|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 Consortium** | Relevance to the objectives of the selected action (and field). | Proposal corresponds to objectives of the mobility action. Proposal falls clearly within the scope of, and addresses target groups relevant to, the selected field. |  | | **30** |  |
| Relevance to the needs and objectives of participating organisations and (expected) individual participants. | Proposal clearly identifies, specifies and addresses needs and objectives within participating organisations and among target participants. |
| Extent to which the (consortium) proposal is suitable for producing high-quality learning outcomes for participants. | Proposal clearly states the expected learning outcomes of (future mobility) participants and relates these to clearly identified needs. The consortium centres on the provision of training and study opportunities for developing the professional knowledge, skills and competences of staff and students. |
| Extent to which the (consortium) proposal is suitable for reinforcing the capacities and international scope of participating organisations. | Proposal clearly supports participating organisations in strengthening capacity and in their ability to successfully cooperate with international partners in the field of higher education. |
| Extent to which the (consortium) proposal brings forth added-value through results that would not be provided by activities carried out in a single HEI. | Proposal confirms the added-value that the consortium brings forth, highlighting results that would not be attained by mobility activities led by a single HEI. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Award Criteria** | **Elements for Analysis** | **Interpretation of award criteria and Elements for Analysis** | **Expert Comments** | **Maximum score** | **Expert Score** |
| **Quality of the Consortium Composition and the Cooperation Arrangements** | Appropriate composition. | Consortium involves an appropriate composition of sending HEIs as well as complementary participation from organisations in other socio-economic sectors, where relevant, bringing forth the necessary profile, experience and expertise to successfully deliver all aspects of the project. |  | **20** |  |
| Adequate management experience. | Extent to which the coordinator of the Consortium has previous experience in managing a consortium or a similar project type. |
| Distribution of tasks and responsibilities. | Distribution of roles, responsibilities, tasks and resources is clear and well defined and demonstrates the commitment and active contribution of all participating organisations. Tasks and resources are pooled and shared. |
| Clear financial and management responsibilities. | Clear responsibilities in terms of contractual and financial management. |
| Involvement of newcomers. | Involves newcomers (i.e. those not having previously participated in mobility in the field of HE). |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 all mobility project phases (preparation, implementation of mobility activities, follow-up). | Proposal confirms that all mobility phases are properly designed (including in terms of monitoring and problem resolution) to allow for the successful delivery of future mobility. |  | **20** |  |
| Quality of practical, management and support arrangements. | Proposal demonstrates efficient measures and appropriate resources to ensure high quality mobility with practical arrangements clearly outlined. |
| Quality of cooperation and communication between the participating organisations as well as with other stakeholders. | Proposal confirms adequate cooperation arrangements and appropriate channels for communication among participating organisations, alongside an appropriate distribution of tasks and responsibilities. |
| Where relevant: quality of arrangements for the recognition and validation of learning outcomes. | Proposal confirms that participants’ learning outcomes will be appropriately recognised or validated, where relevant, through the use of existing European tools and instruments supporting recognition and transparency (e.g. ECTS). |
| If applicable: appropriateness of measures for selecting and involving participants in mobility activities. | Proposal defines fair and transparent criteria against which each organisation will select participants for mobility activities and for promoting the participation of disadvantaged persons in HE mobility actions. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 activities led by the consortium. | Proposal includes adequate activities for evaluating project outcomes, in particular the quality of mobility-oriented learning outcomes and the effectiveness of support measures put in place by the participating organisations, as well as the outcomes of the project as a whole. |  | **30** |  |
| Potential impact on participants and participating organisations both during and beyond the project (consortium) lifetime. | Consortium is likely to have a substantial and positive impact on the participating organisations and on future mobility participants. Proposal describes measures that will be taken to ensure lasting effects, including beyond the project (consoritum) lifetime. |
| Potential impact at local, regional, national and/or European levels (beyond those organisations and individuals directly participating in the consortium). | Consortium is likely to benefit individuals and organisations other than those directly participating, with relevant potential beneficiaries (individuals and organisations) identified in the proposal. |
| Appropriateness and quality of measures aimed at disseminating the outcomes of activities led by the cnosortium, within and beyond the participating organisations and partners. | Proposal includes a clear and convincing plan for the dissemination of results tied to activites led by the consortium, describing planned activities and identifying relevant target audiences and multipliers. Proposal confirms measures or approaches that will be used to reach out to identified target groups / target audiences. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 Consortium (goals, actors, 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 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]** |