|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proportionality Principle:** in order to ensure a fair assessment of all applications, experts shall take due account of the size of the project and the experience of the participating organisations; the quality of each application shall thus be assessed for all award criteria considering this proportionality principle. | | | | **Project Number:** |  | |
| **Name of Expert:** |  | |
| *Note: this is only a working version of the assessment form; final comments and scores must be entered into the Online Expert Evaluation Tool (OEET):* [*https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/assessment/roundlist.do*](https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/assessment/roundlist.do) | | | | | | |
| **Award Criteria** | **Elements for Analysis** | **Interpretation of award criteria and Elements for Analysis** | **Expert Comments** | | **Maximum score** | **Expert Score** |
| **Relevance of the Project** | The relevance of the proposal to the objectives and priorities of the Action | The proposal corresponds to the objectives and the format of the Action, as well as to the priorities of the field as described in Part B and Annex I of the Programme Guide. The application clearly falls within the scope of school education and addresses target group(s) relevant for this action, i.e. school staff. Staff mobility should particularly enhance the professional skills and competences of school staff, for example:   * improve their abilities to respond to individual learners' needs and to deal with their social, cultural and linguistic diversity; * contribute to develop new and better teaching methods and innovative approaches to learning; * improve the skills and competences of those managing and leading schools; * promote the formal recognition of skills and competences acquired through professional development activities abroad; * to be able to develop a European dimension in school education. |  | | **30** |  |
| The relevance of the proposal to the needs and objectives of the participating organisations and of the individual participants | The proposal identifies and addresses clearly specified needs of the applicant school in terms of professional development of staff. It also describes how the project will be aligned with the profile of the school education staff who are to be selected. |
| The extent to which the proposal is suitable for producing high-quality learning outcomes for participants | The expected learning outcomes are clearly explained and in line with the identified needs of school education staff. The planned activities are likely to produce the envisaged learning outcomes. |
| The extent to which the proposal is suitable for reinforcing the capacities and international scope of the participating organisations | The proposal explains the current or planned involvement of the sending school in other international activities and the place of the mobility project in this context. The mobility project should ideally be a start, continuation or follow-up of other international activities. If the project includes partner organisations abroad, the proposal supports the sending school in strengthening its capacity and ability to successfully cooperate with international partners in the field of school education. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Award Criteria** | **Elements for Analysis** | **Interpretation of award criteria and Elements for Analysis** | **Expert Comments** | **Maximum score** | **Expert Score** |
| **Quality of Project Design** | The clarity, completeness and quality of all the phases of the project proposal (preparation, implementation of mobility activities, and follow-up) | The proposal shows that all the phases of the project have been properly developed in order for the project to realise its objectives. It contains a clear and well-planned timetable. The sending school will ensure good preparation of the project implementation in cooperation with the receiving organisation and with the participants. The programme of activities is clearly defined, comprehensive and realistic. The proposal includes a clear method and regular and concrete activities to monitor progress and address any problems encountered. |  | **40** |  |
| The consistency between project objectives and proposed activities | The proposed activities are appropriate for achieving the objectives of the project. The type, number and duration of mobility activities are appropriate, realistic and match the capacity of the participating organisations. The project provides good value for money. |
| The quality of the European Development Plan of the applicant organisation | The European Development Plan provides information on:   * the needs of the school in terms of quality development and internationalisation (e.g. as regards management competences, staff competences, new teaching methods or tools, European dimension, language competences, curriculum, organisation of teaching and learning, reinforcing links with partner institutions) and how the planned activities will contribute to meeting these needs; * the impact expected on the pupils, teachers and other staff, and on the school overall; * how the school will integrate the competences and experiences the staff will acquire through their mobilities into the curriculum and/or the school's development plan, * if and how the school intends to use eTwinning and/or School Education Gateway in connection with the planned mobility activities. |
| The appropriateness of measures for selecting and/or involving participants in the mobility activities | The proposal clearly shows that the school intends to organise an open, just and transparent process for selection of staff to participate in mobility activities. The criteria for selection are clearly defined and ensure that the selected staff have the relevant profile. |
| The quality of the practical arrangements, management and support modalities | The roles of all actors (sending and – if identified in the application - receiving organisation as well as the participants) are clearly defined. The proposal includes a well-developed approach for how to deal with practical arrangements (venue, transfers, accommodation, etc.). The proposal explains how the sending school intends to support the participants before, during and after the mobility. |
| In case of national mobility consortia: appropriateness of the consortium composition, potential for synergies within the consortium, and the capacity of the coordinator to lead the project. | The proposal clearly explains the reasons and added value of the joint consortium application (for example: involving schools that otherwise could not participate in the Programme, enhancing the dissemination and impact of project results, better aligning the project activities with school policy, etc.). The proposal explains the capacities, competences and experience of the coordinator relevant for taking the lead role in the consortium. |
| The quality of the preparation provided to participants | The proposal shows that participants will receive good quality preparation before their mobility activity, including linguistic, cultural and/or pedagogical preparation as necessary. |
| The quality of arrangements for the recognition and validation of participants' learning outcomes, as well as the consistent use of European transparency and recognition tools. | The proposal describes concrete and appropriate ways in which the sending school intends to recognise and validate the competences gained during the mobility. Where possible, European recognition tools are used.  Recommended EU recognition tool for school education staff: Europass. |
| **Award Criteria** | **Elements for Analysis** | **Interpretation of award criteria and Elements for Analysis** | **Expert Comments** | **Maximum score** | **Expert Score** |
| **Impact and Dissemination** | The quality of measures for evaluating the outcomes of the project | The proposal includes adequate activities to evaluate the outcomes of individual mobilities and of the project as a whole. The evaluation will address whether the expected outcomes of the project have been realised and whether the expectations of the sending schools and participants have been met. |  | **30** |  |
| The potential impact of the project:   * + on participants and participating organisations during and after the project lifetime;   + outside the organisations and individuals directly participating in the project, at local, regional, national and/or European levels. | The project is likely to have a substantial positive impact on the participants' competences and future professional practice but also on the sending and, if relevant, receiving organisation. The project will contribute to developing a European dimension in the participating schools.  The project includes relevant measures to have a longer-term multiplier effect and sustainable impact both within and, if relevant, outside the sending school (e.g. in other schools or in the community). In the long-term perspective, the project will benefit learners of the participating schools. The project results will be incorporated in the management and/or pedagogical/curricular framework and practice of the sending school. |
| The appropriateness and quality of measures aimed at disseminating the outcomes of the project within and outside the participating organisations | The proposal includes a clear and good quality plan to disseminate the results of the mobility project within and outside the participating organisation(s). It describes the chosen methods and channels, and identifies target groups and multipliers (e.g. teachers of the same subject within the school but also with the community, local school authorities, teachers associations, educational magazines, online professional groups, regional/national events for teachers).  Dissemination includes the transfer of competences acquired during the mobility, and actively involves the participant. If applicable, the project makes use of eTwinning and/or School Education Gateway to disseminate project results, in addition to use of the Erasmus+ Project Results Platform. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall Comments for the Applicant** | |
| [add summative assessment comments FOR THE APPLICANT, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the application] | |
| **General Comments to the National Agency** | |
| [add a short description of the planned mobilities (goals, duration, participants, etc.) as well as any other comments for the NA] | |
| **Budget Comments to the National Agency** | |
| [add comments FOR THE NA related to proposed grant reductions referring to specific areas of expenditure or mobility flows and providing clear justification for the proposed reductions] | |
| **Total Score:** |  |

**The table below is to be used only during the CONSOLIDATION PHASE (i.e. where quality assessment involves more than one expert):**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Expert** | **Relevance** | **Quality of Project Design** | **Impact and Dissemination** | **Total Score (out of 100)** |
| [add name of expert 1] | [add original score] | [add original score] | [add original score] | [add original score] |
| [add name of expert 2] | [add original score] | [add original score] | [add original score] | [add original score] |
| [add name of expert 3] *where applicable* | [add original score] | [add original score] | [add original score] | [add original score] |
| **Consolidated Scores:** | **[add consolidated score]** | **[add consolidated score]** | **[add consolidated score]** | **[add consolidated score]** |