GUIDE FOR MSCA POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIP APPLICANTS 2024

Archéologies et Sciences de l’Antiquité (UMR 7140 ArScAn) Maison des sciences de l’homme « Mondes » (Nanterre)

#### We recommend you to read with special attention the MSCA guide for applicants (April 2023) : <https://rea.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2023-06/Guide%20for%20applicants_MSCA%20PF%202023%20rev%202.1%20.pdf>

#### And the MSCA PF Handbook (June 2023): <https://msca-net.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/MSCA_PF2023_handbook_final.pdf>

**The following comments are intended to help you while filling your application form. They are based on the official template for Part B (2023).**

**Indicative timetable for the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Action Postdoctoral Fellowships 2024**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Opening date of the call | 23 April 2024 |
| Deadline for submission of proposals | 11 September 2024  |
| Evaluation of proposals | October-December 2024 |
| Information on the outcome of the evaluation | February-March 2025 |
| Earliest realistic start date | June 2025 |

# Quick Review

### Main Objective of the MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowship Application

*“The goal of MSCA Postdoctoral Fellowships is to enhance the creative and innovative potential of researchers holding a PhD, wishing to acquire new skills through advanced training, international, interdisciplinary and inter-sectoral mobility.”*

(Horizon Europe Work Programme 2023-2024 Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions[[1]](#footnote-1))

## Eligibility Conditions

### Experience

*For Postdoctoral Fellowship Programmes: researchers must be experienced researchers, i.e. at the date of the call deadline, have successfully defended a PhD and have a maximum of 8 years of full-time equivalent research experience (from the date of the award of their PhD degree, years of experience outside research and career breaks will not count towards the above maximum, nor will years of experience in research in third countries, for nationals or long-term residents of EU Member States or Horizon Europe Associated Countries who wish to reintegrate to Europe).*

As from 2022, resubmission restrictions will apply for applications that received a score below 70% the previous year.

There are **two types of Postdoctoral fellowships**:

* **European Fellowships (EF)** – 1 to 2 years mobility within Europe (Member States [MS] and Associated Countries [AC]).
* **Global Fellowships (GF)** – 1 to 2 years mobility (outgoing phase) outside of Europe (Third Country [TC]) **and** 1 year (= return phase) mobility within Europe (MS and AC)

**New**: possibility to add a non-academic **placement** at the end of the project for a duration of up to 6 months (EF and GF)

### Mobility

*Researchers must not have resided or carried out their main activity (work, studies, etc.) in the country of the beneficiary (****EF****), or the host organisation for the outgoing phase (****GF****) for more than 12 months in the 36 months immediately prior to the call deadline.*

*Researchers wishing to reintegrate from a third country must either be based in a third country at the call deadline, or have moved directly from a third country to an EU Member State or Horizon Europe Associated Country within the last 12 months before the call deadline.*

### Secondments

*Researchers receiving a Postdoctoral Fellowship may opt to include a secondment phase, within the overall duration of their fellowship in any country worldwide. The secondment phase can be a single period or be divided into shorter mobility periods.*

*The relevance and added value of these periods will be assessed by the evaluators and may therefore impact the final score awarded to the proposal. Proposals will not be penalised for not including a secondment or non-academic placement period.*

### Non-academic Placements

*If requested and justified in the proposal, an additional period of up to six months at the end of the project can be awarded to researchers who will spend that period in a non-academic organisation established in an EU Member State or Horizon Europe Associated Country*.

**Recruitment duration:** 12-24 months (EF) or 24-36 months (GF, i.e. 12-24 months for the outgoing phase and 12 months for the return phase).

**Secondments duration:** 3-6 months according to the duration of the fellowship (and only during the outgoing phase for GF).

**Non-academic placements**: up to 6 months.

# European Fellowships (EF)

If you want to join the joint research unit [Archéologies et Sciences de l’Antiquité](http://www.arscan.fr/) (ArScAn) at the [Maison des sciences de l’homme (MSH) Mondes](https://www.mshmondes.cnrs.fr/) with a European Fellowship, we recommend to apply for the max. two years. Applying for a shorter fellowship, say the minimum one year, will most likely not be competitive, unless you have a very good and convincing reason for applying for less.

### Supervisor

You have to demonstrate that the close supervision from your supervisor and the Host Institution environment will be exactly what you need to further your career as researcher. Without the engaged involvement of the supervisor in the proposal-writing phase, there are little chances for success.

### Research support staff

As well you will need to engage with administrative staff who can help you with appropriate input to your proposal.

One of the distinctive features of the joint research unit ArScAn is that it belongs to three academic and research institutions: Paris Nanterre University, Panthéon Sorbonne Paris 1 University and CNRS (Délégation régionale Île-de-France Meudon). According to your discipline and research field, and in agreement with your supervisor, you will depend on one of two of these institutions and you will be connected to the corresponding administrative structure.

#### Due to summer holidays in France, all draft proposals should be sent before 2024 June 24rd for review, feedback and advice, to the supervisors and either to:

**Panthéon-Sorbonne Paris 1 University**: Ekaterina Smoliakova (ekaterina.smoliakova@univ-paris1.fr) and Alexandra Torero Ibad (alexandra.torero-ibad@univ-paris1.fr)

**CNRS-DR 5 Meudon**: Jordan Ghanem (jordan.ghanem@cnrs.fr)

1. **– Summary** (*even though the summary is in* ***Part A****, please add it at the beginning of Part B so that we can discuss it during the Masterclass; include also a title and pronouncable acronym*)

This section will be the evaluators’ first impression of your application. It should address all three evaluation criteria (Excellence, Impact and Implementation). It should include:

* Brief outline of the rationale behind your project
* Research objectives in relation to the rationale
* How you will go about fulfilling these objectives
* How these objectives fit in with the bigger picture i.e. the EU’s goals for the PF programme as outlined in the Work Programme 2023-2024.

–––

## Part B

**Page limit:** Sections 1, 2 and 3 together should not be longer than **10 pages**. All tables, figures, references and any other element pertaining to these sections must be included as an integral part of these sections and are thus counted towards this page limit.

## Part B-1

### – Excellence

The excellence section of the application is your opportunity to convince the evaluators that the proposed project is of the highest scientific quality:

* The scientific content / methodology of the project itself
* The training programme in the project and how you (the fellow) and the institution will mutually benefit from each other’s knowledge
* The host supervisor / research group / institution
* The proposed researcher and how the project will improve your career prospects

#### – Quality and pertinence of the project’s research and innovation objectives (and the extent to which they are ambitious, and go beyond the state of the art)

* + - *Describe the quality and pertinence of the R&I objectives; are the objectives measurable and verifiable? Are they realistically achievable?*
		- *Describe how your project goes beyond the state-of-the-art, and the extent to which the proposed work is ambitious.*

Make sure you address these points; consider using the bullets as sub-headings in the above order. The main purpose of this section is to outline the scientific content of the project, with a focus on how it goes beyond the current state-of-art. You have to outline what the outcome of the proposed project will be and what the significance of this is.

To do so, start by introducing the research challenge and answer the following questions:

* What are the research objectives of the project?
* How will the project contribute to new input and/or results to the current state-of-art within the field of research? How is it innovative and/or original?
* Why is the project proposed timely? Have there been specific technological/scientific/societal developments making this a particularly good time for the project?
* Make sure the scientific novelty and quality of the project is clear.

#### – Soundness of the proposed methodology

**(including interdisciplinary approaches, consideration of the gender dimension and other diversity aspects if relevant for the research project, and the quality of open science practices)**

*At a minimum, address the following aspects:*

* + - *Overall methodology*
		- *Integration of methods and disciplines to pursue the objectives*
		- *Gender dimension and other diversity aspects*
		- *Open science practices2*
		- *Research data management and management of other research outputs*

You must detail here the methodology of your research, in its overall and on some specific points such as interdisciplinarity, open science and diversity aspects (novelties and challenges significant in the Horizon Europe program).

To clarify your methodology, you can consider the following questions:

 What research methods and approach (including concepts, models and hypotheses) will be using and why are they the most appropriate for the project proposed?

* + - What will be the different stages of your project and the expected intermediate results?
		- What challenge and methodological issue might you have to overcome?
		- How expertise and methods from different disciplines will be brought together and integrated in pursuit of your objectives? (or explain why it can not)
		- How are aspects of diversity considered in your research? (or why it is not relevant)
		- What open science practices do you consider appropriate and how would you like to implement them as part of the proposed methodology?
		- How your research data will be managed in line with the FAIR principles?

#### – Quality of the supervision, training and of the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host

**Supervision:** You need to outline, with the assistance from the host institution, why the host supervisor/research group/institution (research section/department /faculty/university) is particularly strong – both in terms of the research area of the proposed project but also in integrating and working with postdocs (if the fellow is a postdoc). Outline why this host is the best placed to do this research and if possible, justify it with examples

Describe the qualifications and experience of the supervisor. Provide information regarding the supervisors' level of experience on the research topic proposed and their track record of work.

**Training:** It is crucial that there is a clear training plan for the research fellow. The focus purpose is an ambitious but realistic training through research. The reviewers are looking to see the new competencies that you’ll develop including interdisciplinary expertise, inter-sectoral experience and transferable skills. Outline why the host is the right institution for this training. Use your objectives as a starting point to address what you will learn and what the host will get out of it for each objective.

**Transfer:** Explain how the collaboration between the researcher and the host will benefit both sides and what the mutual benefits of this collaboration will be.

2 See HE Programme Guide, p. 38-54 which are dedicated to open science : [https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-](https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/guidance/programme-guide_horizon_en.pdf) [tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/guidance/programme-guide\_horizon\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/guidance/programme-guide_horizon_en.pdf)

Try to answer four questions:

* What will be the benefits in terms of “transfer of knowledge” from the host to the fellow?
* What is the added value with the mobility?
* How the host is the right institution and the more appropriate for training the fellow with new techniques, methodologies, etc.
* To what extent the fellow is going as well to bring added value to the host?
* What training would you need and what training could you provide?

#### – Quality and appropriateness of the researcher’s professional experience, competences and skills

*Discuss the quality and appropriateness of the researcher’s* ***existing*** *professional experience in relation to the proposed research project.*

Start with a brief summary of your research/educational background with a focus on your most significant achievements:

* Your most impressive publications
* Any prestigious conferences where you have delivered a presentation
* An eye-catching research stay abroad

Showcase your experiences in collaborative research projects, mentioning:

* Any well-known research projects of which you have been a part
* Research collaborations you have helped develop
* Competences and skills that they have contributed to develop

Insist on experiences that showcase professional skills and abilities, which are essential to the project proposed. Demonstrate how they reflect initiative, independent thinking, project management skills, leadership qualities… Distinguish between knowledge/skills/know-how BEFORE and AFTER the project.

–––

### – Impact

#### – Credibility of the measures to enhance the career perspectives and employability of the researcher and contribution to his/her skills development

* + - *Specific measures to enhance career perspectives and employability of the researcher inside and/or outside academia*
		- *Expected contribution of proposed skills development*

The impact derives from your results. Distinguish between short term impact (immediately after the grant period) and longer-term impact.

You should describe specifically how the new acquired competences that you will gain will get you to your next job and make you attractive to different employers. You should have a concrete plan of training-through-research. The focus is therefore on the long-term impact of what you learn after the project has been completed.

Consider focusing on scientific and training impact.

#### – Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities

* + - *Plan for the dissemination and exploitation activities, including communication activities*.
		- *Strategy for the management of intellectual property, foreseen protection measures*.

N. B.: What is the difference between “Communication” and “Dissemination”?

**Communication** = to communicate on **your project** through various ways (website, poster, flyer, etc.) **Dissemination/exploitation** = actions targeting potential users and uses of **the results of your project,** either in the academic context or in the non-academic area (culture, education, social, policy- making, etc.)

**How** will you disseminate the research results and data? Obvious possibilities are scientific journals and presentations at scientific conferences. When it comes to journals, give the evaluators an idea of your level of ambition by stating the specific journals you hope to publish in.

You can also consider depositing some of your data in repositories (ex. Zenodo).

How can you exploit the results? Will it lead further to industry collaboration, professional organisations, and else? How can other researchers benefit from your findings?

Remember to describe if there are potential for inventions and how you would like to exploit that. Possible outreach activities:

* Visiting schools, universities, community organisations, etc. and promoting research field.
* Workshop Day.
* Summer-School Week (lectures and experiments).
* Public talks, TV-Talks, podcasts and articles in Newspapers.
* E-Newsletters to be released on the internet for the attention of the public at large (e.g. Wikipedia).
* Little films and video-clips to be released on the internet, in spaces open to the public at large.
* Public websites, virtual exhibitions, blogs.

Discuss at this stage how you envisage the protection, the management, or even the sharing of intellectual property (using for example a data management plan).

If relevant, also address the question of what data cannot be shared and how it will be managed (with the help of your institution's DPO for example).

#### – The magnitude and importance of the project’s contribution to the expected scientific, societal and economic impacts

*Provide a narrative explaining how the project’s results are expected to make a difference in terms of impact, beyond the immediate scope and duration of the project*.

**What** are the results or research data that could be widely reused?

What is the level of impact that your data could achieve (from the most restricted to the broadest: scientific, economic/technological, societal).

Explain the limitations that may be encountered at this level.

–––

### – Quality and Efficiency of the Implementation

You need to give the impression that you have a very clear idea about how to conduct your research and appropriate training activities. Evaluators like to see a project which, if funded, is “ready to roll”.

#### – Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages

* + - *Brief presentation of the overall structure of the work plan, including deliverables and milestones.*
		- *Timing of the different work packages and their components*
		- *Mechanisms in place to assess**and mitigate risks (of research and/or administrative nature)*

N. B.:

A **work package (WP)** is a quantitative and qualitative description of an activity to be carried out in the project – for example, the work to be done and the result to be achieved for a clearly defined task within the project. A work package can be thought of as a sub-project.

A **deliverable** is a tangible or intangible outcome of the project in relation with its objectives. A deliverable can be a report, a document, a server upgrade or any other building block of an overall project.

**Milestones** are key steps in the project life, a measurement of progress toward an output. There is no work associated with a milestone; it is a flag to signify some work has been completed.

Actually the main resource is you as a fellow. You need to show that your work plan is feasible in accordance with the time available. Thus the **Gantt Chart** is very important; please follow the EU advices on this matter. The Gantt Chart should reflect work packages, secondments, short stays, training, dissemination in the scientific community and more widely, and exploitation, communication activities.

It is advisable to write a simple work plan, which breaks down the project period in 3 or 4 main phases. Work packages are usually only used in bigger and more complex projects, but as the guide asks for the use of these, you can merely call the various phases in you project work packages. One work package could be data collection, design of and implementation of experiments. A second work package could be analysis and a third could be writing and dissemination.

Deliverables and milestones for a research project is often the same. It could be publication of an article, or similar tangible results.

If you do have **secondment**(s), you need to describe here how you plan it: “where” and “when”, and of course “how” they correlate to your whole research and training programme and “what” is the added value for including them.

#### The secondment is a place where you will acquire new methodology skills, not a place where you will collect sources. For the latter, you can plan short visits.

If pertinent, describe how committed the hosts-of-secondment are; what they are going to provide / contribute as infrastructure, equipment, office-space/ amenities, training and supervision. Here particularly showcase the specific skills developed, which are actually why the researcher is seconded there anyway, hence underlining the complementarity and synergy with the Host.

Demonstrate that you have a realistic idea about which obstacles can come in the way for the implementation of the planned activities. Show that you are aware of any reasonably realistic risks, and how you will seek your supervisor’s advice as appropriate

#### – Quality and capacity of the host institutions and participating organisations, including hosting arrangements

* + - *Hosting arrangements, including integration in the team/institution and support services available to the researcher.*
		- *Quality and capacity of the participating organisations, including infrastructure, logistics and facilities should be outlined in Part B-2 Section 5 (“Capacity of the Participating Organisations”).*

Show that you and your “supervisor” have a clear and realistic plan for how to monitor the progress of the project. It is advisable to be explicit about how frequently progress monitoring meetings with your supervisor will take place.

## Part B-2

### – CV of the researcher

Writing a Curriculum Vitae (indicative length: 5 pages)

You can start with a small summary of your milestones and major achievements so far and you can link major achievements to resulting publications.

The CV must include: academic achievements and expertise; professional activities; prizes and awards; successfully obtained funding; a list of publications; poster presentations and conference proceedings, any relevant industry experience; teaching and supervising experience.

Always specify what was your role in a given project.

Do not forget experience outside academia. Explain gaps in your CV. Always start with the dates dd/mm/yyyy (arranged in reverse order: the most recent first)

Use the CV template that you prefer, but it must include the following sections and the presentation should be clear.

\*\*\*

**Personal information** Family name, First name: Date and place of birth: Nationality:

URL for your website: (on the website you can add all the data you want and a complete publication list)

ORCID[[2]](#footnote-2)

**Education**

Dates PhD title

Name of Faculty/Department, Name of University/Institution, Country dates Master Name of Faculty/ Department, Name of University/Institution, Country

**Current position(s) / Academic position(s)**

Dates Current Position

Name of Faculty/ Department, Name of University/Institution, Country

**Previous positions**

Dates Position held

Name of Faculty/Department, Name of University/Institution, Country

**Fellowships and awards / Research projects**

Dates Name of Faculty/Department/Centre, Name of University/Institution, Country Dates Award received from Name of Institution, Country

Dates Scholarship, Name of Faculty/Department/Centre, Name of University/Institution, Country

**Supervision of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows**

Dates Number of Postdocs/ PhD/ Master Students

Name of Faculty/Department/Centre, Name of University/Institution, Country

(If no experience with supervision on graduate students, show qualifications in other ways)

**Teaching activities (if applicable)**

Dates Teaching position – Topic, Number of hours/semesters, Name of University/Institution, Country

**Organisation of scientific meetings (if applicable)**

Dates [Please specify your role and the name of event], Country + founding

Dates [Please specify type of event and the number of participants], Country + founding

**Institutional / Administrative responsibilities (if applicable)**

Dates Faculty member, Name of University/Institution, Country

Dates Graduate Student Advisor, Name of University/Institution, Country

Dates Member of the Faculty Committee, Name of University/Institution, Country Dates Organiser of the Internal Seminar, Name of University/Institution, Country Dates Member of a Committee, Role, Name of University/Institution, Country

**Commissions of trust (if applicable) / Membership of scientific committees**

Dates Scientific Advisory Board, Name of University/Institution, Country Dates Review Board, Name of University/Institution, Country

Dates Review panel member, Name of University/Institution, Country Dates Editorial Board, Name of University/Institution, Country

Dates Scientific Advisory Board, Name of University/Institution, Country Dates Reviewer, Name of University/Institution/ Country

Dates Scientific Evaluation, Name of University/ Institution, Country Dates Evaluator, Name of University/Institution, Country

**Memberships of scientific societies (if applicable)**

Dates Member, Research Network “*Name of Research Network*”

Dates Associated Member, Name of Faculty/Department/Centre, Name of University/Institution, Country Dates Funding Member, Name of Faculty/Department/Centre, Name of University/Institution, Country

**Major collaborations (if applicable)**

Name of collaborators, Topic, Name of Faculty/Department/Centre, Name of University/Institution, Country

**Languages (Modern and Ancient) Career breaks in research (if applicable)**

Dates, [Please indicate the reason for the break, the place of residence during this period, the duration in months and why do you want to restart a career in research]

You can also add: **Excavations**

**PUBLICATIONS** [Put your name in bold so that it is visible]

**All publications cited**, whatever their type, **must be accessible to the public** and respect the principles of open science (publication in open access or at least deposit in an repository, in France we use HAL, which is an institutional one and open to all).3

3 See the official template for Part B:

***Publications*** *in peer-reviewed scientific journals, peer-reviewed conference proceedings, and/or monographs.*

* *They are expected to be open access either published or through repositories.*

***Other outputs*** *such as data, software, algorithms significant for your research path.*

* *They are expected to be open access in appropriate repositories to the extent possible; they should be accompanied by a very short qualitative assessment of their scientific significance and not by the Journal Impact Factor.*

#### Books

Acosta-Hughes, B.

2010 *Arion’s Lyre. Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry*. Princeton — Oxford.

2002 *Polyeideia. The* Iambi *of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley — Los Angeles.

2000 *Literature and the Visual Arts in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Norman.

#### Edited Books

Acosta-Hughes, B. – Kosmetatou, E. – Baumbach, M. (eds.)

2004 *Labored in Papyrus Leaves*. (Hellenic Studies 2). Cambridge (MA) — London. Pp. 378.

*[Do not forget to give the total number of pages; it should always be even]*

Arrighetti, G. (ed.)

1999 *Letteratura e riflessione sulla letteratura nella cultura classica*. Pisa. Pp. XII + 448.

Bastianini, G. – Casanova, A. (eds.)

2002 *Il Papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi (Firenze 13-14 giugno 2002)* (Studi e Testi di Papirologia, n.s. 4), Florence [*Give the English form of toponyms*]. Pp. 78.

Chiron, P. – Lévy, C. (eds.)

2010 *Les Noms du style dans l’antiquité gréco-latine* (Bibliothèque d’études classiques 57). Leuven — Paris

— Walpole (MA). Pp. VI + 456.

#### Journal Articles

Angiò, F.

2003 “Posidippo di Pella, *Ep.* IX, 3086–3093 Gow–Page (*Anth. Pal.* XII 168)” *Museum Helveticum*

[*Give the full title of journals and series]* 60, 6-21. *[use USA quotation marks*]

Bernsdorff, H.

2002 “Anmerkungen zum neuen Poseidipp (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)” *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 5, 11-44.

#### Book Chapters

Bolmarcich, S.

2002 “Hellenistic sepulchral epigrams on Homer” in Harder, M.A. – Regtuit, R.F. – Wakker, G.C. (eds.)

*Hellenistic Epigrams* (Hellenistica Groningana 5), Leuven — Paris — Sterling (Va), 67-83.

**Book Reviews** *[These should not be mixed with journal articles]*

Prioux, É.

2014 Review of Pagani, L. (ed.) *Asclepiade di Mirlea. I frammenti degli scritti omerici, introduzione, edizione e commento* (Pleiadi 7), Rome, 2007, *Revue de Philologie* 88-2, 177-178.

### – Capacity of the Participating Organisation(s)

*This section + table will be filled with the help of your supervisor.*

### – Additional ethics information

Additional information that could not be included in Part A of the proposal (if needed).

### – Additional information on security screening

Additional information on security aspects that could not be included in Part A of the proposal (if needed).

1. <https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/wp-call/2023-2024/wp-2-msca-actions_horizon-2023-2024_en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. If you do not have an ORCID yet, you can create one at the following address: <https://orcid.org/register>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)