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AGENDA

14.15 Welcome words
The evolution and aims of the Centres of Excellence Programmes
Vice President for Research Riitta Maijala

14.45 Practical issues on the up-coming call
Senior Science Adviser Maiju Gyran

Questions and Answers

16.00 End of the event

Questions: coe@aka.fi
Twitter: #coeinfo2020
CoE team in Academy

- Research Funding Development Unit
  - Maiju Gyran, Ritva Helle and Katri Laitinen
- Culture and Society Unit
  - Satu Huuha-Cissokho and Katja Marjanen
- Natural Sciences and Engineering Unit
  - Samuli Hemming and Kati Sulonen
- Biosciences, Health and the Environment Unit
  - Suvi Broholm and Timo Sareneva

firstname.lastname@aka.fi or coe@aka.fi
Call text

- Background and objectives
- Who can apply?
- Funding to be applied for and funding period
- How applications are submitted and become pending, publicity of applications
- Letter of intent parts and guidelines (first call stage)
- Full application parts and guidelines (second call stage)
- How the application is reviewed
- Funding decision
The letter of intent and full application are done in the online service (SARA).

Consortium application already in letter of intent stage.
Content of the plans

**Full application**
- Responsible science
  - Societal effects and impact
    20+2 pages

**Plan of Intent**
- Aim and objectives
- Implementation
- Applicant, research team and collaborators
  - Bibliography
    6+2 pages
Plan of Intent and full application: Background, aims, objectives, implementation

1. Background, objectives and implementation of research project

1.1. Significance of the research project in relation to current knowledge and the research-based starting points; research questions and/or hypotheses; expected research results and their anticipated scientific impact, potential for scientific breakthroughs and for promoting scientific renewal, scientific added value

1.2. Work plan, schedule, research data and research methods

1.3. Research environment: describe the support provided by host organisation(s), incl. resources and research infrastructures

1.4. Scientific renewal and added value

- Potential for renewal, scientific added value

2. Implementation

2.1. Workplan and schedule:

- Description of the research to be performed in the project, starting from objectives, scientific references and preliminary data (if available)
- Description of research tasks, their implementation and interconnections
- If necessary, description of the responsibilities and management related to these tasks
- Schedule for project implementation, incl. research tasks and work packages, distribution of personnel resources, and project milestones and deliverables

2.2. Research data, materials and methods:

- Research data to be used, justifications and information on data collection/acquisition and use, taking into account issues such as intellectual property rights
- Research methods and how they will contribute to answering the research questions or confirming the hypotheses, or how they will support the chosen approach

2.3. Risk assessment and alternative implementation strategies:

- Critical points for success, probability of risks and alternative implementation strategies

2.4. Research environment

- Support from host organisations, incl. resources, infrastructure, etc.
- Description of host organisation’s support to the CoE
- Description of local, national and/or international research environment including research infrastructures; enter the infrastructures to be used also on the tab ‘Affiliations’ in the online services.
Plan of Intent and full application: Applicant, research team and collaborators

1. Applicant, research team and collaborators

2.1. Project personnel and their relevant merits: tasks and roles, key merits and complementary expertise of CoE director, deputy director and team leaders

2.2. Collaborators and their key merits in terms of the project

3. Applicant, research team and collaborators

3.1. Project personnel and their relevant merits:
   - Tasks and roles, key merits and complementary expertise of CoE director, deputy director and team leaders

3.2. Collaborators and their key merits in terms of the project:
   - National and international collaborators of key significance to project implementation as well as their merits
   - Justifications for choice of collaborators
CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH

4. Responsible science

4.1. Research ethics:
- Information on ethical issues (e.g. ethical governance procedures, informed consent, anonymity of subjects and withdrawal from research) that concern the chosen topic, methods and data
- Information on research permits granted or pending
- More information: Ethical guidelines

4.2. Promoting open science:
- Publication plan that supports open access (Academy-funded projects are required to commit to open access publishing)
- Data management plan (as a separate appendix) that supports reuse of data
- More information: Open science
- More information: Data management

4.3. Promoting equality and non-discrimination:
- Information on how the project will promote equality and non-discrimination within itself or in society at large
- More information: Equality

5. Societal effects and impact

5.1. Effects and impact beyond academia:
- Brief description of the appeal, utilisation potential and application areas of the research results beyond the scientific community
- For instance, provide a self-assessment of the expected societal impact of the research in the long or short term. Impact beyond academia may come in many different forms depending on the research field and the project. For example, science is a source of wealth and prosperity, but it also improves our understanding of the world and enhances the level of civilisation, supports the development of good practices and informs decision-making.
- More information on the wider impact of research: impact of research

5.2. Considering principles of sustainable development:
- Brief description of how the project promotes one or more of the eight goals for sustainable development: equal prospects for wellbeing, a participatory society for citizens, sustainable employment, sustainable society and local communities, a carbon-neutral society, a resource-wise economy, lifestyles respectful of the carrying capacity of nature and decision-making respectful of nature.
- More information: Sustainable development

Only in full application: responsible science and societal effects and impact
CoE Programme for the years 2022-2029, selection process

Call for proposals
Open June 2020
DL October

Plans of Intent, international remote peer review evaluation
Nov 2020-Feb 2021

Internal preparatory group(s)
March 2021

Academy Board Sub-Committee
• Selection of the CoE to be invited to the 2nd evaluation stage
April 2021

Full applications
DL May-June 2021, Int. peer review evaluation panels with interviews September 2021

Internal preparatory group(s)
October 2021

Academy Board Sub-Committee
• Selection of the CoEs
November 2021
Funding Negotiations
Nov-December 2021

Funding period starts 1.1.2022
Review form

1.2 Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of the research  Sub-rating (1–6)
Significance of the project; objectives and hypotheses; ambition and state of the art of objectives (possible novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines); scientific impact of the research; potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes, etc.

1.3 Implementation of the research plan  Sub-rating (1–6)
Feasibility of the project (bearing in mind the extent to which the proposed research may include high risks); materials, research data and methods; human resources and management of research tasks; research environment including research infrastructures; identified potential scientific or methodological problem areas and mitigation plan, etc.

1.3.1. Research consortium  (no numerical rating)
Significance and added value of the consortium for the attainment of the research objectives

1.4 Responsible science  (no numerical rating)
Has the applicant considered the following aspects of responsible science properly? Select Yes/No under each sub-question. Provide further comments if needed.

1.4.1. Ethical issues
   □ Yes
   □ No

1.4.2. Open access of research publications
   □ Yes
   □ No

1.4.3. Data management plan and open access to data or metadata
   □ Yes
   □ No

1.4.4. Promotion of equality and non-discrimination within the project or in society at large
   □ Yes
   □ No

2.1 Competence of applicant(s) and complementary expertise of research team  Sub-rating (1–6)
Merits and scientific expertise of the applicants in terms of project implementation; complementary expertise of the research team; competence of the applicant(s) in terms of supervising PhD candidates or postdoctoral researchers; support for researcher training within the project; etc.

2.2 Significance of research collaboration and researcher mobility  Sub-rating (1–6)
Significance of national and/or international research collaboration including complementary expertise and research environment of the collaborators in terms of project implementation; significance of the planned mobility to the implementation of the research plan and researcher training; etc.

3 Overall assessment and rating

3.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of the project, additional comments and suggestions
Please list major strengths and weaknesses of the application as well as any additional comments.

   Strongest:
   Weaknesses:
6 (outstanding) Demonstrates exceptional novelty and innovation. Has potential to substantially advance science at global level. High-gain project that may include risks

5 (excellent) Is extremely good in international comparison – no significant elements to be improved

4 (very good) Is in general sound but contains a few elements that could be improved

3 (good) Is in general sound but contains important elements that should be improved

2 (fair) Contains flaws. Is in need of substantial modification or improvement

1 (poor) Severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application
Restrictions

- If you have CoE funding already
- If you are member of Research Councils, Strategic Research Council (SRC) or Board of the Academy

Under consideration
- If you are director of the Flagship
- If you are director of the consortium funded by SRC, on-going in 2021

- ONLY one application/researcher already in plan of intent phase
  - No changes to the consortium between letter of intent and full application stage
FAQ

- Team leaders need to have host institution’s commitments already in letter of intent phase

- Groups abroad via collaboration

- Can apply in normal September call and in CoE call

- Restriction for Academy projects: only director, vice-director and team leaders for the first 3 years!
We invite you all to comment and send your views on the materials to coe@aka.fi before **Wednesday 15th April 2020**!

- Call text
- Hakuilmoitus
- Guidelines for writing plan of intent
- Aiesuunnitelma ohje
- Guidelines for writing full application
- Varsinaisen suunnitelman ohje

- Evaluation form
Thank you!

Programme for Centres of Excellence in Research

- Based on competition, covers all disciplines
- Funding cooperation
- The national CoE strategy 1997, amendment 2009, amendment 2015