|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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 the objectives and the priorities of Key Action 2, as described in the section "what are the aims and priorities of the Strategic Partnership" of the Programme Guide. Specific objectives of the project are linked to the priorities of the Action and have the potential to contribute to their achievement, proportionately to the limited scope and size of this partnership format. Provisions regarding field specific and horizontal priorities, particularly the priority on inclusion and the application of European priorities in a national context, shall apply equally for School Exchange Partnerships as for all other types of Strategic Partnership. |  | **30** |  |
| Extent to which the proposal is based on a genuine and adequate needs analysis | Motivation of individual partner schools to participate in the project and the purpose of the partnership is clearly explained. Proposal links the project's objectives with the goals and/or needs of the participating schools and, where relevant, their staff, learners and communities.  |
| Extent to which the objectives are clearly defined, realistic and address issues relevant to the participating organisations and target groups | Objectives of the project are clear, achievable and proportional to the scope and experience of the partnership. Proposal explains how the project is going to address the needs of the involved schools and lead towards the achievement of their stated goals. |
| Extent to which the proposal is suitable of realising synergies between different fields of education, training and youth  | Project outcomes might be relevant for other fields of education, training and youth in addition to the school education field. **Note: because School Exchange Partnerships is implemented only by schools, projects which are not able to demonstrate synergies with other sectors should not be penalised based on this criterion.** |
| Extent to which the proposal is innovative and/or complementary to other initiatives and projects already carried out by the participating organisations | Proposed activities are complementary to the activities of the involved schools and other projects they have conducted. In relation to the school's usual activities and previous projects (if relevant), implementing the described project is likely to provide the schools and participants with new experiences and add to their knowledge and practices. |
| 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 nature of the project brings clear added-value by enabling the involved schools to achieve results that could not be reached without the involvement of schools from different countries. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | Project activities are well described and planned out. Project timetable sets out a clear and realistic timing for project activities. **Because School Exchange Partnerships are implemented only by schools and have limited scope and budget, project implementation can be described in a simpler way in the application.** |  | **20** |  |
| Consistency between project objectives and activities proposed | Planned activities are appropriate for the achievement of the project's objectives. Where transnational learning, teaching or training activities are proposed, content and expected results are clearly explained and relevant to the project's objectives. |
| Quality and feasibility of the proposed methodology | Proposal explains how the planned activities will lead to the achievement of the project's objectives. Where transnational learning, teaching and training activities are proposed, the methodology is clearly explained and appropriate. **Because School Exchange Partnerships are implemented only by schools and have limited scope and budget, methodology can be described in a simpler way in the application.** |
| Existence and relevance of quality control measures to ensure that the project implementation is of high quality, completed in time and on budget | Proposal defines appropriate mechanisms for project management. Where transnational learning, teaching or training activities are proposed, practical arrangements are appropriate. Responsible persons in each participating school are clearly identified and planning is in place for continued project implementation in case of staff changes. |
| Extent to which the project is cost-effective and allocates appropriate resources to each activity | Proposal provides value-for-money comparing planned results to the grant requested. Where relevant, project budget includes appropriate financial support to allow participants with special needs to participate fully and on equal footing with other staff and participants. However, the project is not obliged to request extra funding for special needs support if applicant deems the unit cost contributions to be sufficient and effective to ensure equal treatment of participants. |
| Where transnational learning, teaching or training activities are proposed: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 proposed: proposal explains how the proposed activities will contribute to the achievement of project objectives and will benefit the involved schools and participants. Expected results are clearly set and are relevant. Proposal clearly explains who are the participants and sets appropriate standards for: selection of participants; preparation and support of participants; ensuring the safety of participants (especially for activities involving pupils). In projects lasting longer than 24m, any additional duration must serve to improve the quality and number of long-term pupil mobilities. **This criterion carries higher than average influence on the assessment score in case long-term study mobility of pupils or long-term teaching assignments are proposed.** |
| Where transnational learning, teaching or training activities are proposed:quality of arrangements for the 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 proposed: benefits of the proposed learning, teaching and training activities for participants are clearly explained in terms of personal development and learning outcomes. Where long-term activities are proposed, mechanisms for learning outcomes; recognition, by the sending school, are clearly defined. **This criterion carries higher-than-average influence on the assessment score in case long-term study mobility of pupils or long-term teaching assignments are proposed.** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 (schools) with the necessary profile, experience and expertise to successfully deliver all aspects of the project  | Proposal clearly explains the reasons for participation of the involved schools and their common interests. The role and contribution of each the participating organisation is clearly described. Proposal demonstrates the capacity of the partnership to ensure effective implementation of the project and follow-up of its results. Where relevant, proposal also demonstrates the capacity of the partnership to support participants 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 definition and appropriate distribution of roles and tasks and a balanced participation of the participating schools in work programme implementation, taking into account the nature of the activities and the experience of the involved partners. |
| Extent to which the project involves newcomers to the Action | Extent to which the proposal involves schools who are newcomers to the Strategic Partnerships action and for whom the participation in the project is expected to have a positive impact. In case the project involves a combination of newcomer and more experienced schools, there is a planning put in place to exchange experiences and provide support to the newcomers. For projects involving larger number of schools, scoring should take into account the proportionality between the number of newcomers and the size of the partnership. **In line with the goal of the School Exchange Partnerships to strengthen the European dimension in the participating schools and to build up their capacity for cross-border cooperation, this carries higher than average influence on the assessment score.**  |
| Existence of effective mechanisms for coordination and communication between the participating organisations, as well as with other relevant stakeholders | Methods for coordination and communication between partners are clearly described and appropriate. Proposal explains if and how eTwinning and/or School Education Gateway will be used to support project implementation. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | Methods proposed to assess to which the extent the project's objectives have been achieved are appropriate and proportional to the scope of the project.  |  | **30** |  |
| Potential impact of the project on participants and participating organisations, during and after the project lifetime | Considering the presented motivation for the project, its objectives and the proposed activities, the project is likely to have a substantial positive impact on the participating organisations, their staff and learners, during and after the project implementation. |
| Potential impact of the project outside the organisations and individuals directly participating in the project, at local, regional, national and/or European levels | If relevant, and in proportion to its size and scope, the proposal identifies the benefits the project will have for groups or organisations not participating in the project. |
| 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 project results that can be disseminated and/or transferred, as well as target groups for dissemination. An appropriate set of measures is proposed to make the project results known within the partnership, in the schools' local communities and in the wider public. Proposal explains if and how eTwinning and/or School Education Gateway will be used to support the dissemination of the project results (in addition to use of the Erasmus+ Project Results Platform). |
| Quality of 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 expected to contribute to the development and internationalisation of the involved schools in the long-term. Proposal sets out realistic and effective planning to continue using the project results or implement relevant activities after the end of the funding period. Proposal explains if and how eTwinning and/or School Education Gateway will be used to support the follow-up of the project. |
| **Note: Because School Exchange Partnerships are implemented only by schools and have limited scope and budget, the assessment of the criterion «Impact and Dissemination» shall pay particular attention to respecting the Proportionality Principle across each of the above-listed elements.** |

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