MADRID GABRIELLA MORREALE PROGRAMME

# Evaluation Guide

## 1 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Madrid Gabriella Morreale Plan call (hereinafter MGM) offers permanent positions within the research system of the Community of Madrid to promote the objectives of generating, attracting, retaining, and stabilizing research talent included in the Talent Programme of the VII PRICIT (2026-2029).

Selected researchers will be hired by the Madrimasd Foundation as distinguished researchers and will become employees of the Foundation, working at one of the host research institutions in the Community of Madrid designated as eligible in the call.

The recruited individuals will be subject to periodic follow-up evaluation processes throughout their professional careers.

The success and impact of the individuals recruited through MGM within the Madrid Strategy for Research and Innovation 2030 depend on the quality of the procedures used to select applicants and subsequently on the follow-up evaluation processes of the recruited research staff.

The selection of applicants is based on peer review and is founded on scientific excellence and leadership.

For this selection process, as many evaluation panels as necessary will be established to specifically cover each of the eligible thematic areas in each call.

Selection essentially depends on the judgment of the highly renowned experts who make up each of the panels.

Selection is based on scientific excellence and leadership, as recognized through the informed judgment of experienced panel members qualified to assess these concepts.

Panel members are not part of the scientific community of the Community of Madrid in order to guarantee the complete independence of the process.

The panels use the principles of the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) for evaluation, discouraging the use of metrics based on impact factors as the sole parameter of the quality of applicants' published articles. The evaluation considers all research outputs, including qualitative indicators of their impact and future projection.

Priority is given to the excellence of applicants, but consideration will also be given to the suitability of the host institution, insofar as, through its commitment, it must provide optimal working conditions that allow researchers to carry out their research projects.

The call is based on equal opportunities and therefore gender, age, nationality, religion, racial group, or other physical characteristics do not influence selection. Panels shall avoid all possible unconscious biases.

The MGM call admits candidates of any age provided that they meet the postdoctoral seniority requirements established by the call and comply with applicable legal and labour regulations. Therefore, it is possible to recruit researchers approaching retirement, provided that the Evaluation Committee considers them to remain fully active, productive and capable of making innovative advances.

No quotas are established regarding gender, nationality, or institutions of origin or host institutions.

## 2 TOPICS AND PANELS

MGM calls consider different eligible thematic areas each year, each with its own evaluation panel.

Specialised panels in the different thematic areas, normally consisting of four to nine experts depending on the number of applications received, will be established by the Evaluation Committee of the call.

## 3 SELECTION CRITERIA

The MGM call is aimed at recruiting the most promising and influential researchers in the eligible thematic areas, using scientific excellence and leadership as the main selection criteria.

For the evaluation, the following merits and capabilities will be considered:

| Criterion | Maximum score |
|---|---|
| **1. Scientific contributions**<br>Substantial and relevant contributions to the corresponding field of research, demonstrating versatility and innovative approaches. Primarily publications in scientific journals, but also books, conferences, and other formats for communicating research results, according to their relevance in the specific thematic area. | **Up to 40 points** |
| **2. Independence and leadership**<br>Demonstrated capacity to carry out research activity with intellectual independence, scientific maturity and leadership skills in directing research teams and projects. Demonstrated ability to attract resources through competitive funding, whether from public or private, national or international calls. | **Up to 40 points** |
| **3. Knowledge transfer, researcher training activities and other merits**<br>Evidence of knowledge transfer activities and the practical application of research results (e.g. patents, company creation), with a tangible impact on business, industry, society or public policies. Supervised doctoral and master's theses. Scientific awards and recognitions. Membership of scientific editorial boards. Science management activities. Leadership/membership of nationally or internationally relevant scientific associations or societies. Organisation of conferences. Scientific outreach activities. Evaluation committees. | **Up to 20 points** |

Panel members record their assessment using the Evaluation Form included in the Annex to this guide.

## 4 SELECTION PROCESS

The evaluation is carried out in several phases:

**Phase 1.** Selection of panel members for each thematic area by the Evaluation Committee.

**Phase 2.** Individual remote evaluation by panel members. Each application will be evaluated by at least two panel members.

**Phase 3.** First meeting of each panel to reach a consensus evaluation. Before the meeting, all evaluations and comments are made available to panel members. During the meeting, all applications are

discussed in order to prepare an evaluation report for each applicant indicating the strengths and weaknesses of the application that may require improvement or alternative explanation. Reports must be clear, respectful and constructive. Offensive comments, references to gender, nationality, family situation or other personal characteristics, and references to specific numerical indicators must be removed.

**Phase 4.** The evaluation reports are sent to applicants and they are given a period of 10 calendar days to exercise their right of reply and submit allegations or comments.

**Phase 5.** Second meeting of each panel to review the allegations, generate a final evaluation, and propose a ranking including the selected candidate for each thematic area.

**Phase 6.** Final decision by the Evaluation Committee. This Committee must analyse the expressions of interest submitted by the host institutions.

## 5 CONSTITUTION OF THE PANELS

Panels are constituted each year by invitation according to the eligible thematic areas included in the call.

Panel members shall accept the conditions of participation through a contract signed on the evaluation platform.

The identity of panel members is not communicated to applicants before the evaluation.

All information related to the evaluation is kept under strict confidentiality.

Panel members must not maintain any contact with applicants or with representatives of either the home or host institutions.

Breaches of confidentiality may result in termination of the contract.

After the evaluation has concluded, panel members must delete electronic files and destroy printed copies.

If panel members have a conflict of interest or cannot evaluate an application for personal or professional reasons, they must immediately inform the Madrimasd Foundation.

A conflict of interest exists when panel members:

**a)** May benefit directly or indirectly from the selection of the applicant.

**b)** Have a close family or personal relationship with the applicant.

**c)** Have collaborated scientifically with the applicant during the previous 8 years.

**d)** Have maintained a relationship of scientific rivalry or professional hostility with the applicant.

## 6 ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS

All candidates are reviewed beforehand by Madrimasd to verify their eligibility for the call.

Panel members may assume that the administrative, academic, legal and labour requirements have already been verified, but if any doubt arises, it should be reported to Madrimasd staff.

Madrimasd staff are available to provide prompt and accurate advice on any aspect of the evaluation process.

ANNEX · EVALUATION TEMPLATE

# Evaluation Form

## 1 SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTIONS

**0–40 points**

| Question | A | B | C |
|---|---|---|---|
| Do the candidate's scientific contributions constitute significant advances in their discipline? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Is the recognition and influence of the candidate's publications within the international scientific community demonstrated through different indicators? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Do the candidate's scientific contributions demonstrate collaboration with national and international research groups? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Has the candidate maintained a sustained record of scientific excellence over the last 10 years? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Do the candidate's scientific contributions demonstrate the ability to address multidisciplinary problems? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**Comment**

**Subtotal criterion:** _____ **/ 40**

## 2 INDEPENDENCE AND LEADERSHIP

**0–40 points**

| Question | A | B | C |
|---|---|---|---|
| Has the candidate established original and sustained research lines that are clearly identifiable? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Has the candidate demonstrated the ability to create and lead competitive research groups in different national and international institutions? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Is the candidate internationally recognized as a leading expert in their field? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Has the candidate held relevant leadership responsibilities in institutions, research centers, or research units? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Has the candidate obtained competitive national and international funding as Principal Investigator of projects and/or individual contracts? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Has the candidate coordinated large-scale national or international research projects, contracts, consortia, networks, or associations? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Are the funding calls through which the candidate obtained their main resources highly relevant and competitive? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Has the candidate demonstrated a sustained ability to attract resources? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**Comment**

**Subtotal criterion:** _____ **/ 40**

## 3 KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER. RESEARCHER TRAINING. OTHER ACHIEVEMENTS

**0–20 points**

| Question | A | B | C |
|---|---|---|---|
| Has the candidate protected or transferred the results through patents, licenses, software, databases, or other mechanisms? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Has the candidate developed collaborations with companies, public administrations, or other non-academic entities through R&D contracts or technological support? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Has the candidate participated in knowledge valorization initiatives (company creation, scientific entrepreneurship, product or service development, etc.)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Has the candidate supervised a significant number of successfully defended doctoral and master theses? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Has the candidate received prestigious awards, distinctions, or invitations? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Is the candidate a member of editorial boards of journals? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Has the candidate organized congresses, workshops, conferences, outreach initiatives, or other scientific events of national or international relevance? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Has the candidate held significant management responsibilities within R&D&I funding agencies, research centres, or academic institutions? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**Comment**

**Subtotal criterion:** _____ **/ 20**

# Overall Assessment

**Main strengths**

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |

**Main weaknesses**

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |

**Relative position with respect to the international standard of the call**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ Exceptional | ☐ Highly competitive | ☐ Competitive | ☐ Below the expected standard |

| TOTAL SCORE | _____ / 100 |
|---|---|

**Final recommendation**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ☐ Fund as a priority | ☐ Reserve list | ☐ Do not fund |

# Optional standard answers for strengths and weaknesses

## 1. Scientific Contributions

### STRENGTHS

- **High impact:** The candidate's scientific contributions represent major breakthroughs and significant advances in their discipline.
- **Strong citations:** Publication record demonstrates exceptional international recognition and sustained influence through high citation metrics.
- **Active networking:** Clear evidence of highly productive collaborations with both national and international research groups.
- **Long-term excellence:** Maintained a remarkable and uninterrupted record of scientific excellence over the last 10 years.
- **Multidisciplinary approach:** Successfully addresses complex, multidisciplinary problems by merging distinct research methodologies.

### WEAKNESSES

- **Incremental progress:** Scientific contributions are primarily incremental and do not significantly advance the current state of the discipline.
- **Low visibility:** Publications show limited international visibility and below-average citation indicators within the field.
- **Isolated research:** The candidate's work shows a lack of meaningful collaboration with external national or international research groups.
- **Inconsistent record:** The record of scientific excellence has fluctuated significantly and has not been sustained over the last decade.
- **Narrow focus:** Research remains highly specialized with little to no ability to address broader multidisciplinary issues.

## 2. Independence and Leadership

### STRENGTHS

- **Original vision:** Established clear, highly original, and fully autonomous lines of research.
- **Group creation:** Successfully created, managed, and led competitive research groups across multiple institutions.
- **Global authority:** Internationally recognized as a leading expert and a reference figure in their specific field.
- **Institutional role:** Held major leadership and administrative responsibilities in prestigious research centers or units.
- **PI funding:** Secured substantial competitive funding as Principal Investigator from highly demanding national and international calls.
- **Large-scale management:** Coordinated high-profile international consortia, large-scale projects, and research networks.

### WEAKNESSES

- **Lack of autonomy:** Fails to demonstrate a clearly identifiable or independent line of research separate from former supervisors.
- **No group leadership:** Limited experience in creating or leading independent, competitive research teams.
- **Limited recognition:** Lacks sufficient international recognition as a leading expert or authority in the field.

- **No institutional impact:** Has not held relevant leadership or managerial roles within research centers or academic institutions.
- **Low funding success:** Struggled to attract competitive funding as a Principal Investigator, relying heavily on secondary roles.
- **No consortia experience:** Lacks experience in managing or coordinating large-scale research projects, networks, or international consortia.

## 3. Knowledge Transfer

### STRENGTHS

- **High market potential:** Generated highly actionable results with clear potential for practical application outside academia.
- **IP protection:** Successfully protected and transferred intellectual property through active patents, licenses, or databases.
- **Corporate ties:** Established strong R&D contract collaborations with private companies and public administrations.
- **Entrepreneurship:** Actively participated in knowledge valorization initiatives, including spin-offs and scientific entrepreneurship.

### WEAKNESSES

- **Purely theoretical:** Results are strictly academic with very little potential for exploitation or application outside academia.
- **No IP record:** No evidence of protecting or transferring research results through patents, software registry, or licenses.
- **No external collaboration:** Lacks collaborative R&D contracts or technological support initiatives with non-academic entities.
- **No valorization:** No involvement in scientific entrepreneurship, company creation, or product development initiatives.

## 4. Researcher Training

### STRENGTHS

- **Productive supervision:** Supervised a significant number of successfully defended PhD theses and Master's projects.
- **Postdoc mentoring:** Demonstrated a strong commitment to mentoring and advancing the careers of postdoctoral researchers.

### WEAKNESSES

- **Low supervision rate:** Insufficient track record in supervising doctoral theses or training postgraduate students.
- **No postdoc guidance:** Lacks experience in supervising or managing postdoctoral researchers and technical support staff.

## 5. Other Achievements

### STRENGTHS

- **Peer recognition:** Actively serves on prestigious editorial boards and international R&D&I funding evaluation panels.
- **Conference organizer:** Successfully organized major national and international conferences of high relevance to the field.

**WEAKNESSES**

- **Low community service:** Limited participation in journal editorial boards or funding agency evaluation panels.
- **No event management:** No proven experience in organizing scientific conferences or managing R&D&I programs for funding bodies.