

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 2-5, examples are also provided.

Introduction

At the final report stage, KA2 Strategic Partnerships having a grant of more than €60,000 are required to involve at least one external expert in final report assessment. Where there are lower levels of funding involved, National Agencies (NAs) can choose whether to involve external or internal experts in final report assessment.

Where an external expert is involved in final report assessment, it is the responsibility of the NA to ensure that an assessment (comments and scores) meets minimum quality standards and that the resultant comments can be used to provide feedback to beneficiaries. NA staff should ensure 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 or the final report.	comments should cover each of the final report assessment criteria and should incorporate all required sub-elements.	comments should be easily aligned with the scores that have been awarded for each criterion and should be within the predefined scoring ranges.	comments should be polite and respectful and should avoid first person references (for example, I think that, I expect that).	whilst exceptions exist, comments should be of a standard size, as determined by NA staff (for example, 1-2 paragraphs).

As a result of reviewing a final report assessment, NA staff might request that experts revisit or revise an assessment where the Five Cs are not satisfactorily met. In no situation, however, should NA staff propose changes to the scores attributed by external experts, asking instead that experts, themselves, ensure consistency between scores and comments.

Regardless of the score given for any individual assessment criterion, experts must assess the final report in full, providing comments for each of the four criteria (Relevance; Quality of Implementation; Quality of Cooperation; Impact and Dissemination) as well as comments on the application as a whole, the latter providing a cumulative analysis of the final report and highlighting the **strengths** and **weaknesses** associated with overall project delivery and associated outputs and outcomes.



Key Action 2:

Strategic Partnerships

Final Report Assessment

ASSESSMENT COMMENTS BRIEFING SHEET

Example Comments: Positive Final Report Assessment

☞ RELEVANCE

Overall project achievements are **wholly in line** with the original objectives of the project, with targets for University-business collaboration **fully achieved** and with notable improvements evident in each of the participating countries and regions.

With limited original ambition for crossover between the different fields of education and training, it is **encouraging** to see plans for wider collaboration, with future networking efforts **positively targeting** all teaching and training professionals working in the delivery of initial and continuing professional development in the targeted (nursing) sector.

Project delivery is **clearly complementary** to existing programme delivery in the four participating higher education institutions and there are **notable benefits** to continued collaboration with local employer networks, as is currently planned. Among the participating professionals, it is also **clear to see the benefits** of participation in the project, most notably in terms of the potential for future career (and learning) progression.

☞ QUALITY OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

All planned activities were **delivered effectively**. The adopted methodology **aligned well** with overall development ambitions in all but one country (Germany) with the use of alternate approaches **convincingly-argued** in this case. Targets for student and learner participation were **met and exceeded** and **appropriate mechanisms** were introduced to measure learning achievement. The division of management and monitoring tasks, across two institutions in the coordinating country **worked well**, with a clear division of responsibility and with **no reported difficulties** over the two-year project lifetime.

Each of the two intellectual outputs that were originally targeted (course curriculum; online collaboration platform) were **delivered on time and in full**. Following an extensive process of testing (students) and validation (partners), the curriculum has been further subject internal validation arrangements in each of the participating HE institutions and has a confirmed value of at least 180 ECTS (or local equivalents) thus securing its place in future first cycle (bachelor) programme delivery.

Teacher training activity was fully subscribed and it is **clear to see the benefits** of this to the participating teacher cohorts, with each awarded a certificate of participation (confirming course level, content and status) from the local University partner.

Key Action 2:

Strategic Partnerships

Final Report Assessment

ASSESSMENT
COMMENTS
BRIEFING SHEET

☞ QUALITY OF COOPERATION

The project relied on an **experienced and well-formed** consortium in which individual partners **actively contributed** to development of the two core outputs - it is clear to see how the **complementary knowledge and expertise**, from higher education and industry, worked hand-in-hand to ensure **successful delivery**.

Communication efforts relied on face-to-face interaction - during partner meetings - and on virtual collaboration - the latter an **excellent starting point** for continuing University-business collaboration in each of the participating countries and regions. The management team **served the project well**, keeping partners and wider stakeholders informed of progress at key stages in the project lifetime.

No partner country participation was foreseen, or took place.

☞ IMPACT AND DISSEMINATION

Clear evaluation measures were put in place, allowing student and learner achievement to be **effectively** recorded and assessed. **Positive** is the fact that individual learners received local credit - with values translated through ECTS - for their participation in the project. In terms of the participating institutions, benefits extend to improved familiarity with the newly-developed curriculum and to newly-established partnerships through which industry partners can play a more active role in course development and delivery in the future. Participating **higher education institutions will also benefit** from being able to directly deliver the newly-developed curriculum.

Dissemination actions **positively included** face-to-face events (conference and national seminars) and a number of relevant online platforms, including the newly-established virtual programme platform. Plans for continued marketing, through professional publications are **equally positive** and ought to secure increased awareness among those seeking to upgrade their skills. Open access **requirements are met** through marketing both the programme development process and an outline curriculum - the inclusion of example (rather than full) learning materials is **convincingly argued** in this case. Plans for extending the reach of the programme through transfer to (international) affiliated campuses are **particularly encouraging**.

Example Comments: Less Positive Final Report Assessment

☞ RELEVANCE

Project implementation is **neither well-described nor adequately-evidenced**, with many of the planned activities **difficult to envisage**. Targets for University-business collaboration are reportedly met, yet there is **insufficient evidence** of how this was achieved and what the overall value was to the project and to the participating institutions, regions and countries.

Ambitions that centre on extending collaboration to all teaching and training professionals in the nursing sector are potentially positive yet **further insight is needed** into the form (and benefits) of all such future collaboration.

Equally, **more needed to be said** as regards the benefits of participation both for the participating students and learners - with currently only **limited insight** into learning recognition – and for the participating institutions from within and beyond the higher education sector. Currently, it is **difficult to envisage** how the project will result in change and improvement in future programme development and delivery.

☞ QUALITY OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

We are informed that all planned events and activities were delivered in full, yet the required insight into curriculum and platform development is **not sufficiently-well described** at the project end. Declarative statements are made in relation to development and testing of the new course curriculum, with a **need for much greater detail** on the depth and range of student and learner participation and on mechanisms for assessing and rewarding learning achievement.

Management and monitoring responsibilities were divided across two institutions in the coordinating country, with the **benefits of this approach not obvious** and with no obvious division of tasks and responsibilities. This also appears to have caused confusion among partners with some partners citing duplicated reporting activity in their evaluation feedback.

Each of the two intellectual outputs that were originally targeted (course curriculum; online collaboration platform) yet **there is little said** in terms of exactly what changes and improvements each comprises and/or whether the required internal / external validation processes have been followed with a view to securing future delivery (and credit awards) by the participating HE institutions. Teacher training activity was reportedly fully subscribed yet **only limited insight** is given into programme content and a full participant list is **lacking**.

☞ QUALITY OF COOPERATION

Whilst an experienced consortium was established for this project, the nature of the different partner inputs is **not well described** and there is **little said** in terms of how partners from higher education and industry worked together to develop the new curriculum and platform. In this respect, the value of this collaborative partnership approach is **not easy to confirm**.

Communication efforts relied on face-to-face interaction and virtual collaboration yet **much of the required detail is lacking** at the project end. The final report lists a number of multi-stakeholder events and activities yet only **limited insight** is given in terms of that which was targeted for discussion or promotion. Participant lists are also lacking making the depth and reach of participation **difficult to assess**.

No partner country participation was foreseen, or took place.

☞ IMPACT AND DISSEMINATION

Evaluation activity is **not obvious** and it remains unclear if there were specific measures put in place in order to assess learning achievement among the participating students and learners. Credit arrangements remain **equally unclear** and it is not obvious if efforts were made to certificate participation among the teacher-training cohorts. At an institutional level, **more needed to be said** as regards how the newly-developed developed course curriculum will enhance or improve future programme delivery.

Dissemination actions **appear limited** to a single online platform and to a series of promotional events, yet **each lacks the required detail** on short-and-long term marketing ambitions and on the depth of participation among local and wider stakeholders to be fully convincing. Initial references to use of professional journals to increase awareness of the newly-developed curriculum are **not described** at the project end. Whilst the existence of an online platform confirms some potential for continued promotion and use of the developed curriculum, there is a **notable lack of access** to the developed materials with **only limited insight** given into plans for future use within each of the participating countries and regions.