|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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 vocational education and training and addresses target group(s) relevant for this action, i.e. VET staff and learners. |  | **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 and objectives of the participating organisations and of the individual participants in the field of VET. Participating organisations, including intermediary organisations, are active contributors to the field of VET and/or to establishing links between VET and the world of work. |
| The extent to which the proposal integrates long-term mobility (ErasmusPro) | The extent to which the proposal includes feasible ErasmusPro activities (mobilities of duration of longer than three months with an emphasis on work-based learning). In line with the general principle of proportionality, the integration of ErasmusPro activities should be proportional to the overall size of the requested project grant and the operational capacity of involved organisations. |
| The extent to which the proposal is suitable to producing high-quality learning outcomes for participants | The expected learning outcomes of the participants are clearly explained and in line with the identified needs of the VET staff and/or learners. The proposal provides VET staff with appropriate training opportunities in view of developing their professional knowledge, skills and competences. And/or: The proposal provides learners with appropriate opportunities in view of acquiring knowledge and skills for their personal development and employability. |
| The extent to which the proposal is suitable to reinforcing the capacities and international scope of the participating organisations | The proposal clearly supports the participating organisations in strengthening their capacity and ability to successfully cooperate with international partners in the field of VET. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 designed in order for the project to realise its objectives. The programme of activities is clearly defined, comprehensive and realistic. The project contains a clear and well-planned timetable. The proposal foresees a clear method and regular and concrete activities to monitor progress and address any problems encountered.  |  | **40** |  |
| The clarity of planning and feasibility of implementation of long-term mobility (ErasmusPro), if applicable | If ErasmusPro activities have been proposed and approved by the assessor, the extent to which the application shows that realistic timetable and good planning has been established for all the phases of ErasmusPro activities. The proposal clearly describes which concrete activities to monitor progress of ErasmusPro mobilities and address any problems encountered. The timing and methodology for these monitoring activities are appropriate to ensure good quality outcomes for ErasmusPro activities. |
| The consistency between project objectives and activities proposed | The proposed activities are appropriate for achieving the objectives of the project. The proposed activities are appropriate to address the identified needs of the organisations and participants involved in the project. The type, number and duration of mobility activities applied for are appropriate, realistic and match the capacity of the participating organisations. The project provides good value for money.  |
| The quality of the practical arrangements, management and support modalities | The proposal demonstrates that efficient measures are put in place and appropriate resources allocated by the participating organisations to ensure high quality mobility activities. If applicable, the role and added value of the intermediary organisation is clearly described and relevant. |
| 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 pedagogic 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 shows that the learning outcomes of the participants will be appropriately recognised or validated.Where possible, European recognition tool - ECVET or Europass - will be used. Note: This criterion will carry higher than average influence on the assessment score in case the project proposes ErasmusPro activities. |
| The appropriateness of measures for selecting and/or involving participants in the mobility activities | The proposal clearly defines the criteria on the basis of which each organisation will select learners/staff to participate in mobility activities. The criteria are fair and transparent and allow for selecting individuals whom the project aims to address and with a high potential of achieving the intended learning outcomes. |
| If applicable, the quality of cooperation and communication between the participating organisations, as well as with other relevant stakeholders | The proposal shows that appropriate cooperation arrangements are established between the participating organisations. It indicates appropriate channels for communication between the participating organisations. The proposal shows that the distribution of responsibilities and tasks of all participating organisations is balanced. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 for evaluating the outcomes of the project, in particular the quality of the learning outcomes of mobility activities 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** |  |
| The potential impact of the project on participants and participating organisations during and after the project lifetime | The project is likely to have a substantial positive impact on the participating organisations and participants. The proposal describes the measures that will be taken to ensure lasting effects of the project, including after the end of the project. If the project foresees mobility of VET staff, it will benefit learners of the sending organisations in the long-term perspective. |
| The potential impact of the project outside the organisations and individuals directly participating in the project, at local, regional, national and/or European levels | The project is likely to benefit individuals and organisations other than those directly participating in the project. Relevant potential beneficiary organisations and individuals are identified in the proposal.  |
| 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 for the dissemination of the project results, concretely describes the dissemination activities and identifies the right target group(s) of these activities. The proposal includes proactive measures that will be taken to reach out to these target groups. |
| The extent to which the project promotes long-term mobility (ErasmusPro) by developing sustainable cross-border cooperation and recognition structures, if applicable. | The proposal describes potential for the involved organisations to move towards more sustainable cooperation beyond the funding period of this project, based on the experience gained through organising ErasmusPro activities and recognition of learning outcomes. |

|  |
| --- |
| **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]** |