

Annex 6.1: Matrix for Evaluation Questions, Judgment Criteria and Indicators

EQ 1 (Relevance)	To which extent are the objectives of Tempus IV consistent with the partner countries' needs, national or/and regional priorities and support the implementation of EU related policies and strategies (European Higher Education Area (EHEA)/Bologna process, country strategies under ENPI, IPA and DCI)?	
Judgment Criterion 1.1	The objectives and priorities of Tempus are in line with the HE policy/development frameworks in the partner countries in particular in terms of capacity building, quality of HE, relevance of HE to the world of work and society and internationalisation of HE.	
Indicator 1.1a	Level of correspondence of Tempus objectives with the HE policy/development frameworks in the 8 partner countries visited by the evaluators.	
Indicator 1.1b	The national or/and regional HE policy frameworks in the 8 partner countries visited by the evaluators are followed up with national activities directed to capacity building, quality of HE, relevance of HE to the world of work and society, and internationalisation of HE.	
Data sources	Interviews	Documents
Data collection	NTOs, national authorities, HE Agencies (1.1)	HE policy/devt. frameworks of the partner countries; national and regional priorities for Tempus IV; EACEA overviews of HE systems; other relevant reports (EUA, EURASHE, ESU, EURYDICE)
Judgment Criterion 1.2	The strategic and technical orientations supported by the European Higher Education Area (EHEA)/Bologna process and the country strategies under ENPI, IPA and DCI are relevant to the needs of the 8 partner countries visited by the evaluators, and in line with their priorities.	
Indicator 1.2.a	The needs and national or/and regional HE policy frameworks of the partner countries are in line with the EHEA goals and	

	Bologna action lines (even if the country is no EHEA member).	
Indicator 1.2.b	Level of correspondence between the needs and national or/and regional HE policy frameworks in the partner countries, and the individual country strategies under ENPI, IPA and DCI.	
Data sources	Interviews	Documents
Data collection	NTOs, national authorities, HE Agencies, international actors, senior HEIs management	HE policy/devt. frameworks of the partner countries; national and regional priorities for Tempus IV; other relevant reports (country reports, EUA, EURASHE, ESU, EURYDICE); Tempus action fiches and individual country strategies under ENPI, IPA and DCI;

EQ 2 (Relevance)	To which extent is the principle of giving priority to regional cooperation (inter-country cooperation) consistent with the partner countries' needs and is the programme properly designed to reach this objective?	
Judgment Criterion 2.1	The regional approach is meaningful in the local contexts and corresponds to the needs of the countries / regions concerned.	
Indicator 2.1.a	Stakeholders - in particular national authorities and the members of the academic community – consider that - regional cooperation is beneficial to the needs of/in their individual countries and institutions, - the regional approach of Tempus IV strengthens cooperation between the individual partner countries and contributes to the relevance of the programme.	
Data collection	Interviews	
Data sources	Senior HEI management & HE Agencies, project partners/grant holders, national authorities, EUDs, NTOs	
Judgment Criterion 2.2	The regional dimension within Tempus brings added value to the programme and contributes to the modernisation objectives of HE in the partner countries.	
Indicator 2.2a	The regional dimension is an adequate approach to achieve the objectives of the programme and contributes to enhancing cross-border cooperation and regional networks of universities, promoting the exchange of experience and best practice,	

	establishing benchmarking, etc.;	
Data Collection	Documents	Interviews
Data Source	EACEA documents, studies, field monitoring reports, the Review of the Higher Education Systems in the Tempus Partner Countries	NTOs, grant holders/ project partners, senior HEI management, HE agencies

EQ 3 (Relevance)	To which extent are the implementation modalities of Tempus relevant and do they adequately reflect the objectives of Tempus?		
Judgment Criterion 3.1	The distinction between two categories of projects (Joint Projects and Structural Measures) is relevant and reflects the objectives of the programme.		
Indicator 3.1	The characteristics of both categories of projects funded (JP, promoting innovation and change at micro institutional level, and SM, introducing the macro-level reforms) are different and complementary, notably in terms of objectives, approaches and activities, etc.		
Data Collection	Interviews	Documents	Questionnaires
Data Source	NTOs, ECDs, national authorities, HEIs, HE agencies	Tempus IV calls, application guidelines, JP and SM statistics	grant holders, project partners, NTOs, NCPs <i>(concrete analysis of on-going projects)</i>
Judgment Criterion 3.2	The current eligibility and award criteria used in the selection of projects (e.g. the minimum partnership requirements, and the right balance between quality and geographical balance) are in line with the objectives of Tempus IV. These requirements are achievable by a critical mass of applicants/consortium members in all countries / regions.		
Indicator 3.2a	The current eligibility and award criteria used in the selection process adequately reflect the objectives of Tempus IV.		
Indicator 3.2b	The minimum partnership requirements are appropriate and achievable by a critical mass of applicants/consortium members in all countries/regions.		

Data Collection	Documents	Interviews	
Data Source	Tempus IV calls, application guidelines, selection procedures, selection protocols, national policy framework for HE (3.2), feed-back from unsuccessful applicants in the most recent EACEA customer satisfaction surveys		national authorities, NTOs (3.2)
Judgment Criterion 3.3	The mobility component under Tempus IV is sufficiently developed and is instrumental for achieving the programme objectives.		
Indicator 3.3a	The extent of mobility (duration, number of staff involved, number of student versus staff mobility flows, number of academic versus support staff mobility flows) is appropriate / relevant for achieving the programme objectives.		
Indicator 3.3b	Mobility flows (EU to PC, PC to EU, PC to PC) are appropriate / relevant to achieve the programme objectives?		
Data collection	Documents	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data sources	EACEA documents, statistics on mobility	grant holders/project partners, NTOs (3.3)	HEI senior management, agencies, grant holders/project partners, NTOs

EQ 4 (Efficiency)	To which extent do the new features introduced under Tempus IV contribute to enhance the impact of the programme in the partner countries?
Judgment Criterion 4.1	The increased budget per project leads to an improved efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the individual projects and strengthens the systemic impact of Tempus IV in the partner countries.
Indicator 4.1a	The increased funding level maximises the impact of the projects and thus improves the efficiency and effectiveness of the programme.
Indicator 4.1b	The increased funding corresponds to a real need of the participating institutions and is adequately reflected in implemented project activities. (i.e. Tempus IV is not simply funding the same activities for an increased budget).

Data collection	Interviews	Questionnaires	
Data sources	EU delegations, NTOs, national authorities, senior HEIs management, grant holders (also of Tempus III ¹)	project partners, NTOs	
Judgment Criterion 4.2	The fact that more and more projects are coordinated by partner country institutions contributes to the objectives of the programme, increases ownership at institutional level and improves the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the projects.		
Indicator 4.2a	The coordination of the projects by partner country institutions contributes to an increased ownership, and the projects' efficiency, effectiveness and impact is improved.		
Indicator 4.2b	The coordination of the projects by partner country institutions contributes to building the capacity of those institutions.		
Data collection	Questionnaires	Interviews	Documents
Data sources	grant holder/project partners	NTOs, national authorities, grant holder/project partners, senior HEI management	Project monitoring reports from the 8 countries visited by the evaluators

EQ 5 (Efficiency)	To which extent does the (new) set up/division of tasks between the EC, EACEA, the EU Delegations, NTOs, enhance the programme performance of Tempus IV? Are the national authorities in the partner countries adequately involved in the implementation of the Tempus IV?
Judgment Criterion 5.1	The takeover of the programme management by the EACEA Tempus Unit in early 2009 contributes to an enhanced programme performance.
Indicator 5.1a	A rise in the overall satisfaction of the applicants and beneficiaries with the Tempus programme since 2008.

¹ Interview partners from Tempus III projects to be proposed by NTOs.

Data Collection	Documents	Interviews	Questionnaires
Data Sources	most recent EACEA customer satisfaction surveys (5.1a)	grant holders/ project partners, NTOs	grant holders/ project partners, national authorities, NTOs/NCPs
Judgment Criterion 5.2	The current emphasis put by EACEA on field monitoring and studies and dissemination activities is relevant to the objectives of the programme and supports policy-making activities at Commission level and in the Partner countries.		
Indicator 5.2a	The EACEA uses lessons learnt from the desk and field monitoring to identify best practice and disseminate it, and to inform the management of Tempus actions.		
Indicator 5.2b	Policy-making activities at Commission level and in the partner countries are informed by the EACEA studies and activities.		
Data collection	Documents	Interviews	
Data sources	EACEA reports, Tempus studies, field monitoring reports	EACEA, relevant DG directorates, EU-Delegations, national authorities	
Judgment Criterion 5.3	The EU Delegations are adequately involved in the management of the Programme. At country level, the respective roles of the EU Delegations, the NTOs and the national authorities in the implementation of the Programme are clear, complementary and contribute to the programme performance.		
Indicator 5.3	The EU Delegations have a clear role and are committed and being of use to Tempus IV, and the respective roles and responsibilities of the EU Delegations, the NTOs and the national authorities are conceived as complementary and beneficial to the overall programme's performance by the stakeholders.		
Data collection	Questionnaires	Interviews	
Data sources	NTOs, project partners	EU Delegations, NTOs, national authorities, grant holders/project partners, senior HEI management	

EQ 6 (Efficiency)	To which extent do the NTOs and NCPs contribute to enhancing the programme performance?		
Judgment Criterion 6.1	The strengthened role of NTOs in the promotion of the Tempus programme, assistance to potential applicants and project monitoring and the NCPs support have improved the quality of applications and project implementation.		
Indicator 6.1a	Increasing number of good quality (defined by the evaluation scores) project applications since the first call under Tempus IV.		
Indicator 6.1b	The applicants' assessment of the information/support received through the NTOs and related activities improved in the course of the calls under Tempus IV.		
Indicator 6.1c	There is a demonstrable link between NTOs systematic field/project monitoring and trouble-shooting for the project beneficiaries.		
Data collection	Documents	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data sources	EACEA statistics and documentation of selection process (6.1.a), customer satisfaction review (6.1b), NTO project monitoring reports (6.1c) + annual reports on field monitoring for the 8 countries visited by the evaluators	Grant holders (6.1.b), NTOs and NCPs (6.1c)	Grant holders and, if feasible, unsuccessful applicants (6.1.b & c), EACEA & NTOs (6.1.c),
Judgment Criterion 6.2	The strengthened role of NTOs: i) as intermediaries between the EU (Commission, EU Delegations, Executive Agency) and the national authorities in matters related to Tempus has improved the management of the programme, ii) in the promotion of other EU education programmes has improved the visibility and attractiveness of EU programmes in the Partner Countries.		
Indicator 6.2a	The NTOs facilitate communication between the EU (EC, EU Del.s, EACEA) and the national authorities by providing information and appropriate feed back to both parties.		

Indicator 6.2b	There is a wider awareness of, demand for and more visibility of other EU education programmes at national level (in particular Erasmus Mundus and Jean Monet), through increased promotion, communication and networking by NTOs.		
Data collection	Documents	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data sources	EACEA documentation, NTO reports (6.2a & b), comparison with previous evaluation doc	Grant holders, NTOs (6.2a & b),	National authorities, EACEA & NTOs, HEIs, grant holders (6.2a & b)
Judgment Criterion 6.3	The NTOs support adequately the network of HEREs and contribute to enhancing its impact.		
Indicator 6.3a	NTOs have a leading role in mobilising and monitoring HEREs activities.		
Indicator 6.3b	The active involvement of HERE experts carried out under the accompanying measures, in devising Bologna development strategies at system and/or institutional level, with peers, non-academic bodies, public authorities and dissemination of good practice.		
Indicator 6.3c	There is an increased number of HERE teams that deliver(ed) multiple and valuable outcomes serving both the Tempus programme and the European Union cooperation strategy with neighbouring countries.		
Indicator 6.3d	How decision makers in HE institutions, other HE bodies/ agencies and ministries in the partner countries rate the contribution of specific accompanying measures in their country/region to a transfer of best practices in EU developments in the field of HE to their respective country/region.		
Data collection	Documents	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data sources	HERE's activity annual reports, note defining the role of HEREs	Grant holders, NTOs (6.3b, c)	National authorities, EACEA, NTOs, HEI, grant Holders (6.3a, b & c) , HERE (6.3a,b)

EQ 7 (Effectiveness)	To which extent does the development and implementation of structural measures and joint projects enhance the quality and relevance of HE in the partner countries?		
Judgment Criterion 7.1	There is a demonstrable link between the outcomes of the structural measures projects and (actual or intended) reforms at system level in the partner countries/regions.		
Indicator 7.1a	The SM projects have contributed directly and indirectly to reforms in the partner countries in the 8 visited countries. Relevant bodies are informed by SM projects and apply the gained know how.		
Indicator 7.1b	Outcomes developed in the course of SM projects are maintained and active/in use after the end of the project.		
Data collection	Documents	Interviews	Questionnaires
Data sources	A selection of project applications, project reports and field monitoring reports (7.1a, b) in the 8 countries visited by the evaluators	EACEA & NTOs (7.1a), EU Del.s (7.1.b), SM grant holders, project partners/ HE agencies/bodies (7.1a, b,)	NTOs (7.1a), SM grant holders/ project partners (7.1a)
Judgment Criterion 7.2	The implementation of modern curricula contributes to increased quality and relevance of HE to the world of work and society in the partner countries.		
Indicator 7.2a	The rationale for developing/modernising curricula in the individual project application and reports makes specific reference to quality and relevance for the world of work.		
Indicator 7.2b	Newly developed curricula emphasise employability and transferable skills.		
Indicator 7.2c	Social partners/employers were/are involved in curricular design.		
Indicator 7.2d	Mechanisms are put in place fostering continuous cooperation/consultations between university and the world of work.		
Indicator 7.2e	The significance of the new and revised curricula/study programs/qualifications are communicated to a wider public (e.g. potential students, employers, parents).		
Indicator 7.2f	A (periodical) review and internal validation of the new curricula is carried out		

Indicator 7.2f	An external validation of the new curricula is carried out and these curricula are duly accredited.		
Indicator 7.2g	Credit systems such as ECTS, learning outcomes and/or diploma supplement are introduced and applied in the newly developed and implemented curricula.		
Indicator 7.2h	(New) Elements of student-centred learning are integrated in the newly developed and implemented curricula (teaching and learning methods, learning resources, internships and their recognition with ECTS).		
Indicator 7.2i	Majority of new and revised (harmonized with the three cycle system) university curricula developed by Tempus are successfully implemented.		
Data collection	Documents	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data sources	project applications (7.2.a, c, e, h, i) project and field monitoring reports (7.2.a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, I); EACEA statistics and project reports, publications and studies, Bodies responsible for licensing/ accreditation of (new) study programs, EACEA statistics (where conducive) - for selected projects in the 8 countries visited by the evaluators	grant holders (7.2.b, c, d, e, f, 7.2.g, h, i), project partners	grant holders/ project partners (7.2.b&c&d, h, i), senior HEI management (7.2.c, d, e, f, g, i), HE Agencies 7.2.d), NTOs (7.2.e), students (7.2.g&h)A
Judgment Criterion 7.3	There is a demonstrable link between the outcomes of other types of joint projects (governance reform and higher education and society) and (actual or planned) reforms at institutional level in the partner countries/regions.		
Indicator 7.3a	The percentage of accomplished joint projects from the first four calls under Tempus IV that improve university governance and finance, which are/will be fully/partially/not applied in the partner countries upon the projects' completion.		
Indicator 7.3b	% of HEIs which improved design and development of internal quality assurance systems, institutional and financial autonomy and accountability, and increased capacity of HEIs to support the reform and modernisation in the partner countries following a relevant joint project targeting governance reform.		
Data collection	Documents	Interviews	Questionnaires

Data sources	A selection of project applications, project reports and field monitoring reports (7.3a,b) in the 8 countries visited by the evaluators	EACEA & NTOs (7.3a), EU Del.s (7.3a,b), project partners/ HE agencies/bodies (7.3a, b)	NTOs (7.1a,b), grant holders/ HEI, project partners (7.1a)
--------------	---	--	--

EQ 8 (Effectiveness)	To which extent does the implementation of the programme appear balanced in terms of geographical coverage, institutions and disciplines concerned?		
Judgment Criterion 8.1	There is a wide representation of partner countries and institutions in selected projects, also within the countries.		
Indicator 8.1a	Balanced representation of partner countries in selected projects.		
Indicator 8.1b	Balanced representation of partner institutions per country in selected projects.		
Indicator 8.1c	% of multi-country projects (i.e. projects involving more than one partner country) over total number of funded projects.		
Data collection	Documents		
Data sources	Tempus statistics & financial envelopes		
Judgment Criterion 8.2	There is a wide representation of EU countries and institutions in selected projects.		
Indicator 8.2a	Balanced representation (%) of EU countries in selected projects		
Indicator 8.2b	Balanced representation (%) of EU partner institutions in selected projects		
Data collection	Documents		
Data sources	Tempus statistics		
Judgment Criterion 8.3	The variety of types of HEIs is adequately represented in selected projects (public / private sector; academic / vocational higher education, etc.)		

Indicator 8.3a	Balanced representation of HEIs (public / private sector; academic / vocational higher education, etc.) represented in selected projects		
Data collection	Documents		
Data sources	Tempus statistics		
Judgment Criterion 8.4	The needs (and priorities) of the partner countries are covered by the selected projects.		
Indicator 8.4a	In the 8 partner countries visited by the evaluators, a critical mass of eligible/selected projects corresponds with the needs of the partner countries.		
Data collection	Documents	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data sources	National/regional priorities, EACEA project descriptions	NTOs, grant holders/project partners (8.4a)	Senior HEI management, NTOs, grant holders/project partners, national authorities, HE agencies, other international actors in HE, students

EQ 9 (Impact)	To which extent has Tempus IV increased the capacity of HEIs and supported the reform and modernisation of the HE system in the partner countries?
Judgment Criterion 9.1	Tempus IV has helped to increase human capacity at HEIs to support the reform and modernisation of HE in the partner countries.
Indicator 9.1a	Demonstrable contributions of Tempus projects on human capacity building (training schemes, etc.)
Indicator 9.1b	Tempus projects have had a broader impact also on the individuals who did not participate directly in projects (idea of dissemination of results).
Indicator 9.1c	Tangible evidence of impact of Tempus on career development of participating individuals.

Indicator 9.1d	Number of university staff trained in the framework of Tempus IV projects:		
Data collection	Documents	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data sources	Project reports and documentation of good practice examples given by projects and/or NTOs in the 8 partner countries visited by the evaluators	Grant holders/project partners and NTOs (9.1a, b, c, d)	Senior HEI management, NTOs, grant holders/project partners, national authorities, HE agencies, EACEA
Judgment Criterion 9.2	The Tempus programme has helped to increase institutional capacity at HEIs to support the reform and modernisation of HE in the partner countries.		
Indicator 9.2a	Demonstrable contributions of institutional capacity building initiatives under Tempus IV to system reform (institutional or sectoral) in the partner countries, such as development of services to students, new governing structures, QA procedures, etc.		
Data collection	Documents	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data sources	Project reports and documentation of good practice examples given by projects and/or NTOs in the 8 partner countries visited by the evaluators	Grant holders/project partners and NTOs	Senior HEI management, NTOs, grant holders/project partners, national authorities, HE agencies, EACEA
Judgment Criterion 9.3	The Tempus IV programme has supported national legislative reform and changes in national HE systems.		
Indicator 9.3a	Evidence of direct and indirect effects of Tempus IV support to sectoral HE reforms, for example legislative reforms.		
Indicator 9.3b	Stakeholder projection: probability of successful implementation of national legislative reforms and system changes that are developed with Tempus IV support.		
Data collection	Documents	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data sources	Project reports and documentation of	Grant holders/project partners and	Senior HEI management, NTOs, HERE,

	good practice examples given by projects and/or NTOs in the 8 partner countries visited by the evaluators	NTOs (9.3a, b)	grant holders/project partners, national authorities, HE agencies, EACEA
Judgment Criterion 9.4	Significant impact on establishing regional co-operation among partner countries across all regions and on strengthening co-operation within individual partner countries.		
Indicator 9.4a	A demonstrable link between Tempus IV and the development of sustainable (likely to continue after projects end) regional cooperation in the countries concerned (joint programmes and degrees, research and teaching collaboration activities, partnership agreements among universities, staff and student exchange, etc.).		
Indicator 9.4b	% of multi-country projects (i.e. involving more than one partner country) over total number of funded projects.		
Indicator 9.4c	Evidence of institutional cooperation within the partner countries.		
Data collection	Documents	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data sources	Tempus statistics, project reports and documentation of good practice examples given by projects and/or NTOs in the 8 partner countries visited by the evaluators	Grant holders/project partners and NTOs	NTOs, HERE, grant holders/project partners, Senior HEI management, national authorities, HE agencies, EACEA
Judgment Criterion 9.5	Beyond the institutions directly involved in the Programme, Tempus IV has also had an impact on other higher education institutions and other stakeholders at national level.		
Indicator 9.5a	Positive “snowballing” effects of individual or collective progress achieved by Tempus IV projects (good practice examples) from the first 3 calls.		
Indicator 9.5b	Positive “snowballing” effects expected by stakeholders when Tempus IV phases out.		
Data collection	Documents	Interviews	Questionnaires

Data sources	Documentation of “snowballing” effects given by projects and/or NTOs in the 8 partner countries visited by the evaluators	NTOs, HERE, grant holders/project partners, Senior HEI management, national authorities, HE agencies	Grant holders/project partners and NTOs
Judgment Criterion 9.6	The accompanying measures (in particular the HEREs) have raised the awareness in the partner countries of EU developments in the field of HE and have contributed to strategic reform design and/or decisions in HE (at institutional and/or system level); for example in relation to quality assurance systems, the development of qualification frameworks and ECTS.		
Indicator 9.6a	The level of involvement of the Higher Education Reform Experts (HERE) in promotion and awareness-raising activities in their home countries.		
Indicator 9.6b	The active involvement of HERE experts in devising HE development strategies (including Bologna) at system and/or institutional level, with peers, non-academic bodies, public authorities and others.		
Indicator 9.6c	Number and diversity of participants in events under the accompanying measures component that promote, discuss and/or disseminate issues related to reforms in HE in the partner countries since the launch of Tempus IV.		
Indicator 9.6d	How decision makers in HE institutions, other HE bodies/ agencies and ministries in the partner countries rate the contribution of specific accompanying measures in their country/region to a transfer of best practices in EU developments in the field of HE to their respective country/region.		
	Documents	Questionnaires	Interviews
	annual HERE activity reports, EACEA/NTO reports (9.6a,c), relevant new laws and regulations and/or strategy papers given by the interlocutors in the 8 partner countries visited by the evaluators	NTOs (9.6c,d)	HERE, NTOs, national authorities & other stakeholders, EU-Del.s, EACEA; senior management in HEIs & HE agencies, grant holders/project partners

EQ 10 (Sustainability)	Which activities, elements and/or outcomes of the programme are likely to continue/be maintained once EU support discontinues?		
Judgment Criterion 10.1	The transfer of knowledge for curriculum development, governance reform and strengthening links between HE institutions and society through Joint Projects have led to sustainable innovations in the partner countries.		
Indicator 10.1.a	The number of new and revised curricula (in line with the three cycle system) that are developed under Tempus IV and will be validated, licensed and are implemented/opened by 2014.		
Indicator 10.1.b	The number of HE institutions having set up active internal quality assurance mechanisms and procedures – that were informed by a Joint Project under Tempus IV – by the academic year 2013/2014.		
Indicator 10.1.c	The number of HE institutions (universities and/or faculties) having systematically introduced cooperation with businesses, social and economic partners in their policy and procedures by the academic year 2014.		
Indicator 10.1.d	The number of HE institutions having introduced or improved their policy for human resources development (academic and non-academic staff).		
Data sources	Documents	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data collection	EACEA statistics, field monitoring reports, project reports	senior HEI management, grant holders/ project partners	senior HEI management, HE agencies
Judgment Criterion 10.2	External stakeholders (private companies, governmental bodies, civil society representatives, etc) have been involved in the implementation of Tempus IV projects, have benefited from them and acknowledge the benefit of the programme.		
Indicator 10.2a	Share of Tempus IV projects (of overall number of projects) actively involving external stakeholders.		
Indicator 10.2b	Degree of involvement of external stakeholders in the implementation of Tempus IV projects and extent to which they acknowledge benefit of their involvement in the individual project;		
Data sources	Documents	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data collection	Tempus statistics	project partners/grant holders (non HEI), NTOs (10.2)	external stakeholders, NTOs

Judgment Criterion 10.3	Beneficiary institutions and national authorities have a vision of the long term benefits and the necessary follow-up to ensure the project/programme outcomes generate sustainable impact beyond the end of the projects.	
Indicator 10.3a	National Authorities present a comprehensive vision of possible long term benefits and the necessary follow-up.	
Indicator 10.3b	Beneficiary institutions present a comprehensive vision of possible long term benefits and the necessary follow-up.	
Data collection	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data sources	beneficiary institutions (10.3b)	national authorities, beneficiary institutions, NTOs, EU-Delegations
Judgment Criterion 10.4	Tempus activities have led to the establishment of institutional cooperation partnerships beyond the actual Tempus IV activities (between EU and PC, between PCs and within PCs).	
Indicator 10.4a	The number and nature (mobility, teaching, research) of institutional partnership agreements initiated following Tempus activities.	
Indicator 10.4b	Cooperative teaching and research activities and projects, summer schools, academic exchange, self-financed or with third party funds, etc. initiated following Tempus activities.	
Data collection	Documents	Questionnaires
Data sources	project reports	grant holders/ project partners & senior HEI management

EQ 11 Coherence	To what extent is the Tempus IV programme complementary to EU and other initiatives in HE in the partner countries (in particular Erasmus Mundus, the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7), etc.)?	
Judgment Criterion 11.1	The objectives and activities under Tempus are complementary to other EU initiatives in the field of HE.	
Indicator 11.1a	Complementarity between Tempus and EU bilateral cooperation in the field of HE	

Indicator 11.1b	Complementarity between Tempus and other programmes such as Erasmus Mundus and FP7	
Data collection	Documents	Interviews
Data sources	EC country strategies (11.1.a), EC project documentation (11.1.b)	EUDs (11.1.a, b) + Commission DGs
Judgment Criterion 11.2	Erasmus Mundus and Tempus projects in individual regions/countries are complementary.	
Indicator 11.2a	Stakeholders consider both programmes as complementary tools and make use of both types of projects.	
Indicator 11.2b	Number of Erasmus Mundus partnerships building on programmes/actions developed under Tempus IV.	
Data collection	Questionnaires	Interviews
Data sources	NTOs, grant holders/project partners	EACEA & NTO (11.2.a, b), grant holders/project partners, senior HE management