



Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

Erasmus Mundus and External Cooperation

Dr. Daniel MARTINA  
University of Angers

rue de Rennes, 40  
FR - 49100 Angers  
**France**

Brussels, 13/08/2010  
EACEA/P4/JF/SM/dm D (2010) 303676

**Re: Erasmus Mundus Action 1.B - Joint Doctorate Programmes - Call for Proposals EACEA/29/09**  
**Title: Doctoral training in nanomedicine : pharmaceutical innovations and applications in therapy, imaging and regenerative medicine.**  
**Ref.: 512248-1-2010-1-FR-ERA MUNDUS-EMJD**  
*(Please quote this number in all correspondence)*

Dear Sir/Madam,

You have submitted a proposal under Action 1.B in the framework of the Erasmus Mundus Call for proposals EACEA/29/09.

I regret to inform you that your proposal has not been selected.

The Agency received 148 proposals under Action 1.B – Joint Doctorate Programmes. 9 of these proposals were selected for funding, and a further 3 are on the reserve list. All eligible proposals were assessed with the assistance of independent academic experts on the basis of the selection and award criteria listed in the Call for proposals.

The selection decision is based on the quality of the proposal, its relative position in comparison with the other proposals received and the budget available.

The table below provides you with an indication of the overall and relative quality of your proposal which was included under Group II

Groups		Number (% of eligible proposals)
I	Proposals of very good quality (score higher than 75 points out of 100)	29 proposals (21,2%)
II	Proposals of good quality (score between 60 and 75 points out of 100)	63 proposals (46 %)
III	Proposals of weak quality (score less than 60 points out of 100)	45 proposals (32,8%)
Ineligible proposals		11 proposals (7,4% of all proposals received)

Enclosed you will find the consolidated version of the two independent academic experts' assessments of your proposal. Please take account of the fact that most of the assessments were written by non-native speakers and that the Agency cannot comment on these independent assessments.

A new Erasmus Mundus Action 1 Call for proposals will be published by the end of 2010 with a deadline of 30 April 2011. Should you wish to submit a new proposal, I recommend you to consult the EACEA website at:

[http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus\\_mundus/funding/higher\\_education\\_institutions\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/higher_education_institutions_en.php) in order to be informed about the publication of the relevant application documents.

You may also contact the Erasmus Mundus National Structure located in your country in order to be provided with assistance and support in the preparation of a new proposal:

[http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus-mundus/doc1515\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus-mundus/doc1515_en.htm)

I take the opportunity to thank you for the interest you have shown in the programme and the work you have invested in preparing your proposal.

Should you require any further information, please contact us through our functional mailbox [EACEA-Erasmus-Mundus@ec.europa.eu](mailto:EACEA-Erasmus-Mundus@ec.europa.eu)

Sincerely Yours,

*J. Fronia*

Joachim Fronia  
Head of Unit

Annex: Comments and recommendations from the independent academic experts who assessed your proposal.

Proposal number:	512248-EM-1-2010-1-FR-ERA MUNDUS-EMJD
Proposal title:	Doctoral training in nanomedicine : pharmaceutical innovations and applications in therapy, imaging and regenerative medicine.
Coordinator:	Prof. Frank BOURY
Applicant organisation:	University of Angers

<b>Award Criteria</b>
<p><b>B.1 Academic and Research quality (25% of the max. score)</b></p> <p>Fostering novel professional figures, specifically educated in nano-medicine from a multidisciplinary, intersectorial and transnational perspective, is a prerequisite for any development of candidate products and clinical progress. Fully in line with the needs analysis, strategic objectives and general training objectives of the programme establish concerted actions between basic research, clinical expertise and associate industrial partners. Although the added value and distinctiveness are obvious, existing joint doctorate programmes in the field are not demonstrated. This subcriterion is presented as B1.3 instead of B1.2. There is a specific added value in the proposal in terms of: potential scientific exchange and integration between HEIs and associated partners; complementarity from design to application in therapy; technologies and methodologies available as a result of the joint programme. But, research methodologies and approaches are not exactly specified. There is distinctiveness, as this programme is unique in Europe in terms of novelty of the field and integrated effort in providing dedicated education in nano-medicine. The programme is innovative in promoting an integrated approach in a newly emerging research area. Training and research activities will be supervised in co-tutelle by renowned PhD supervisors. However, training objectives, in terms of core and transferable skills, are limited. It is stated that training will include mandatory local courses and international conference(s). However, this key part of the programme is not well defined. Network-wide events include 5 summer/winter schools. Convincingly, the programme is already clearly defined and includes training on GMP, GLP, GCP and statistical methods for pre/clinical studies. The participation of industry/public sector is not fully justified under this subcriterion. This subcriterion is presented as B1.4 instead of B1.3. Inter-sectoral and inter-organisational collaboration is not specifically addressed. Mobility (such as placements) will take place in associated member institutions. The programme supports research activities, short-term training and is fully recognized through ECTS. Agreements to deal with potential issues, such as IPRs and confidentiality, are not set out. The issues of graduate employability are not discussed. This subcriterion is presented as B1.5 instead of B1.4. The programme has strong potential in terms of education and scientific achievements. However, more effort is needed to provide a clear description of the degree of exchange, integration, flow of communication, purpose and mobility between the individual partners.</p>
<p><b>B.2 Partnership experience and composition (25% of the max. score)</b></p> <p>The network has a critical mass of highly specialized scientists in the field of nano-medicine, multi-disciplinary expertise, and infrastructures to contribute successfully to the EMJD specific training and research objectives. There is experience in training within the Consortium at the Master and PhD level but the expertise of some academic staff to supervise PhD candidates is not evident. A number of publications demonstrate the existence of links between partner organizations. In terms of complementarities, some examples of collaboration between partners are listed, however, activities and outcomes should have been specified. Obligatory and optional courses are not specified. Schedule of summer/winter schools is clear. Under this section, an exemplified description of how complementarities will be exploited should have been given, so as to provide concrete evidence of the exchanges envisaged by the proposal. The consortium "diversity" is not specifically addressed under this criterion. Networking and cooperation activities within consortium appear good. Collaboration has occurred via organisation international conferences, participation in previous EC projects, joint publications and common clinical trials. The level of internationalization, in terms of Master and PhD students, is relevant (25-30%). There is intersectorial collaboration in the programme. There is</p>

collaboration with companies and creation of spin-offs, and each partner has established Technology Transfer Offices that seek opportunities for funding academic research. However, the arrangements to manage collaboration with the private sector should have been described.

**B.3 European integration and functioning of the programme**  
(20% of the max. score)

The training and research programme has a structured and integrated organization, e.g. there is full mutual recognition for all training activities of the candidates through ECTS and co-tutelle of doctoral candidates. The consortium plans to invite visiting scientists and develop an approved course handbook. A description of the whole PhD curriculum is shown in a Figure. However, that does not provide a sufficiently detailed overview of a joint, integrated programme of training and research. An overview of the courses offered is missing. Mandatory mobility periods are respected and will be discussed between partners at the beginning of the curriculum. Mobility is appropriately flexible in timing and length, to address the needs of the doctoral students, in terms of training/research at the partner HEI and intersectorial education. Mechanisms for selection of doctoral candidates are limited. A centralized process should be used routinely for selection of the applicants. The recruitment procedure would benefit from the use of more quantitative tools for assessment of candidates. Exact criteria are not defined. Applicants should be informed about selection and scoring criteria at all stages of the process. The way the consortium will propose specific research topic is described. Equity issues, including gender balance, are not addressed. There is detailed description of how the participation costs will be used and distributed among the participating institutions. Students will not be charged with additional participation costs, which is good but the way in which the participation costs have been calculated is not demonstrated. Supervision and monitoring of the candidate activities are good. Mechanisms for thesis defence aim to promote excellence and quality in education but are too demanding in terms of publications. Participation of external examiner in the final evaluation of the student is a rule. Presence of three external members at any given PhD defence is excellent. Potential financial coverage beyond the 3rd year is described under section B.5.3. Candidates will receive a double degree, which is already current practice at partner institutions. The measure taken, or envisaged, by the consortium to deliver a fully accredited and recognised joint degree is demonstrated.

**B.4 Provisions for EMJD candidates and fellowship holders**  
(15% of the max. score)

The consortium uses sufficient promotion channels to attract highly interested candidates. There is commitment to achieve a high dissemination of vacancies, using established communication tools and to attract applicants from 3rd countries. The services offered by the host institutions are provided through established student support and assistance services. There is commitment to provide good quality, concrete support in many aspects of the graduate life. Although some services provided to candidates are available, the proposal fails to describe if each partner is able to provide them. Specific services available for doctoral candidates with a family, or with special needs, are not described. The official language of the Consortium is English. The consortium offers local language courses to candidates, however their recognition in the joint programme and costs coverage are not evident. Linguistic aspects should have been better addressed, e.g. language levels of competency to be acquired are not identified, or monitored. Students will be hired according to the national labour legislations, with coverage of health care and social security, including pension rights, and in accordance with the EU recommendations but there is no information on the use of employment contracts (single contract or multiple contracts). In the UK, due to national legislations, students will be offered stipends, which is justified. Financial management of fellowships and consortium lump sum is described. Balanced distribution of fellowships among partners will be ensured. There is good description of career promotion procedures. The way that the consortium will monitor progress during completion of the training programme, and career developments after graduation, is not presented. Specific tools to monitor the career development of the fellows should be put in place. The description of the rights and obligations of both parties is very generic. Details of the content of Doctoral Candidate Agreement are not given.

**B.5 Programme Management and Quality Assurance** (15% of the max. score)

There is commitment within the Consortium to allocate sufficient human resources to the programme. The exact composition and the role of management and supervision board are defined. There is a high quality joint governance structure - with a clear distribution of roles and responsibilities - aimed at ensuring a consistent, feed-back based, network-wide, monitoring and functioning of the programme. Mechanisms of response to negative feed-back, dispute resolution, voting, quorum will be appropriately formalized in the "Framework Partnership Agreement". Measures to ensure the proper implementation and continuity of the joint programme beyond Community funding are convincing. To

this aim complementary funding will be sought from public agencies and private sector partners. The Consortium has already raised complementary funding to pay a potential fourth year of study. It is noteworthy that the number of intended fellowships to be awarded in the first cycle of the EMJD is much higher than that funded by the EMJD programme.

Internal and external quality assessment is relevant. Questionnaires and feed-back systems are implemented. However, frequency and methodology of this exercise should have been better defined. Participation of external evaluators is considered.

#### Global Comments

The proposal provides a convincing outline of nano-medicine with emphasis on its potential impact in healthcare. Fully in line with the needs analysis, the programme establishes concerted actions between basic research, clinical expertise and associate industrial partners. It aims to foster professional figures specifically educated in nano-medicine from a multidisciplinary, intersectorial and transnational perspective, as a prerequisite for development of candidate products and clinical progress. Although the added value and distinctiveness are obvious, existing joint doctorate programmes in the field are not demonstrated. The programme has specific added value and distinctiveness in promoting an integrated approach in a newly emerging research area. However, training and research activities are only partially defined with the exception of the proposed 5 summer/winter schools, e.g. there is limited description of training activities in terms of core skills; more effort should have been made to provide an exemplified description of training through research activities and its articulation with training; a clear description of the degree of exchange, integration, flow of communication, between the individual partners should have been provided. The consortium consists of leading groups in the field with outstanding publication record and management of training programmes. Inter-sectoral and inter-organisational collaboration is not specifically addressed but the role and appropriateness of the professional sector participation is justified and the role of management and supervision boards is well defined. The programme actively supports research activities, provides short-term training, is fully recognized through ECTS and promotes career prospects. The course is based on awarding recognised double degrees. The measure taken, or envisaged, by the consortium to deliver a fully accredited and recognised joint degree is demonstrated. Mandatory mobility periods are respected. Common standards and mechanisms for the application, selection, admission and review of doctoral candidates are very generic. Financial management of fellowships and consortium lump sum is described but the way in which the participation costs have been calculated is not demonstrated. The consortium uses sufficient promotion channels to attract highly interested candidates. Although some services provided to candidates are available, the proposal fails to describe if each partner is able to provide them. The consortium offers to candidates local language courses; however their recognition in the joint programme and costs coverage are not evident. Consortium plans to use employment contracts in most partners in order to appoint the candidates with the exception of one partner, where the stipends are justified due to national regulations. But no information on how does the consortium plan to use employment contracts (single contract or multiple contracts) is provided. Moreover, the description of the rights and obligations of both parties is very generic. The way how consortium will monitor progress during completion of the training programme and career developments after graduation is not presented. Measures to ensure the proper implementation and continuity of the joint programme beyond Community funding are convincing. Concrete initiative taken by some consortia partners to secure additional funding for the joint programme is demonstrated. Internal and external quality assessment is relevant.