

In this briefing sheet, detail is provided on the expectations of NA staff, and others, in relation to the assessment comments prepared and submitted by experts. On pages 2-4, examples are also provided.

Introduction

Mobility applications requesting a grant of ≤ €60,000 and applications from holders of the VET Mobility Charter are required to be assessed by only one expert (internal or external) in what is called the INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT phase.

Mobility applications requesting > €60,000 (where the applicant does not hold a VET Mobility Charter) are required to be assessed, separately, by at least two experts (internal or external) during the INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT phase. In such cases, checks can be made by NA staff - those not involved in assessment - to ensure that experts have understood the need to provide assessments that are coherent, comprehensive and consistent. Where two experts are involved, experts are required to bring together their scores and comments during a CONSOLIDATION phase. Consolidation activity can take place onsite or offsite but ultimately involves internal or external experts sharing and discussing thoughts and opinions, as contained in their individual assessments, with a view to agreeing on a single consolidation document in which common and consolidated scores and comments are provided (i.e. not simply the average of the two).

In all cases, staff at the National Agency (NA) are responsible for ensuring that assessments meet minimum standards: ensuring that each assessment is Coherent, Comprehensive, Consistent, Courteous and Concise (the Five Cs):

Coherent	Comprehensive	Consistent	Courteous	Concise
comments should be easy to understand (even for a reader that has not read the application) and should provide feedback that the applicant will understand and can learn from	comments should be provided for each of the award criteria and should incorporate most, if not all, of the composite elements	comments should be consistent with the scores that have been awarded for each criterion and should be aligned with the predefined scoring bands for each action	comments should always be polite and respectful, and should avoid first person reference (e.g. I think that...)	whilst exceptions exist, comments should be of a standard size, as determined by the NA (e.g. 1-2 paragraphs per criterion); experts should avoid repeating that which is written in the application

NA staff must ensure that final assessment data (scores and comments) is able to be used to inform the National Selection Committee and to provide feedback to individual applicants. Consequently, NA staff might request that experts revisit or revise an assessment where the Five Cs are not satisfactorily met. However, in no situation should NA staff propose changes to the scores attributed by experts, asking instead that experts, themselves, ensure consistency between scores and comments.



Key Action 1:
Individual Mobility

ASSESSMENT
COMMENTS

Briefing Sheet
Page 1

Example Comments: Positive Assessment

☞ RELEVANCE

The project provides a **convincing outline** of the planned staff mobility action and is **wholly relevant** to the selected field of School Education. Mobility plans centre, **appropriately**, on three distinct actions (planning; delivery; evaluation and promotion) and expect to involve a total of 12 school staff (out of 100) in training and observation activities, with management, administrative and teaching professionals expected to be equally involved.

Development needs are **clearly stated** and form part of an institutional development strategy (European Development Plan) which encompasses a broader range of goals and actions to which planned mobilities will **positively contribute**. It is also **clear** to see how the project will contribute to broader European mobility goals centred on the professional development of staff working in education and training. Learning outcomes are to be developed, in detail, in phase one of the project yet it is **assuring** to see examples of these already provided at the application stage. Institutional capacity building is inherent to overall mobility plans which is **encouraging**.

☞ QUALITY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN

Clear planning, selection, delivery, evaluation and promotion activities are planned, with each **providing the required level of detail** at the application stage. The type, number and duration of mobilities is **not excessive** yet ought to allow the required capacity-building among participants: in this respect, it is **positive to see** that different programmes (and durations) are planned for teaching staff and management/support staff.

Internal resources are **adequately detailed** and programme delivery **will build positively** on past mobility experiences, including in terms of hosting visiting teaching staff. A short induction plan **covers all expected needs**, and **positively includes** a session on cultural immersion. Learning outcomes will be developed for each of the two groups and ultimate participation and achievement **expects to be recognised** as a part of existing staff review and progression practices for all participants. Transnational collaboration and communication is **convincingly described** and builds on past mobility successes.

Key Action 1:
Individual Mobility

ASSESSMENT
COMMENTS

☞ IMPACT AND DISSEMINATION

Evaluation mechanisms are **clear and appropriately extend** to both visiting and hosting staff and schools. **Positive** are plans to reflect on learning and achievement - and on the use of this within school management and teaching delivery - as a part of staff review and progression meetings.

In the short-term, impact is limited to those participating, yet it is **encouraging to see** involvement from teaching and non-teaching staff. Longer-term impact goals centre, **suitably**, on the continued marketing of mobility successes both within and beyond the applicant school. **Noteworthy** are plans for the direct involvement of mobility participants in all such (internal and external) promotional actions.

Wider dissemination plans centre **appropriately** on informing wider stakeholders and multipliers, in each of the participating regions (sending and receiving) and on the use of existing online platforms for marketing confirmed mobility successes.

Example Comments: Less Positive Assessment

☞ RELEVANCE

Whilst commenting on the perceived importance of staff mobility, the project **fails to align** this with any institutional development goals or strategies (i.e. European Development Plan) making it **difficult to envisage** how plans for staff mobility will impact positively on teaching delivery in the longer term. As a whole, the level of detail provided in the application is **limited** and there is **no direct reference** to any of the programme or action goals or objectives.

Development needs are **not clearly stated** and there is no reference to the targeted learning (or learning outcomes) for participating staff. Whilst true that there is a planning stage foreseen in the early months of the project, **greater insight is needed** at the point of application with a view to confirming the relevance of that which is planned.

Institutional capacity building **needs to be better considered** and aligned with all plans for mobility.

Key Action 1:
Individual Mobility

ASSESSMENT
COMMENTS

☞ QUALITY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN

Whilst it might be positive to have a single vision for European mobility, through involving the “whole cohort” of 24 teaching staff, it is important to confirm whether all staff will participate at the same time and for the same duration (currently not clear) and, if so, how this expects to impact on continued teaching delivery at the school.

Much of the required planning is foreseen to take place in the early months of the project yet without greater detail, at the point of application, it is difficult to confirm the potential for successful programme delivery. In particular, there is a need for additional detail on the programme and type of activities that staff will follow, the programme duration, the related learning outcomes, and the importance of these learning outcomes for improving and enhancing future teaching delivery.

Course preparation plans also need further explanation, including in terms of cultural and linguistic preparation, as do plans for evaluating and recognising the participation of teaching staff.

Use of the eTwinning platform to identify (one or more) suitable hosts is positive.

☞ IMPACT AND DISSEMINATION

Whilst there exists a broader commitment to evaluating programme successes, there is insufficient detail provided in terms of when and how this might take place, and who might be involved.

Impact potential is not well argued with a need for greater explanation of the targeted learning outcomes, confirming how their achievement might impact on individual and institutional development goals and strategies.

Positive are plans to make use of existing promotional networks, and platforms, in the applicant region yet it would be useful to also know target numbers (individuals, organisations) for all such activities.