B1b: Curriculum Vitae and Track-record

1.1 The evaluation of the PI

	StG	CoG	AdG
Career stage	Starting their own independent research team or programme.	May still be consolidating their own independent research team or programme.	Already established research leaders with a recognized track record of research achievements.
Objective	Demonstrate the ground-breaking nature, ambition and feasibility of their research proposal.		
Achievement level	Should have already shown evidence of the potential for research independence, for example by having produced at least one important publication as main author or without the participation of their PhD supervisor.	Should have already shown evidence of research independence.	Expected to be an active researcher and to have a track-record of significant research achievements.

Source: Work Programme 2024, pp.17-18

The evaluation criteria in the ERC Work Programme 2024 takes the above elements into account when assessing the qualifications of the PI for the conduct of the proposed research.

Scientific Excellence: Intellectual capacity and creativity
To what extent has the PI demonstrated the ability to conduct ground-breaking research?
To what extent does the PI provide evidence of creative and original thinking?
To what extent does the PI have the required scientific expertise and capacity to successfully execute the project?

1.2 B1b Curriculum Vitae and Track-record

As of call 2024, the ERC has introduced changes to the structure of the CV and Track Record. Instead of being addressed separately, the CV and Track Record have now been joined and simplified, and the candidate will have 4 pages in total to address the following items: Education and Key qualifications, current position(s), relevant previous positions, a list of up to ten research outputs that demonstrate how the applicant has advanced knowledge in their field (with an emphasis on more recent achievements) and a list of selected examples of significant peer recognition. The applicant may also include narratives on the significance of the selected outputs, their role in producing each of them, and how these demonstrate their capacity to successfully carry out their proposed project, as well as relevant additional information on noteworthy contributions to the research community, career breaks, diverse career paths and life events.

1.2.1 The power of using narratives

The reviewers have to assess the information provided in the 4-page CV and track-record, based on the evaluation questions included on item 1.1 above. When taking a close look at the evaluation questions and the template, it is immediately apparent that there is no direct link between the specific sections of the template and the evaluation questions. This creates freedom for the applicant on how to provide the reviewers with strong "answers" to these questions.

An important tool for generating such answers will be the use of narratives in strategic sections of the CV. Considering moreover the fact that the applicant will have 4 pages to address few and seemingly straightforward items, we conclude that there is space for including narratives to offer context and substantive, qualitative arguments that provide the reviewers with the complete picture as to **why you** are the right PI for this project.

1.2.2 Note: San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) and COARA's Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment

There is an ongoing push from the ERC to assess research excellence primarily on qualitative measures and steer away from a metrics-based assessment of excellence, including what the panel members have been identifying as "boasting" with high numbers. This has been made clear by the ERC having signed both the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) and COARA's Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment.

Candidates should no longer rely on metrics as quality indicators (and should therefore avoid metrics such as Journal Impact Factor (JIF), Article Influence Score (AIS), h-index etc). Instead, emphasise your expertise and advanced knowledge in the field. Consider also avoiding terms like 'leading institution' or 'world-renowned scholar' but focus on a substantiation of relevant qualities that demonstrate how you as a PI have benefitted and/or contributed to the field.

1.3 Sections of the Curriculum Vitae and Track-record Template

There is a suggested template for the Curriculum Vitae and Track Record in the B1 documentation. This template helps structure the evaluation for the reviewers as it makes the information more comparable between different applicants. The template is a suggested format, and we recommend following it where logical and appropriate but also adapting it where appropriate to illustrate and highlight why your CV is excellent in view of your research field(s).

The evaluation questions are formulated broadly, which allows reviewers to include perhaps more subconscious evaluation criteria like the quality of scientists as scientific leaders in their field. That's why, as mentioned above, it is crucial to include substantive, qualitative arguments that highlight the quality of your track record, for instance by indicating clearly to the potential reader when your research community is small but core for opening new horizons for research in other fields.

PERSONAL DETAILS
Family name, First name:
Researcher unique identifier(s) (such as ORCID, Scopus ID, Research ID, etc....):
URL for web site:

YR tips: Update your website as soon as you have submitted the proposal. Reviewers, both those from the panel as well as the external reviewers, tend to cross-check the information

provided with that what is presented on your website. Applicants coming to our interview training regularly report that they see a peak of visits to their website during the ERC evaluation process.

It is not necessary to provide for example address details, telephone number, e-mail address. This information is provided in the on-line A forms. It is also no longer necessary to provide date of birth or nationality.

OPENING NARRATIVE OR BIOSKETCH

Include a narrative on what uniquely positions yourself as the PI for this project (see power of narratives above).

The purpose of this narrative is to demonstrate your expertise, your capacity, as well as your creativity and/or originality. Further, it should demonstrate how you are uniquely placed as the PI able to address the questions asked in this project. This means that you should highlight the important research questions and/or topics you have worked on. This will help the reviewer to understand why, for example, you have the interdisciplinary background to work on the specific problem/question. Discuss why you have the capacity to make a success out of the project by describing how you have matured your scientific/methodological skills over the different stages of your career and how this allows you now to tackle the current complex question of your ERC project.

Refrain here from discussing your publications, as this can be done under the heading of "Selected Research Outputs". That section should, in fact, underpin the arguments built in this narrative (see further below).

EDUCATION AND KEY QUALIFICATIONS

200? PhD Name of Faculty/Department, Name of University/ Institution, Country, Name of PhD supervisor

199? Master Name of Faculty/ Department, Name of University/ Institution, Country

Consider adding:

1. The title of the PhD thesis to show in which field you have been active;
2. (If applicable) Any distinctions or honours to your titles. Consider indicating how prestigious this honour is (eg. 'cum laude' in the Netherlands is more prestigious than in Germany; In Germany 'summa cum laude' is prestigious.)

CURRENT AND PREVIOUS POSITION(S)

201? - Current Position, Name of Faculty/ Department, Name of University/ Institution/ Country

200? –201? Position held, Name of Faculty/Department, Name of University/Institution/Country

200? –201? Position held, Name of Faculty/Department, Name of University/Institution/Country

List all your current and past positions.

If applicable also the names of the research leaders if world-wide known. It is important to show that you have been able to propose and carry out research independently and originating from ideas developed in your team. On the other hand, you would also like to demonstrate that you have been working with the best researchers in the world.

Mobility is always impressive, in particular if this was abroad. Highlight any country to country and workplace mobility detailing the kind of research you have been carrying out in the past and the major scientific achievements. Consider providing information that does not fit into the other sections. But if you have never been abroad, don't worry: what is being

reviewed is if you have the scientific expertise and capacity to successfully undertake the project. Therefore, a narrative on your key qualification's should provide the convincing arguments as to why you are THE PI for this proposed research.

RESEARCH ACHIEVEMENTS AND PEER RECOGNITION

Research achievements

[Provide a list of up to ten research outputs that demonstrate how you have advanced knowledge in your field with an emphasis on more recent achievements, such as publications, articles deposited in a publicly available preprint server, books, book chapters, conference proceedings, data sets, software, patents, licenses, standards, start-up businesses or any other research outputs you deem relevant in relation to your research field and your project. *You may include a short, factual explanation of the significance of the selected outputs, your role in producing each of them, and how they demonstrate your capacity to successfully carry out your proposed project*.]

Peer recognition

[Provide a list of selected examples of significant recognition by your peers if applicable, such as prizes, awards, fellowships, elected academy memberships, invited presentations to major conferences or any other examples of significant recognition you deem relevant in relation to your research field and project. *You may include a short explanation of the significance of the listed examples*.]

Research Achievements:

(i) Presenting your selection

You can list up to 10 research outputs. These could be publications, articles deposited in a publicly available preprint server, books, book chapters, conference proceedings, data sets, software, patents, licenses, standards, start-up businesses or any other research outputs you deem relevant in relation to your research field and your project.

Your selection must address the three evaluation questions: ability to conduct ground-breaking research; evidence of creative and original thinking; and required expertise and capacity to successfully execute the project.

(Note that StG candidates are required to show evidence of potential for research independence, for example by having produced at least one important publication as main author or without the participation of their PhD supervisor).

(ii) Discussing each output

Use here the power of narratives to address, with your selection of outputs, the evaluation criteria for the PI. Therefore, discuss each output to highlight (i) what was the ground-breaking contribution (ie. what is the significance of this output for the field), (ii) what was your role in producing the output (including how does it show originality or creativity), and (ii) how the output demonstrates your expertise and capacity to successfully carry out the proposed project.

You can also highlight recognitions you may have received through the output (eg. Invitations to conferences? Awards? Was the output featured in the cover page of the journal?) as well as whether this led to impact for society (eg. policy development?) or commercially.

Collaborations: Further consider if it is important to highlight your collaborations in the light of the current research proposal: **Address in the discussion of your papers which of the collaborators are of importance for you in the current conduct of the research project.** Anybody listed as co-author is automatically excluded for peer review of the B2 because of potential conflict of interest if this was a collaboration of the last five years.

Particularly for SH proposals, where it is common for instance to include a great number of case studies undertaken in different countries, panel members want to see if you have a network that can be supportive of the research project. Being able to demonstrate your collaborations with internationally recognised scholars, or those you propose to invite to participate in workshops discussing the research of the project etc. may increase the feasibility of your proposed research project.

In the case of PE and LS projects, the panel assesses positively the availability of external experts who can assist with e.g. using cutting edge technologies, method or delivering high quality material, models, data etc.

Contributions to the early career of excellent scientists: This is no longer evaluated, but it could still have a functional role in discussing how some of the students, postdocs that you have supervised made important contributions to the research output.

Peer Recognition:

The candidate should show "a list of selected examples of significant peer recognition".

Below are some suggestions of information that can potentially demonstrate peer recognition:

- Fellowships, Honours and Awards
- Invited talks, presentations, lectures
- Editorial/Reviewing Activities and Scientific Evaluations

Positions of trust: may be expected from an AdG candidate. These allow the reviewers to assess not only the recognition of your expertise but indeed your authority in the field, giving confidence of your capacity. While perhaps StG and CoG candidates would not be expected to already have such roles, if applicable you can also include this heading. Under this, you can therefore include elements such as:

> Board/Committee Roles;

> Expert/Advisory Roles;

> Leadership Roles

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

You may provide relevant additional information on your research career to provide context to the evaluation panels when assessing your research achievements and peer recognition as described above.

Career breaks, diverse career paths and major life events

[*You may include a short factual explanation of career breaks or diverse career paths such as secondments, volunteering, part-time work, time spent in different sectors or the effects of major life events such as long-term illness as well as the effects of pandemic restrictions on research productivity*.]

Other contributions to the research community

[*You may include a list of particularly noteworthy contributions to the research community you have made other than research achievements and peer recognition and a short explanation of these contributions. The purpose of this section is to allow the panels to take a more rounded view of your career and achievements and to ensure that any additional responsibilities, commitments and leadership roles that you have taken on beyond your individual research activities are recognised and taken into account.]*

Contributions to the research community:

The purpose of this section is to offer reviewers a more holistic view of your career and achievements and to ensure that any additional responsibilities, commitments and leadership roles that you have taken on beyond your individual research activities are recognised and taken into account.

Note that panel members have expressed their appreciation for applicants' experience in teaching, administrative responsibilities or other social achievements, stating that they valued researchers who were "not egoists interested only in publications."

Below are our suggestions of elements that can be included as contributions to the research community:

- Organisation of scientific meetings
- Institutional services
- Training and Teaching of students (including supervision of PhDs and Postdocs)

Other elements under Additional Information: If there are other elements in your trajectory that are crucial to underpin your capacity and unique position as the PI for the project you are proposing, you may include additional headings under 'Additional Information' for these. This may be the case, for instance, of important Previous Projects, examples of Commercial Innovation, etc.

When including such information, consider including also a brief discussion on why these elements are important to underpin your capacity and expertise as the PI (eg. what were the important novel insights you were able to generate from that particular previous project?).

Career breaks, diverse career paths and major life events:

Describe significant career breaks and/or unconventional scientific career paths, including maternal/paternal leaves. Be factual, all panel members are group leaders and have experience with why scientists are confronted with career breaks. Panel members prefer to be informed so they understand why there is a potential dip in a career and can take these into account.

A note on diverse career paths: Avoid, in this section, making defensive narratives to 'justify' a diverse career path you may have had. Instead, consider: what from that diverse career path (eg. coming from another field, practical experience?) may have informed your thinking, and perhaps motivated your research? Most often, it is more powerful to provide this context in your opening narrative as a positive argument on your unique signature, rather than including it in this section as a negative argument.

1.4 Elements removed from the CV and Track Record template

Candidates that have submitted an ERC proposal in the past may have seen the old format of the CV and Track Record, and will notice now that some information that used to be required is no longer included in the new template. Below we explain why some of these are no longer relevant, and where, if relevant, you may still mention some of this information in the new template.

FUNDING ID

The Funding ID is no longer part of the CV and Track Record but has been moved as an appendix to the B2. Therefore, reviewers will evaluate funded projects (that will run in parallel with the ERC) to assess how novel indeed is what you propose. Consider nonetheless whether specific projects (specially for expired grants that will not be listed in the Funding ID) demonstrate how you are qualified as the PI for the project – in which case they can be mentioned in the biosketch/opening narrative, linked to your selected research outputs, or even included under Additional Information.

SUPERVISION OF GRADUATE STUDENTS AND POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS

There have been quite some debates at the level of the ERC council as to the importance of this capacity and in general it was decided it was not informative to understand the capacity of the PI to undertake the proposed research. However, as mentioned above, you may include a brief overview of your supervision as a 'contribution to the research community' (but avoid making lists of PhDs and Postdocs you have supervised, and do not include their names; provide simply an overview of how many you have supervised in what Institution).

TEACHING ACTIVITIES

In the light of providing more emphasis on the research proposal itself this has become redundant. Nonetheless, if you have for instance developed or coordinated modules, this information may also be included as a 'contribution to the research community'.

MEMBERSHIPS OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES

This was never particularly relevant and as of call 2024 we can finally ignore it. Nonetheless, elected memberships may be included as an example of Peer Recognition, and if you have for instance founded a Research Network or Scientific Society, this can be included as a 'contribution to the research community'.

MAJOR COLLABORATIONS

Consider whether you can link your network to your selected outputs. In other words, it may still be relevant to show the reviewers that you have a network that can be supportive of the project - so perhaps you can mention the researchers/organisations you have worked with on some of your selected outputs.