

TEMPUS

Modernising higher education

Tempus IV, Second Call for proposals, 2009
Overview on the selection process and results

28 October 2009



European Commission

TEMPUS



http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/index_en.php

Main steps in the selection process

Preparation of the selection process

Roadmap, milestones, recruitment of experts, tools and methodologies

Reception of project proposals: 28 April 2009

Check of eligibility, exclusion and selection criteria

Evaluation of proposals against award criteria

Experts' briefing

Assessment of proposals by academic experts

Debriefing with lead experts to shortlist best proposals

Inter-service selection panel at the Agency

Consultations

EC Delegations, NTOs and Ministries of Education in Partner countries

Financial verification

Inter-service selection panel at the Agency for final list of projects

Award decision by the Authorising Officer (EACEA Director)

Total number of applications received

Increased interest...

608 proposals submitted

(15% more compared to 530 received in 2008)

150 (25%) PC coordinator (grant-holder)


(19% more compared to 126 received in 2008)

€ 950.000 = average budget size

10 partners = average consortium size


Applications from EU MS & PC Institutions

2009



2009



2008



Breakdown of applications by target region


2009

2008




- CENTRAL ASIA
- MEDITERRANEAN COUNTRIS
- MULTIREGIONAL
- WESTERN BALKANS
- EASTERN EUROPE

Breakdown of applications according to activity type



Subject areas addressed for curriculum reform



Project assessment against award criteria by external experts

Assessment

- ❖ Each application assessed by two different experts, by teleworking, supported by the Agency on-line assessment tool
- ❖ 1st stage: Each expert carried out individual assessment
- ❖ 2nd stage: the 2 experts assessing the same proposals reached consolidated judgements and scores
- ❖ Lead-experts responsible to mediate consolidations, ensure quality assessment outputs, final proofreading

Debriefing panel with lead-experts

- ❖ Discussion on the quality of the proposals
- ❖ Suggestions for improvement of the evaluation exercise

Feedback from experts after assessment on award criteria – 2nd Call

Most difficult criteria to assess

- ❖ Relevance
- ❖ Budget and cost effectiveness

Contents of award criteria

- ❖ Number of criteria should be kept as such, but
- ❖ Better balance needed (Methodology is too comprehensive, some overlapping aspects to be avoided or included in other criteria, e.g. Dissemination goes better with Sustainability)



Feedback from experts after assessment on award criteria – Tempus IV First Two Calls (1)

Part of application best completed?


- LFM
- Work plan
- Needs analysis
- Description of partner institutions
- Project summary

Feedback from experts after assessment on award criteria – Tempus IV First Two Calls (2)

Part of application worst completed?

- Sustainability & dissemination
- Outcome & activity tables
- Quality control, monitoring and management
- Budget

Selection progress




Overview of the selection progress on target regions


REGION	Received applications	Eligible applications	Above the 50% threshold	Proposed for consultation	Recommended for funding
Western Balkans	127	107	83	58	24
Central Asia	36	33	23	17	5
Eastern Neighbouring	148	120	90	52	12
Russian Federation	62	53	41	23	9
South Neighbouring area	157	129	106	33	16
Multiregional	78	53	34	21	6
TOTAL	608	495 (81.41%)	377 (76.16%)	204 (54.11%)	69 (11.34%)

IPA – National vs Multi-country

Country participation in projects recommended for funding



Country	Nat	MC	JP	SM
Albania	0	3	3	0
Bosnia	2	5	4	3
Croatia	2	4	5	1
FYROM	1	9	9	1
Kosovo	2	4	5	1
Montenegro	1	3	4	0
Serbia	5	8	11	2





ENPI South - National vs Multi-country

Country participation in projects proposed for funding



Country	Nat	MC	JP	SM
Algeria	1	5	4	2
Egypt	2	4	5	1
Israel	0	1	0	1
Jordan	0	4*	3	1*
Lebanon	0	3	2	1
Morocco	1	6	4	3
occ Palestinian territory	1	1	0	2
Syria	2	0	1	1
Tunisia	0	6	4	2

*Out of which a project including an association of Arab universities, pan-Arabic organisation based in Jordan and covering the other countries involved in the consortium.





DCI - National vs Multi-country

Country participation in projects proposed for funding



Country	Nat	MC	JP	SM
Kazakhstan	0	3	3	0
Kyrgyzstan	0	3	3	0
Tajikistan	1	2	3	0
Turkmenistan	1	0	0	1
Uzbekistan	0	4	3	1


ENPI East - National vs Multi-country Country participation in projects recommended for funding



Country	Nat	MC	JP	SM
Armenia	0	3	2	1
Azerbaijan	0	2	2	0
Georgia	0	4	3	1
Belarus	0	4	3	1
Moldova	1	1	0	2
Russia (incl. Bilateral)	9	5	12	2
Ukraine	3	8	8	3


Number of applications from EU Member States Submitted vs Selected

AT	BE	BG	CZ	DK	DE	GR	ES	FI	FR	HU	IE	IT	LT	LV	LU	NL	PL	PT	RO	SI	SK	SE	UK	Total
11	18	2	6	5	98	14	26	12	60	17	1	63	5	2	1	15	12	7	6	10	5	36	25	457
3	3	0	0	0	13	0	9	2	7	2	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	54



Number of applications from the Partner Countries Submitted vs Selected

AL	AM	AZ	BA	BY	EG	GE	HR	IL	KG	LB	MA	ME	MK	PS	RS	RU	SY	UZ	TN	UA	XK	Total
1	4	3	5	2	23	4	20	6	2	4	4	5	10	4	25	16	3	1	1	5	3	151
0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	2	0	0	0	1	15



Selection Conclusions

Summary results

69 proposals recommended for funding
15 proposals have partner countries as coordinator (21%)

50 Joint Projects
19 Structural measures (27,5%)

35 proposals are multi-country (49%)

€ 815.000 = average budget size

13 partners = average consortium size, out of which
9 partner country organisation in average / project

Next steps

- ➔ Notification of results - feedback to applicants
- ➔ Contractualisation
- ➔ Preparation of the Tempus IV – Third call for proposals