

Dr. Eloïse Adde

NATIONAL-SUBJECTS

SOC panel, Université Saint-Louis - Bruxelles

MSCA Individual Fellowship

2020 Call

4/5/2020



Summary:

- I. About me ...**
- II. Redaction of the proposal**
- III. Evaluation**

I. About me ...



Dr. Éloïse Adde

- **Saint-Louis University**
- CRHiDI
- 1.4.2020 – 31.3.2022
- Supervisor: **Pr. Éric Bousmar**
- <https://www.crhidi.be/membres/adde-%C3%A9lo%C3%AFse/>
- <https://usaintlouis.academia.edu/%C3%89lo%C3%AFseAdde>

Historian, specialist in medieval history of Bohemia

- **2011:** Defense of the PhD thesis in medieval history and Czech literature in Paris (Paris 1 and Paris 4, Sorbonne)
- **2008-2009:** CEFRES, Prague (doc. researcher)
- **2009-2010:** IFHA/Göthe Universität, Frankfurt-am-Main (doc. res.)
- **2010-2012:** CEFRES, Prague (post-doc)
- **2013:** Humboldt Universität, Berlin (post-doc)
- **2013-2019:** University of Luxembourg (researcher)

MSCA-IF-2019 : Cumulative percentage of proposals above threshold, with a given score or higher (funding range marked in green)																			
Number of eligible proposals	440 proposals	647 proposals	196 proposals	1061 proposals	168 proposals	951 proposals	856 proposals	1753 proposals	181 proposals	892 proposals	1740 proposals	58 proposals	11 proposals	88 proposals	119 proposals	148 proposals	10 proposals	74 proposals	316 proposals
Cut off score for funding*	89,4	93,0	82,2	92,4	91,6	92,4	93,4	92,6	91,2	91,4	93,0	92,0	89,4	89,8	91,6	91,2	94,2	88,4	90,0
Score equal to or above	CAR	RI	SE	ST-CHE	ST-ECO	ST-ENG	ST-ENV	ST-LIF	ST-MAT	ST-PHY	ST-SOC	GF-CHE	GF-ECO	GF-ENG	GF-ENV	GF-LIF	GF-MAT	GF-PHY	GF-SOC
100	0,23%	0,31%	0,00%	0,00%	0,60%	0,21%	0,35%	0,29%	0,00%	0,11%	0,23%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,68%	0,00%	0,00%	0,63%
99	0,45%	1,24%	0,00%	0,38%	1,19%	0,74%	0,82%	0,80%	0,55%	0,11%	0,75%	1,72%	0,00%	1,14%	1,68%	2,03%	0,00%	0,00%	1,27%
98	1,82%	3,40%	0,00%	1,13%	2,38%	1,47%	1,52%	1,83%	1,10%	0,67%	1,95%	1,72%	0,00%	1,14%	3,36%	3,38%	0,00%	0,00%	2,85%
97	2,95%	4,95%	2,04%	2,36%	2,98%	2,52%	2,57%	3,19%	1,10%	1,57%	3,68%	3,45%	0,00%	1,14%	4,20%	4,73%	0,00%	0,00%	5,38%
96	4,77%	8,66%	2,55%	4,52%	4,17%	4,63%	4,56%	5,02%	2,21%	3,25%	5,34%	5,17%	0,00%	4,55%	6,72%	6,08%	0,00%	1,35%	7,28%
95	6,82%	12,36%	5,10%	6,50%	4,76%	6,52%	7,83%	7,59%	2,76%	5,61%	7,41%	8,62%	0,00%	5,68%	7,56%	10,81%	0,00%	4,05%	10,44%
94	9,09%	17,31%	6,12%	8,67%	6,55%	8,52%	11,45%	10,33%	4,97%	7,29%	10,06%	17,24%	0,00%	10,23%	12,61%	16,22%	20,00%	4,05%	13,92%
93	11,59%	20,56%	7,14%	11,88%	10,12%	11,04%	14,60%	12,89%	6,63%	9,87%	13,16%	18,97%	0,00%	10,23%	15,97%	20,27%	30,00%	10,81%	17,72%
92	13,86%	24,11%	7,65%	15,08%	13,10%	15,04%	16,94%	16,26%	9,39%	12,11%	15,98%	25,86%	18,18%	13,64%	19,33%	21,62%	30,00%	10,81%	19,94%
91	16,59%	26,58%	10,71%	18,85%	14,88%	19,03%	20,68%	19,68%	14,36%	15,13%	17,87%	32,76%	18,18%	19,32%	26,89%	25,00%	30,00%	13,51%	22,15%
90	18,86%	28,90%	12,24%	22,34%	17,26%	21,35%	24,65%	22,88%	17,13%	18,50%	20,11%	39,66%	18,18%	23,86%	27,73%	25,00%	40,00%	16,22%	25,95%
89	20,91%	30,91%	14,80%	25,16%	19,64%	25,24%	27,45%	25,84%	19,34%	21,75%	22,01%	39,66%	36,36%	29,55%	29,41%	28,38%	40,00%	20,27%	29,11%
88	23,86%	34,00%	16,84%	29,03%	21,43%	28,29%	31,19%	28,75%	25,41%	26,01%	24,89%	43,10%	36,36%	30,68%	30,25%	32,43%	40,00%	22,97%	31,65%
87	25,45%	38,33%	18,88%	32,42%	24,40%	31,02%	34,23%	31,83%	29,28%	29,60%	27,01%	43,10%	36,36%	34,09%	31,93%	37,16%	50,00%	22,97%	33,54%
86	28,64%	41,73%	19,90%	36,48%	24,40%	33,65%	37,38%	35,48%	32,60%	33,74%	30,11%	43,10%	36,36%	38,64%	32,77%	39,86%	50,00%	29,73%	38,29%
85	30,68%	44,82%	21,94%	41,19%	25,60%	36,17%	41,00%	38,45%	39,78%	37,00%	33,33%	44,83%	45,45%	38,64%	38,66%	43,92%	50,00%	37,84%	41,46%
84	34,09%	48,07%	22,96%	44,30%	29,17%	40,06%	43,46%	41,36%	44,20%	40,70%	35,63%	50,00%	54,55%	45,45%	44,54%	47,97%	50,00%	43,24%	43,99%
83	37,50%	51,78%	25,51%	47,88%	34,52%	42,69%	46,14%	45,35%	47,51%	43,72%	38,10%	56,90%	54,55%	46,59%	49,58%	50,00%	50,00%	44,59%	46,52%
82	40,23%	55,02%	27,55%	51,46%	36,90%	45,95%	49,18%	49,06%	49,17%	47,09%	41,15%	60,34%	54,55%	47,73%	54,62%	52,03%	60,00%	47,30%	48,42%
81	42,73%	57,34%	29,59%	54,76%	38,69%	48,90%	53,86%	52,37%	51,93%	51,46%	44,14%	63,79%	54,55%	50,00%	60,50%	54,05%	60,00%	54,05%	52,85%
80	45,68%	60,74%	32,65%	56,93%	41,07%	51,52%	56,43%	56,19%	56,35%	54,60%	47,36%	67,24%	54,55%	53,41%	65,55%	58,11%	70,00%	56,76%	56,33%
79	50,00%	64,45%	34,18%	59,94%	44,05%	54,36%	59,23%	59,33%	57,46%	59,08%	50,29%	70,69%	54,55%	55,68%	68,07%	62,16%	70,00%	58,11%	59,81%
78	53,18%	70,02%	36,73%	62,58%	45,24%	57,52%	61,68%	62,46%	60,77%	63,12%	53,16%	74,14%	63,64%	59,09%	72,27%	64,86%	70,00%	60,81%	62,03%
77	55,91%	72,33%	39,80%	65,50%	47,02%	59,62%	64,02%	65,54%	62,98%	66,59%	55,75%	74,14%	72,73%	61,36%	74,79%	66,22%	70,00%	62,16%	63,29%
76	58,64%	74,50%	42,35%	68,43%	50,60%	63,09%	66,47%	67,83%	64,64%	68,50%	57,18%	74,14%	72,73%	65,91%	74,79%	68,24%	70,00%	63,51%	65,51%
75	61,59%	76,20%	45,41%	70,50%	55,36%	66,04%	69,98%	69,99%	66,30%	71,41%	59,48%	74,14%	81,82%	71,59%	78,15%	70,95%	70,00%	68,92%	68,99%
74	63,86%	78,83%	48,98%	73,14%	56,55%	68,35%	72,43%	72,96%	67,96%	73,77%	61,38%	75,86%	81,82%	73,86%	79,83%	72,97%	70,00%	70,27%	70,89%
73	66,14%	80,68%	52,04%	75,12%	57,74%	70,35%	75,12%	74,96%	69,61%	75,56%	63,62%	77,59%	81,82%	73,86%	84,87%	75,68%	70,00%	75,68%	72,15%
72	67,73%	82,38%	55,61%	76,72%	58,93%	71,60%	77,22%	76,10%	71,82%	78,81%	65,92%	79,31%	81,82%	75,00%	84,87%	77,70%	70,00%	77,03%	74,68%
71	69,55%	83,46%	59,18%	79,08%	61,31%	74,03%	78,86%	77,98%	74,03%	80,38%	68,33%	84,48%	81,82%	76,14%	84,87%	78,38%	70,00%	79,73%	75,32%
70	71,36%	84,70%	62,76%	80,77%	61,90%	75,81%	81,07%	79,35%	75,69%	82,51%	70,57%	87,93%	90,91%	77,27%	86,55%	79,05%	80,00%	81,08%	77,22%
Percentage of proposals below threshold (<70)	28,64%	15,30%	37,24%	19,23%	38,10%	24,19%	18,93%	20,65%	24,31%	17,49%	29,43%	12,07%	9,09%	22,73%	13,45%	20,95%	20,00%	18,92%	22,78%

II. Redaction of the proposal

Documents : Part A

- 1.General information (about proposal, including the abstract)
- 2.Administrative data of participating organisations
- 3.Budget
- 4.Ethics
- 5.Call specific questions

Documents : Part B

Document B1 (to be uploaded as a PDF-Document)

1.Excellence

2.Impact

3.Quality and Efficiency of the Implementation

max. 10 pages !!!

Documents : Part B

Document B2 (to be uploaded as a PDF-Document)

4. CV of the experienced researcher (5 pages)
5. Capacities of the participating organisations (1 page each)
6. Ethical aspects
7. Letters of commitment of partner organisation (GF only)

B1. Excellence: p. 1-8

1.1 Quality and credibility of the research/innovation project; level of novelty, appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary and gender aspects: p. 1-6

1.2 Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host: p. 6-7

1.3 Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the institution: p. 7

1.4 Potential of the researcher to reach or re-enforce professional maturity/independence during the fellowship: p. 7-8

B1. Impact: p. 8-9

2.1 Enhancing the future career prospects of the researcher after the fellowship: p. 8

2.2 Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results: p. 8


2.3. Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences: p. 8-9

B1. Quality and Efficiency of the Implementation: p. 9-10

3.1 Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources: p. 9-10

3.2 Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management: p. 9

3.3 Appropriateness of the institutional environment: p. 10



My project

Nation – Power – Subjectivity: The Making of National Subject in Late Medieval Bohemia and Brabant (1300-1450)

An innovative proposal

My research before MCSA:

1. Vernacularisation and Identity in Bohemia (14th c.)
2. Nationhood/nation/national identity and the birth of politics/representation/political communication in the Middle Ages
3. Relationship between the nobility, the bourgeoisie and the King

What is new in my MC proposal:

1. I proposed **a theorization and an archeology** of the nation in the Middle Ages.
2. I address the issue in an original way on **two levels – collective and individual**
3. I **compare** the Kingdom of Bohemia and the Duchy of Brabant
4. **Interdisciplinarity**

My workplan and my Workpackages

- **WP1/** Management and monitoring, **M 1-24**
- **WP2/** Data collection and research update on history of Brabant and Bohemia, **M1-18**
- **WP3/** Theory and application, **M 1-8**
- **WP4/** Data processing (Hyperbase), **M 1-20**
- **WP5/** Scientific dissemination I: Conferences, **M 3-17**
- **WP6/** Scientific dissemination II: Publications, **M 4-24**
- **WP7/** Public outreach, **M 1-24**

Gantt chart

<u>w</u> <u>p</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
1	M1.1 M1.2					D1. 1						D1. .2						D1. 3						D1.4
2			D2. .1	M 2.1					D2. .2									M2. 2						
3			D3. .1			D3. 2		M 3																
4				D4. .1			D4. .2		D4. .3										M4					
5			D5. .1		D5. .2	D5. 3	D5. .4	D5. .5				D5. .6			M 5		D5. .7							
6				M 6.1							D6. 1								D6.2		D6.3			M6. 2
7	M7					D7. 1						D7. .2	D7. .3		D7. .4			D7. 5						

General presentation of the WP

WP2 and **WP4** will be conducted simultaneously. The completion of the lexicometric analysis (**M4**, month 19) is conditional on the completion of the data collection (**M2.2**, month 18). The definition of the corpus (**M2.1**, month 4) will constitute a crucial milestone. A specialist in Czech history, the ER has already collected some primary sources of the Czech corpus and will be able to process some data at the very beginning of the project. The main goal will be to concentrate on the Brabantian corpus. As the project has a strong theoretical component, the entire **WP3** is dedicated to this aspect. On the basis of theoretical readings, the objective will be to construct models concerning the linguistic and socio-political situations (**M3**, month 8) to allow the interpretation of the data. Dissemination of results among peers will be divided in two **WPs**: conferences (**WP5**) and publications (**WP6**). The ER will participate in 2 international conferences (**D5.2**, **D5.4**, months 5, 8), organise a national workshop (**D5.3**, month 7), two sessions at Leeds IMC 2021 (**D5.5**, month 15), as well as an international conference (**M5**, month 15) which will be prepared in advance (call for paper, etc.) (**D5.1**, month 3). **WP6**, concerns mainly the preparation of drafts of the monograph (**D6.4**, month 24), and the publication of two articles in peer-reviewed journals (**D6.1**, **D6.2**, months 11, 19), the collection and preparation of the collective volume gathering the proceedings of the international conference (**D6.3**, month 21), as well as the preparation of texts for the website (**M6**), to be launched in month 4. Knowledge gained during research will be immediately shared with a broader audience: a Facebook page will be created at the beginning of the action (**M7**, month 1). This will be regularly updated throughout the entire duration of the action. The conference/debate (**D7.5**) and the international conference (**M5**), scheduled to be organised concurrently, will be one of the main highlights of the action. To reach an even wider audience the ER will participate in two radio programmes (**D7.1**, **D7.2**, months 6, 12) and publish two articles (**D7.3**, **D7.4**, months 13, 16).

III. Evaluation

Evaluation Criteria

- 1.Excellence (50%)
- 2.Impact (30%)
- 3.Quality and Efficiency of the Implementation (20%)

2. IF - Marie Skłodowska-Curie Action: Individual Fellowships

Excellence	Impact	Implementation
Quality, innovative aspects and credibility of the research (including inter/multidisciplinary aspects)	Enhancing research- and innovation-related human resources, skills and working conditions to realise the potential of individuals and to provide new career perspectives	Overall coherence and effectiveness of the work including appropriateness allocation of tasks and res
Clarity and quality of transfer of knowledge/training for the development of researcher in light of the research objectives	Effectiveness of the proposed measures for communication and results dissemination	Appropriateness of management structures: procedures, including quality management and risk management
Quality of the supervision and the hosting arrangements		Appropriateness of institutional environment (infrastructure)
Capacity of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity in research		Competences, experience, complementarity of the participating organisation institutional commitment
50%	30%	20%
Weighting		
1	2	3
Priority in case of <i>ex aequo</i>		

My results

95,8/100

Excellence: **4,70**

Impact: **5**

Implementation: **4,70**

1/ Excellence

Strengths

- Quality of the research project and methodology
- Interdisciplinarity
- Quality of the supervisor
- Independance of the researcher
- Training offered in new technology (lexicometry)

Weaknesses

- The state of the art and theoretical introduction fails to address at sufficient level of detail modern theoretical approaches.
- The terminology used in the proposal is not always entirely coherent.

2/ Impact

- expertise in new methodologies (lexicometry)
- The researcher's plan to use the project as a basis for improving their position on the job market is convincing.
- The dissemination methods are mostly **traditional but wholly appropriate** to the project. The plan to submit articles in respected journals is **realistic** in view of the research topic.
- The dissemination activities are **properly planned and integrated into the work plan displayed in the Gantt Chart**.
- The dissemination among the non-scholarly audience includes mostly internet tools. The activities are well-specified, well-balanced and suitable for communicating this kind of research.

3/ Implementation

Strengths

- The work planning and resources are logical, appropriate and balanced.
- The Gantt chart is detailed and covers well all the planned activities.
- The management of the host institution is suitable to supporting the researcher: the management structure is very well described.
- The active contribution of the host institution and the training process is clearly and sufficiently described in the proposal.

Weakness

- **Possible risks** are not stated in full detail and the researcher does not appear sufficiently aware, or does not mention them sufficiently, of all the possible difficulties which could endanger the research during the project.

General tips in conclusion ...

- Your project should be innovative, but realistic
- Discuss your project with your supervisor and colleagues
- Read successful proposal to get some inspiration
- Prepare your text with care: high-quality written language is greatly appreciated. Ask a native speaker (better when also a specialist in your field) to read and correct your proposal
- All parts of the application are important, but you should pay special attention to the scientific project

Thank you for your attention ...