|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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:**  |  |
| **Field specifics:** experts should additionally refer to the “Criteria Briefing Sheets” where additional interpretations of the award criteria and sub-elements are provided for specific fields. | **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** | Relevance of the proposal to the objectives and the priorities of the action | Project addresses in a qualitative way the objectives and the priorities of the action. Project addresses at least one of the horizontal or field-specific priorities of the action, as indicated in the Programme Guide. If addressing a horizontal priority, it must clearly prove impact in the field under which the application is presented. If addressing the horizontal priority for "inclusive education, training and youth", it is considered as highly relevant. If addressing one or more European Priorities in a national context (as previously published by the NA), it is also considered highly relevant. |  | **30** |  |
| Extent to which the proposal is based on a genuine and adequate needs analysis | Proposal proves that a solid analysis (drawing on existing knowledge, know-how and practice) has been carried out to identify needs of the target group(s) and organisations. Identified needs are relevant for the field and are clearly linked to those selected priorities. |
| Extent to which the objectives are clearly defined, realistic and address issues relevant to the participating organisations and target groups | Project objectives are clearly stated and can be achieved taking into account the nature and experience of the partnership. Proposal identifies, and adequately addresses, clearly-specified needs for specific project target groups. |
| Extent to which the proposal is suitable of realising synergies between different fields of education, training and youth  | Project is likely to produce outcomes that may be relevant for other fields of education, training and youth (i.e. other than the field that is expected to be most impacted by the project). |
| Extent to which the proposal is innovative and/or complementary to other initiatives and projects already carried out by the participating organisations | Project is likely to produce results that will be innovative for the field, or for the geographical context in which the project is implemented: innovation can relate to the content of outputs, to working methods and/or to persons/organisations involved or targeted. The project will add to the existing knowledge, know-how and/or practices of the participating persons and organisations. Where based on a past project or existing content, the project demonstrates significant added value compared to that which exists or in terms of new target groups, activities or geographical reach and contributes to improving the quality of teaching/training/learning in the participating countries. Relationship between the participating organisations and initial developer are transparent and respect existing rights. Proposed innovation or complementarity is proportional to the scale of the project, the experience of the participating organisations and the potential of the target groups - the latter especially important where targetting the incusion of staff or learners with special needs or fewer opportunities. |
| Extent to which the proposal brings added value at EU level through results that would not be attained by activities carried out in a single country. | Transnational dimension clearly adds value to outcomes; participating organisations are able to achieve results that would not be reached by organisations from a single country.  |
| **Award Criteria** | **Elements for Analysis** | **Interpretation of award criteria and Elements for Analysis** | **Expert Comments** | **Maximum score** | **Expert Score** |
| **Quality of Project Design** | Clarity, completeness and quality of the work programme, including appropriate phases for preparation, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and dissemination | Proposal shows that all phases of the project have been properly designed for realising the project objectives. Work programme is clearly defined, comprehensive and realistic. Project contains a clear and well-planned timetable. |  | **20** |  |
| Consistency between project objectives and activities proposed | Proposed activities are well suited to address the identified needs and reach the objectives that were set for the project.  |
| Quality and feasibility of the proposed methodology | Proposed methodology is realistic and appropriate for producing the expected results. Methodology builds on solid arguments/evidence basis and takes account of existing knowledge and practice. |
| Existence and relevance of quality control measures to ensure that the project implementation is of high quality, completed in time and on budget | Proposal foresees appropriate evaluation activities at critical stages of the project, which will allow measurement of progress and the quality of the project activities and outcomes, as well as the appropriate use of funds. Quality control measures will allow the project to take any necessary corrective measures, in time. |
| Extent to which the project is cost-effective and allocates appropriate resources to each activity | Proposal provides value-for-money when considering results planned compared to the grant requested. Grant request is realistic for a good quality implementation of the planned activities. Where relevant, project budget includes appropriate financial support to allow staff or young people with special needs or fewer opportunities, to participate fully and on equal footing with other staff and participants (e.g. through special needs' funding, exceptional costs, other sources). |
| Where transnational learning, teaching or training activities are planned:extent to which these activities are appropriate to the project's aims and involve the appropriate number of participants | Where transnational learning, teaching or training activities are planned: these contribute directly to the objectives of the project and are strongly embedded in the project logic as a whole. Proposal proves that the learning, teaching or training activities in a specific field are embedded in a coherent package of activities. Learning, teaching or training activities are of the appropriate volume, bring added-value and will have a direct impact on the achievement of the project results.Learning, teaching or training activities are well conceived (i.e. the proposal demonstrates good quality management, support and practical arrangements, selection and preparation of participants, training, teaching or learning agreements, monitoring of teaching, training or learning activities, ensuring the safety of participants).  |
| Where transnational learning, teaching or training activities are planned:quality of arrangements for recognition and validation of participants' learning outcomes, in line with European transparency and recognition tools and principles | Where transnational learning, teaching or training activities are planned: relevant transparency and recognition tools and/or policy approaches developed in the framework of policy cooperation at European level will be used for recognising and validating the learning outcomes of participants, such as: European/national qualifications frameworks; the European framework of key competences and European guidelines for the validation of non-formal and informal learning. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Award Criteria** | **Elements for Analysis** | **Interpretation of award criteria and Elements for Analysis** | **Expert Comments** | **Maximum score** | **Expert Score** |
| **Quality of Project Team and Cooperation Arrangements** | Extent to which the project involves an appropriate mix of complementary participating organisations with the necessary profile, experience and expertise to successfully deliver all aspects of the project  | Taking into account the nature of the project and its expected impact, participating organisations have the skills and competences required to ensure that the work programme can be implemented efficiently, effectively and professionally. Proposal concretely identifies which skills, experiences, expertise and management support each of the participating organisations will make available to implement all aspects of the project proposed. Proposal shows that the participating organisations have established and will run a cohesive consortium with active involvement of all partners and with common goals to be achieved. In this respect, the following factors should be taken into consideration during assessment: level of networking, cooperation and commitment of each participating organisation in the project; profile and background of participating organisations when the nature or target of the activity would necessitate the possession of certain qualifications; capacity of the consortium to ensure effective implementation, follow-up and dissemination of the results achieved through the project; in the case of inclusion projects, the capacity and expertise of the consortium to support (where needed) the participation of staff or learners with special needs or fewer opportunities. |  | **20** |  |
| Extent to which the distribution of responsibilities and tasks demonstrates the commitment and active contribution of all participating organisations  | Clear and commonly agreed definition and an appropriate distribution of roles and tasks and a balanced participation and input of the participating organisations in the implementation of the work programme, taking into account the complementary competencies, the nature of the activities and the know-how of the partners involved. |
| Where relevant: extent to which the project involves participation of organisations from different fields of education, training, youth and other socio-economic sectors | Where necessary for the project's success to use expertise from different fields, and/or the project intends to impact more than one field of education, training and youth, relevant organisations of all concerned fields participate in the project. Proposal demonstrates, convincingly, why the participation of organisations from different fields of education, training, youth and/or other socio-economic sectors is best suited to producing outputs that respond to identified needs. |
| Extent to which the project involves newcomers to the Action | Proposal includes one or more participating organisations that are newcomers to this action and on which the impact expected from the participation in the project would be particularly high. |
| Existence of effective mechanisms for coordination and communication between the participating organisations, as well as with other relevant stakeholders | Methods of project coordination and means of communication are clearly described in the proposal and are appropriate to ensure good cooperation between the participating organisations. |
| Where applicable: the extent to which the involvement of a participating organisation from a Partner Country brings an essential added value to the project (if this condition is not fulfilled, the project will not be considered for selection) | Participation of organisations from Partner Countries provides genuine added-value to the project because of the specific skills, experiences or expertise that these organisations bring to the project and that prove to be essential for achievement of the objectives and/or to ensure a significantly higher quality of project outputs. Where the proposal does not provide convincing evidence of such added-value, it must be scored as Weak (0-9 points) under this criterion. |
| **Award Criteria** | **Elements for Analysis** | **Interpretation of award criteria and Elements for Analysis** | **Expert Comments** | **Maximum score** | **Expert Score** |
| **Impact and Dissemination** | Quality of measures for evaluating the outcomes of the project | Evaluation methods proposed will make it possible to assess effectively whether and to which extent the project is producing the intended outcomes.  |  | **30** |  |
| Potential impact of the project on participants and participating organisations, during and after the project lifetime | Project is likely to have a substantial positive impact on the participating organisations and on their staff and/or learners. Impact of the project on the involved participants and organisations is likely to occur during and remain after the project lifetime. Pproposal demonstrates which benefits (transnational, interdisciplinary, cross-field) the proposed cooperation brings to partners, also beyond Erasmus+ funding (e.g. how it contributes to the internationalisation strategies of the participating organisations). |
| Potential impact of the project outside the organisations and individuals directly participating in the project, at local, regional, national and/or European levels | Project results have the potential to be transferred and exploited in other European countries. Proposal identifies relevant stakeholders, including policy-makers at the most appropriate level, whether local, regional, national and/or European. Taking due account of the scope and size of the project: it is likely to have a positive impact at local, regional, national and/or European level; it is likely to lead to innovative developments at system level and/or provide useful input to policy developments; it shows potential for scalability and synergies with other Erasmus+ actions and/or other European Programmes. |
| Quality of the dissemination plan: the appropriateness and quality of measures aimed at sharing the outcomes of the project within and outside the participating organisations | Proposal identifies the project results that can be transferred to the relevant target groups. An appropriate and effective set of measures and tools will be used to reach the target groups for dissemination. Planned dissemination and exploitation activities will ensure an optimal use of the results at local, regional, national and/or European level depending on the scope and size of the project. In each of the participating organisations specific and adequate resources are allocated to the dissemination activities. |
| Where relevant: extent to which the proposal describes how the materials, documents and media produced will be made freely available and promoted through open licences, and does not contain disproportionate limitations | Where the project foresees tangible results and deliverables: participating organisations will allow open access to materials, documents and media produced within the project. Where foreseeing limitations to open access, these are not disproportionate and will not significantly affect the dissemination and possible impact of the project. |
| Quality of the plans for ensuring the sustainability of the project: its capacity to continue having an impact and producing results after the EU grant has been used up | Project is placed in a perspective that goes beyond the project period. It plans to achieve a multiplier effect and sustainable impact that are within its reach considering the scope and size of the project. Where relevant for the type of project: results will be integrated in the management / pedagogical framework of the participating organisations and/or participating organisations have the intention and are able to attract external co-funding or other support from diverse sources to ensure sustainability of the project activities and continued use of outputs and results. |

|  |
| --- |
| **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 project (goals, activities, expected outputs and outcomes.) as well as any other comments for the NA] |
| **Budget Comments to the National Agency** |
| [add comments FOR THE NA on proposed grant reductions (where these exist) providing clear justification for the proposed reductions as well as specific details on where exactly the changes need to be applied] |
| **Total Score:**  |  |

**The table below is to be used only during the CONSOLIDATION PHASE, providing an overview of individual and consolidated scores for the different quality assessment criteria and overall:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Expert** | **Relevance** | **Quality of Project Design** | **Quality of Project Team** | **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 original score] |
| [add name of expert 2] | [add original score] | [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] | [add original score] |
| **Consolidated Scores:** | **[add consolidated score]** | **[add consolidated score]** | **[add consolidated score]** | **[add consolidated score]** | **[add consolidated score]** |