribution of the research training programme is presented in detail beyond the interdisciplinary approach.*
• *The proposal provides a wide and crucial participation of private and non-academic partners in the research and training activities.*
• *Contribution of private sector is distributed in the course of each sub-research programme.*

Weaknesses

• There are no evident weaknesses under this criterion.

Overall comments

The scientific quality of the proposal is excellent.

Criterion 2 - TRAINING

Score: **5.00** (Threshold: 4.00/5.00 , Weight: 0.30)

Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths
• The proposal clearly outlines training objectives.
• The proposed training programme structure is consistent with the training through research programme.
• There is a well-designed plan with monitoring structures, co-supervision, consisting of a supervisor from the academic and the non-academic institution.
• The timeliness and the training needs are clearly addressed in the proposal.
• A broad range of transferable skills and the presentation of the complementarities to create an innovative research environment are evidently specified.
• The proposal involves a well-designed, elaborated system of monitoring the ESRs progress.
• The secondments are well-designed, including the participation of non-academic partners.
• The contact of the researcher with the supervision in terms of frequency of meetings, guidance and advice is persuasively developed in the proposed project.
• Placement of researchers in associated non-academic partners is planned. The duration of the placement is reasonable. The content of training during this time is well defined.
• There is a good description of the combination of local specialist training with network-wide training activities.
• Early researchers and experienced researchers recruited will have a personal career development plan, which includes all requested aspects in line with the principles set out in the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct.

Weaknesses
- There are no evident weaknesses under this criterion

Overall comments

This proposal provides an excellent research training programme.

Criterion 3 - IMPLEMENTATION

Score: **4.70** (Threshold: 3.00/5.00 , Weight: 0.20)

Strenghts and Weaknesses

Strengths
• The capacity to achieve the project's goals is clearly demonstrated both in terms of the expertise/human resources and facilities/infrastructure.

• The structure of networking and management is well-outlined in the proposed project.
• The proposed project illustrates the high scientific capacities regarding training and supervision on the part of network participants.
• Complementarities and synergies among the partners are adequately explained.
• The non-academic partners are well integrated in the highest possible level of the network.
• The proposal presents a detailed and developed plan about the dissemination of best practices during the Network Training Activities and beyond.
• The responsibilities of the scientific committee, work package committee, local research teams, and network's management office are sufficiently explained in the proposal.
• The management plan appropriately reflects the coordination needs arising for conducting such a large research and teaching network.
• The regulations covering the rights and obligations of training staff and doctoral and post-doc research trainees are set up taking into account The European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers.

Weaknesses
- The number of scientific publications for each ESR is not fully elaborated upon.

Overall comments

The proposal provides very clear information on the implementation of this project.

Criterion 4 - IMPACT

Score: **5.00** (Threshold: 4.00/5.00 , Weight: 0.20)

Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths
• The contribution of the proposed research agenda to the improvement of the career prospects of the researchers both in academia, private sector and policy-oriented organizations and the acquisition of new skills is clearly developed.
• The proposal clearly outlines the impacts of research training programme.
• The proposal adequately explains the contributions towards the policy objective of enhancing public-private sector collaborations in terms of research training.
• The training programme presents the acquisition of key skills needed in both public and private sectors, to improve career prospects and employability of researchers and in stimulating creativity.
• The proposal clearly presents how researchers will participate in the specific training and the interaction with private partner experts.
• The mutual recognition by all partners of the training network is precise and clearly documented.
• The contribution of the network to the development of a European Research and Training Area on Social Science is demonstrated.
• The impacts of outreach activities and exploitation of results are clearly listed in the proposal.

Weaknesses
There are no evident weaknesses under this criterion.

Overall comments

This is an excellent project with important impacts.

Ethical issues

Status: **Ethical issues**

Not provided

Recommendations

Not provided