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1. INTRODUCTION

This guide is intended to provide experts with instructions and guidance on how to ensure a high quality standardised assessment of a project proposal received in response to Calls for Proposals managed by the Education Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (the Agency) and advice on providing accreditation.

The Agency manages centralised actions of the Erasmus+ (E+) Programme in the field of education, training, youth and sport for the period 2014-2020. The remaining – decentralised – actions are managed at a national level through the network of E+ National Agencies. Detailed information on all Erasmus+ actions is available on the Agency’s website. Most of these actions provide funding opportunities for projects. The Agency is also in charge of providing accreditation or labels (i.e. Erasmus Charter for Higher Education), which is a pre-requisite for certain organisations to participate in a number of E+ actions.

The aim of the expert evaluation is to ensure that each application receives an objective assessment from a person with expertise in the field covered by the action, and that this individual assessment is also subject to a review with at least one other person who has assessed the same application. This process helps to ensure that applications of the highest quality are selected for funding or obtain accreditation or a label. Experts support the process through evaluating applications, drafting feedback provided to applicants and reviewing the comparative merits of applications with equal scores in order to rank them.

The Agency appoints an Evaluation Committee for each Call for Proposals. The Evaluation Committee is composed of representatives of the Executive Agency and the European Commission. Experts are not part of this Committee. This committee puts forward to the Agency's Authorising Officer, a list of applications that are recommended for funding. The final decision on whether to fund an application is taken by the Agency following consultation with the relevant services at the European Commission.

The guide is divided in two parts:

1. A general guide providing information on the role of an expert and the methodology and principles of quality assessments that apply to the majority of actions. Variations from this model may exist and are clearly explained in Annex 1.

2. Action-specific information and guidelines, outlined in Annex 1-4 of the guide, containing detailed information on the various actions (i.e. award criteria) and the respective selection and assessment procedures if they differ from the general framework.

The guide refers primarily to the assessment of project applications. However, the guidelines are equally valid for the attribution of accreditation or labels (if not explicitly stated otherwise).

---

1 Please note that the terms “proposal” and “application” are used interchangeably in this guide.

2. ROLE AND APPOINTMENT OF EXPERTS

The role of experts is to advise the Agency on the quality and value for money of applications in relation to the policy objectives of an action in the field of education, training, youth and sport.

Quality assessment is an essential part of the selection procedure. A list of grant applications per action, ranked in quality order, is established based on experts' scores. This list then serves as a basis for the Evaluation Committee to determine the applications of highest merit that will be proposed for funding. The feedback that is sent to applicants at the end of the selection process, builds on the experts' assessments (see section 4 FEEDBACK TO APPLICANTS).

Experts are recruited through an open call for expression of interest. They are appointed on the basis of their expertise in the specific field(s) of education, training, youth and/or sport in which they are asked to assess applications. However, other criteria like language competencies, gender balance, the coverage of nationalities and geographical balance will also intervene in the final composition of an expert panel. The management of expert contracts is based on a fully electronic workflow which is further explained in the call mentioned above.

The Agency does not disclose information or contact details on experts in relation with a given proposal they assess. The Agency however publishes each year on its website the list of experts who have concluded a contract of more than 15.000€ (see point 13.6 Ex post transparency of the call for expression of interest).

2.1 Code of conduct

Experts must perform their tasks to the highest professional standards and in accordance with the instructions of the Agency. They are further bound to a code of conduct as set out in the call (section 13.4) and contract with the Agency. In that respect, experts' attention is draw to the following aspects:

Conflicts of interest

- Experts must not have a conflict of interest at the time of their appointment. A declaration that no such conflict exists is part of their contract signed electronically (for information, see template in Annex 2).
- They must also inform the Executive Agency if such a conflict should arise in any of the applications they have been allocated.

When a potential conflict of interest is reported by the expert or brought to the attention of the Agency by any means, the Agency will analyse the circumstances and any objective elements of information at its disposal. If the Agency comes to the conclusion that there is conflict of interest, the expert is either excluded from the assessment of that particular application, or from the entire selection round.

---

3 “Value for money” is not relevant for accreditation / label
4 The grant award decision is taken by the authorising officer on the basis of the quality of the applications and the budget available (see Article 133 of the Financial Regulations applicable to the general budget of the Union: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:298:0001:0096:EN:PDF
5 The list resulting from this call for expressions of interest is valid for the duration of the current generation of programmes managed by the Agency, i.e. until 31.12.2020 https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/about-eacea/working-expert/call-for-expressions-interest-n%C2%B0eacea201301_en
6 https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/about-eacea/working-expert/call-for-expressions-interest-n%C2%B0eacea201301_en
7 Financial Regulation Art. 57(2): "... a conflict of interests exists where the impartial and objective exercise of the functions of a financial actor or other person, ..., is compromised for reasons involving family, emotional life, political or national affinity, economic interest or any other shared interest with a recipient.” http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:298:0001:0096:EN:PDF
Confidentiality

Experts are bound by confidentiality, as all information relating to the assessment process is strictly confidential. They are not allowed to disclose any information about the applications submitted and the results of the assessment and selection to anyone either during or after the selection.

2.2 Conditions of remuneration and reimbursement

The framework for the remuneration by the Agency of the services provided by experts and the reimbursement of possible travel cost is laid out in the call for expression of interest⁸ (see section 12).

The maximum daily fee for the assessment of applications is 450€. In a number of actions experts are asked to assess several project applications per day. This may include the preparation of the corresponding consolidated assessment where applicable (see section 3.1 The assessment process). The exact workload however varies between actions and is subject to the complexity and volume of an application. Experts are informed about their precise workload and payment conditions, including reimbursement of travel and subsistence cost, at the time of engagement. These conditions are clearly stated in the contract signed with the Agency.

Mandatory briefing and preparatory sessions are reimbursed at a maximum rate of 450€ per day. More detail on these sessions is provided below in section 3.1 The assessment process.

---

⁸ Call for expressions of interest EACEA/2013/01 for the establishment of a list of experts to assist the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency in the framework of the management of European Union programmes https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/about-eacea/working-expert/call-for-expressions-interest-n%C2%B0eacea201301_en
3. ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATIONS

The assessment procedure generally consists of the following main steps described in more detail below:

- briefing of experts;
- individual assessments;
- consolidated assessments including quality review;
- final panel and establishment of ranked list of grant applications proposed for funding;
- feedback to applicants including editing of final comments.

3.1 The assessment process

3.1.1. Expert briefings

In order to ensure high quality of evaluations, the Agency makes certain that experts receive all necessary information and training before they start working. Therefore they generally participate in one or several action-specific briefing sessions:

- to ensure that all information on the content of the call, the technicalities (tools) and the process (selection timetable) has been read by the experts and thoroughly understood. For specific guidance on policy priorities, experts may also refer to the documents listed in Annex 3 to this Guide;
- to make sure experts are familiar with the structure and content of the application form and tools to be used;
- to foster common understanding of the award criteria, priorities and objectives of the call for proposal concerned through group discussions;
- to train and guide experts on how to conduct their evaluations in compliance with the award criteria set out in the call and on what is expected in terms of comments so that all assessments are carried out in a coherent and consistent way;
- to ensure that all experts adhere to the principles of confidentiality, impartiality and absence of conflict of interest in the frame of the evaluation exercise.

General principles of expert briefings

- All information needed to carry out the evaluations is made available well in advance before the briefings preferably through an Online Expert Community.\(^9\)
- Transparency: experts must be provided with the same information as applicants and carry out their assessments on that basis.
- Experienced experts may take the lead role as facilitators to stimulate and frame discussions during the briefing sessions or on the forums in the Online Expert Community.

---

\(^9\) Where an Online Expert Community is set up for a selection round it is used as repository of documents and to enhance discussions and common understanding of the work required during the selection. It is mandatory for experts to join the Online Expert Community of their action.
The briefing sessions are **essentially interactive** and emphasis is put on practical exercises (i.e. exercise on mock application). This allows experts to exchange points of view, get answers to their questions and clarify any doubts related to the selection process and methodology.

**Location of the briefing sessions**

The briefings take place either in Brussels in the premises of EACEA, are organised online, or follow a mixed approach (partly onsite / partly online meetings).

Over the past years the Agency has moved more and more towards **online briefings sessions** as this approach enables **flexibility**:

- Instead of holding a full day briefing onsite, short online sessions can be organised. Spacing the meetings allows experts to study training material bit by bit and have more time for reflection and formulating pertinent questions at the group meeting.

- Experts do not need to stop their regular professional activity to travel to Brussels for several days which makes it easier to combine both engagements. As a result the Agency can engage high quality experts who cannot spend several days in Brussels.

**3.1.2. Individual assessments**

In the majority of actions, applications are evaluated by two experts\(^{10}\). Each expert however first works individually and independently, giving scores and comments for each award criterion, summarising his\(^{11}\) assessment in the assessment form and submitting it electronically\(^{12}\).

**3.1.3. Consolidated assessments**

Once both individual assessments have been finalised and submitted electronically, the Agency puts the experts in contact to consolidate their views on the application and produce single agreed scores and comments on each of the award criteria.

Consolidations may take place online or onsite within the premises of the Agency, or partly online and partly in Brussels:

- Each expert is nominated as Expert 1 or Expert 2 for an application. Expert 1 is in charge of drawing up the draft consolidated assessment in terms of scores and comments, based on the two already completed individual assessments. After agreement with Expert 2, he submits the consolidated assessment electronically in the system.

- If the difference between the total score of both individual assessments is more than 30 points an **additional third assessment** of the application is required\(^{13}\). This would also be the case if:
  - two experts are unable to reach consensus, or to agree on a consolidated scores and comments for an application;
  - there are serious discrepancies in comments between two individual assessments.

- When a third assessment is triggered, the experts with the two assessments that are closest in terms of their overall score will undertake the consolidation\(^{14}\): the most

---

\(^{10}\) In some actions, i.e. Joint Master Degrees, each proposal is assessed by three experts.

\(^{11}\) The pronoun "he" is used referring to male and female experts.

\(^{12}\) At this stage of the evaluation only full points can be used.

\(^{13}\) This requirement does not apply when both experts have scored the application under the thresholds for acceptance for the action.

\(^{14}\) In actions where it is standard to perform three individual assessments all three experts usually undertake the consolidation.
extreme assessment in terms of overall score is not taken into account. Consolidation follows the same rules as explained above.

The consolidated assessment is considered the final assessment of a given application. It means that in case of applications for a grant, the consolidated assessment and scores form the basis for ranking applications in order of merit on the list of eligible grant applications.

3.1.4. Final panel and establishment of grant application lists

Once the consolidation phase is complete, experts will meet onsite in Brussels, to discuss and establish a ranking list of project proposals in order of merit. Projects that do not reach the threshold for one or more of the award criteria or for the overall score\(^{15}\) (consolidated result), will not be proposed for funding.

The ranking of applications should not be based on:

- Assessment results of a subset of award criteria;
- Information other than what is available in the applications or provided by the Agency (e.g. additional information provided by an individual expert based upon his own opinion).

3.2 Assessment of award criteria and scoring

Experts assess applications against the award criteria for an action as defined in the Programme Guide / call for proposals and further presented in Annex 1 of this Guide. Generally, applications are assessed against the following four award criteria\(^{16}\) agreed at E+ programme level:

- Relevance of the proposal
- Quality of the project design and implementation
- Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements
- Impact and dissemination

Each of the award criteria is defined through several elements which must be taken into account by experts when analysing an application. These elements form an exhaustive list of points to be considered when scoring the criterion. They are intended to guide experts through the evaluation of the criterion in question but they must not be scored individually.

In order to give clear guidance to experts on how individual elements of analysis should be assessed, action-specific information is given in Annex 1 if required.

When assessing applications against award criteria experts make a judgement on the extent to which these applications meet the defined criteria. This judgement must be based on information provided by the applicant only. Information relevant to a specific award criterion may appear in different parts of the application and experts take all of it into consideration. Experts must not assume information that is not stated explicitly in the application or search the internet or make use of their personal background knowledge.

An application can receive a maximum total of 100 points. The maximum score for the different criteria ranges between 20 and 30 points. For details on the exact value of a respective action see Annex 4.

In order to ensure quality standards and coherence in approach four ranges of scores and quality levels for applications have been defined.

---

\(^{15}\) For most of the actions, the minimum threshold per award criteria and overall score are 50% and 60% respectively.

\(^{16}\) Variations from this model are explained in Annex 1.
The table below shows the ranges of scores for the individual quality standards depending on the maximum score of the award criterion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum number of points for a criterion</th>
<th>Range of scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>34-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>22-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Very good**: the application addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question convincingly and successfully. It provides all the information and evidence needed and there are no concerns or areas of weakness.
- **Good**: the application addresses the criterion well, although some small improvements could be made. It gives clear information on all or nearly all of the evidence needed.
- **Fair**: the application broadly addresses the criterion, but there are some weaknesses. It gives some relevant information, but there are several areas where detail is lacking or the information is unclear.
- **Weak**: the application fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. It does not address the question asked, or gives very little relevant information.

Experts must provide comments on each award criterion and, in their comments, refer explicitly to the elements of analysis under the relevant criterion. The comments on each award criterion have to reflect and justify the given score. They should emphasise the application's strengths and weaknesses. They also may integrate recommendations for the smooth implementation of the project or the improvement of a future project proposal.

As regards **budgetary assessment of an application**, please note that there are broadly speaking two main budgetary models for projects:

a. the budget is based on real cost i.e. the actual cost incurred under the different budget headings.

b. the budget is based on a simplified grant\(^\text{17}\) i.e. a fixed amount is applied to specific budget headings and / or types of activity or outputs.

Some actions might also propose a mixed model with a budget partly based on real cost, partly on simplified grants. The type of budget model will be specified and fully explained in the Programme guide / Call for proposals.

As a result, the financial analysis of a project will vary.

In the more complex scenario where the budget is based on real cost, experts comment on it under the award criterion **Quality of the project design and implementation.** In particular, they analyse the **coherence of the grant request in relation to the activities and outputs proposed.** In case the application is of sufficient quality to receive a grant but such coherence is missing, experts could, in duly justified cases, suggest a correction of the grant amount requested. They should then clearly specify the grant items to be corrected and the amount. It is, however, the Agency who ultimately decides on the final grant amount awarded to successful applicants.

\(^{17}\) Flat rate, unit cost, lump sum.
N.B.: Experts may not suggest a higher grant than the amount requested by the applicant. They may however express concerns that the amount of funding asked for may not guarantee a satisfactory outcome of the project.

Experts must assess all applications in full, regardless of the score given to any of the award criteria.

3.3 Assessment forms

Experts carry out their assessment online using the Online Expert Evaluation Tool (OEET). The applications to be assessed as well as the assessment forms are accessible through the OEET. Experts are provided with technical instructions for the use of OEET as part of their briefing.

The standard assessment forms, for individual and consolidated assessments, are provided by the Agency and used for all Erasmus+ actions to ensure coherence across the Programme. The template assessment forms are presented in Annex 4a and 4b. Experts examine the issues to be considered under each award criterion, enter their scores for each award criterion and provide comments (see section 3.2 Assessment of award criteria and scoring).

Once the individual assessment is complete, experts validate it in the OEET and confirm that they have no conflict of interest with respect to that particular application.

As part of the quality assessment, experts may be required to provide information on data included in the applications that are collected for statistical purposes such as priorities, objectives or topics, or they may be asked to confirm that the data stated in the application is correct. Experts may also be asked to confirm that the applications comply with the eligibility criteria set out in the call for proposals, i.e. number of organisations present in the consortium, the type of organisations, etc. Experts will have to register this information in the OEET.

3.4 Thresholds

The assessment and funding of applications is based on two types of thresholds:

Quality thresholds

In general terms, an application submitted to the Agency in the frame of the Erasmus+ Programme qualifies for funding if it receives a score of:

✔ at least 60 points in total and

✔ at least 50% of the maximum points for each award criterion.

N.B.: For Erasmus+ Capacity-building in Higher Education, this threshold applies only to criterion "Relevance of the project" (see Annex 4).

Funding threshold

The number of applications that can be funded is also dependent on the budget available for an action as stipulated in the annual work programme of the Commission. As explained above, applications are ranked in order of merit and considered for funding until the available budget runs out. If applications of sufficient quality are available, the Agency usually draws up a reserve list of applications. These could be considered for funding in the event that:

- one or several applications on the main list can no longer be funded (e.g. in the case that a contract between the Agency and the project consortium fails to be signed);
- additional budget becomes available for the action.

18 The annual Work programme is available on the Internet page of DG Education & Culture http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/more_info/awp/index_en.htm
3.5 Quality Assurance
The Agency aims at the highest level of quality at every stage of the evaluation process. Therefore particular emphasis is put on:

Training of experts and communication: the Agency sets up interactive and flexible briefing sessions to make sure that all aspects of the assessment procedure are clearly understood by experts before they start working. Where possible, an Online Expert Community allows on-going dialogue and exchange on thematic, methodological and technical issues among peers and with Agency staff (see section 3.1 Expert briefings).

Quality review: the Agency closely monitors the quality of expert assessments and can require the expert to revise the assessment if it fails to meet the quality standards. Some actions call upon experienced experts, commonly referred to as 'quality / lead' experts, to assist in carrying out quality review of individual and/or consolidated assessments. The aim is to ensure:

a. formal correctness;
b. appropriateness, clarity and completeness of comments;
c. coherence between scores and comments.

The quality/lead experts' identity may or may not be disclosed to the rest of the panel. If they assist the teams anonymously, then Agency staff liaises between them and the panel of experts. Quality experts may also be previously introduced to the panel and then be in direct contact with the experts whose work they are supervising.

Editing of consolidated assessments: some actions appoint experts to proofread the commentary of final consolidated assessments. The nature of this task is to perform a linguistic review of the text in order to remove spelling and grammatical errors and to ensure coherent, correct and polite comments.

3.6 Tools
During the entire assessment process, experts are required to make use of a certain number of IT tools and platforms. In terms of equipment it is sufficient to dispose of a computer with internet connection and a telephone line. At the time of their engagement and in any case before starting the work, experts will receive complete and detailed instructions on the tools they have to use. Specific user guides will be put at their disposal.

Briefing and training of experts
Online briefings are held through a web conferencing system which allows setting up virtual meeting rooms for instantaneous discussions and viewing of presentations and documents.

Online Expert Community
The Community is set up through an online platform that can be accessed through the internet at any time during the entire selection period.

Assessment of applications
Experts access the applications that have been assigned to them in the Online Expert Evaluation Tool (OEET). They also submit their individual and consolidated assessments in this tool.

The OEET further allows an expert with the role of editor to access the commentary of consolidated assessments to proofread them and improve their linguistic quality.

19 The majority of comments are not written by English native speakers.
3.7 Possible problems with applications

Applications may be submitted with some weaknesses of administrative nature or content-related. It might also happen that overlaps between several applications are noticed. The Agency’s policy in these cases is the following:

Unclear or missing information
In case of incomplete or unclear applications, the Agency may contact the applicant and ask to submit additional information or clarifications provided that this does not substantially change the application, or it may decide to assess the application in the form it was submitted.

Double submissions and overlaps
Experts are bound to inform the Agency immediately if they notice that the same or similar text appears in two or more applications submitted under a given selection round, as well as any other indications of possible double submissions and overlaps. The E+ Programme Guide, Part C, "Non-cumulative award", clearly states that “Identical or very similar applications – submitted by the same applicant or by other partners of the same consortium – will be subject to a specific assessment in order to exclude the risk of double funding. Applications which are submitted twice or more times by the same applicant or consortium, either to the same Agency or to different Agencies, will all be rejected. Where the same or very similar applications are submitted by other applicants or consortia, they will be carefully checked and may also all be rejected on the same grounds.”

Please note that the experts are under no circumstances allowed to contact applicants directly.
4. FEEDBACK TO APPLICANTS

The Agency notifies applicants in writing of the results of their application. Each applicant receives feedback on the application submitted. This feedback is based on the consolidated final assessment and is given in English.

After the closure of the selection exercise, experts may be called upon to revisit their evaluation and clarify certain aspects of the application.

5. GOOD ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

To conclude, this guide presents some general tips for good assessment practice. Experts receive more specific advice linked to the action they are working for at the time of their briefing and during the assessment period.

It is recommended that experts:

- read several applications before assessing a first one of them in full as this allows to benchmark answers in different sections of the applications;
- read the whole application carefully before completing the assessment form;
- working on the same project evaluate the applications in a prescribed order so that both individual assessments are completed at the same time to avoid losing time with the consolidations;
- pay particular attention to clarity, consistency and appropriate level of detail in their comments. The commentary must also be balanced, in line with the scoring, objective and polite.
- contact Agency staff immediately if they feel uncertain about any of their assignments or face difficulties which may hamper their work.

6. ANNEXES
Criteria to assess an application submitted under Erasmus+ Capacity-building in Higher Education

Criteria used to assess an application submitted under Erasmus+ Capacity-building in Higher Education are found in the Programme Guide / call for proposals.

- **Eligibility Criteria:** Please refer to the Erasmus + Programme Guide / Call for proposals 2016 EAC/A04/2015 (Eligibility Criteria, pages 152-154 and 157-158) for the detailed criteria.

- **Award Criteria:** Please refer to the Erasmus + Programme Guide / Call for proposals 2016 EAC/A04/2015 (Award Criteria, pages 155-159) for the detailed criteria and elements of analysis.
  

  ✓ Related to the "Relevance of the project" award criterion, experts will have to confirm whether the application specifically addresses the National or Regional priorities defined for each Partner Country/Region, with particular attention to the multi-country projects.

  See: Regional Priorities and National Priorities, under section "GUIDELINES" following the link:


  In all cases, you should provide a full assessment of the whole project proposal.
ANNEX 1.b

Description of the specific selection process and methodology
for
Erasmus+ Capacity-building in Higher Education
ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE

The assessment procedure generally consists of the following main steps described in more detail below:

- briefing of experts;
- individual assessments;
- consolidated assessments including quality review;
- final panel for debriefing and concluding remarks
- consultation of the local stakeholders in the Partner Countries involved in the Erasmus+ Capacity-building in Higher education projects
- final panel of Evaluation Committee to establish the list of project proposed for funding
- feedback to applicants including editing of final comments.
- publication of results on the Agency's website

1. Briefing of experts

Only in the first selection year (2015) all experts are invited in Brussels for one day and a half onsite briefing on the award criteria followed by a guided practical exercise to ensure the common understanding of the assessment contents and scoring system. Online briefings will be organised in the subsequent years for those experts who benefitted from onsite briefing in the previous years for Capacity Building in Higher Education action.

2-3. Assessments

Following the briefing exercise, experts will work remotedly. Each application will be assessed by two different experts who shall reach a consensus and only for the cases where a consensus could not be reached, or in the event of substantial discrepancy in scoring between two individual experts, a third expert will be nominated for the same project. After the assessment by teleworking, all experts will be invited to finalise the consolidated assessments at the premises of the Agency. Few experts with longstanding experience in assessing European cooperation projects are appointed as "quality-experts" to ensure the quality control of experts' assessments.

The assessment of proposals by experts will be based on a two-phase procedure:

- **Individual assessments**: two separate assessments per proposal carried out by experts working independently of one another to provide a commentary and a score against the published award criteria;

- **Consensus** discussion between the two experts involved, which will result in a consolidated score for the proposal and a single agreed commentary and score on each of the four award criteria published in the Call for proposals.

**Workload**: 1.5 project / day (including the individual and the consolidated assessments).
Time schedule of experts' activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase / dates</th>
<th>Activity-tasks</th>
<th>Persons involved</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-4.03.2016</td>
<td>Onsite briefing of experts</td>
<td>New Experts Quality-experts EACEA staff</td>
<td>Onsite - EACEA, BOU2, -1/3 Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.03.2016</td>
<td>On-line briefing of experts</td>
<td>Experts who assessed in 2015 EACEA staff</td>
<td>Web-conferencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.03-4.04.2016</td>
<td>Individual assessment Monitoring individual assessment</td>
<td>All experts Quality-experts</td>
<td>Remotely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-29.04.2016</td>
<td>Consensus bilateral discussions Drafting consolidated assessment, 3rd assessment (wherever the case)</td>
<td>All experts Quality-experts</td>
<td>Remotely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3.05.2016</td>
<td>Finalisation of consolidated assessment and signatures - ranking list Debriefing &amp; Concluding discussions</td>
<td>All Experts Quality-experts EACEA staff</td>
<td>Onsite - EACEA, BOU2, -1/3 Brussels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steps to follow:

A. Individual assessment phase. Each expert completes the proposal’s assessment using a MS Word version of the assessment form and finalises it in the on-line assessment tool;

i. A quality check is done by the quality-expert nominated by the Agency on:
   - Formal correctness
   - Coherence between comments and grading
   - Appropriateness, clarity and completeness of comments

   If a problem is identified, corrections are introduced by the expert and resubmitted.

ii. After the final quality check by the quality-experts, experts will upload the individual assessment on-line and submit it. At the same time, the Word version of the individual assessment will be sent to the Agency.

B. Consolidation phase

Once both assessments for one proposal are finalised the consensus phase starts:

- Each expert is given by the Agency an access to the other assessment. The role of each individual expert can be Expert 1 or Expert 2 that they may play for different projects.
- Quality-experts will ensure the quality check of assessments (e.g., substantiated comments for each award criterion and consistent scores).
- Agency staff and quality-experts verify if there is a significant discrepancy between the two assessments or if the consensus between two experts on the same project could not be reached.

i. If there is no significant discrepancy between the assessments, the experts are requested to perform the following operations:
   - Expert 1 is asked to prepare a draft consolidation report with consolidated scores and comments for each award criteria. Then he sends the draft consolidation report by e-mail to Expert 2. After receiving the draft consolidation report, Expert 2 sends back his/her comments to Expert 1.
• Quality-experts will carry out the quality check ensuring that the grades awarded are compatible and consistent with the comments and that these are clear and constructive. In case one of the elements is not satisfactory, the quality-experts may ask re-drafting the consolidation report.

• After the final quality check by the quality-experts who proofread the experts' consolidated report, Expert 1 uploads the consolidated assessment on-line. At the same time, experts 1 will save a copy of the consolidated report in pdf or Word format and send it by e-mail to the Agency.

• Once finalised and submitted on-line (in Brussels), the consolidation report will be printed and signed by the experts.

ii. If the consensus could not be reached or if a significant discrepancy is identified, a third assessment will be organised. The other 2 experts are asked to read the other experts' assessments and the draft consolidation report, completed with consolidated grades and comments. The consolidation will further take place between the two closest scores. Expert 1 will submit the consolidated assessment on-line. The expert who gave the most divergent score will be informed.

Experts will be asked to undertake their assessments following the order of the raising number of registration (from the lowest number to the highest one), so that discrepancies between their evaluations can be identified as early as possible.

The nature and characteristics of the comments expected from the experts will be specified during the experts' briefing.

Quality assurance
A mechanism to ensure comparability between expert scoring will be used. The deviations of experts' scores against the average scores will be captured in principle at least three times during the assessment exercise: (i) at the briefing stage, simulation of assessment of the same application; (ii) after completion of the first 8 assessments; (iii) before the end of the individual assessment stage. Experts who systematically deviate from the average score will be monitored more closely.

To reinforce the quality assurance, a limited number of experts with longstanding experience in assessing European cooperation projects are appointed as quality-experts. Apart from carrying out a few number of individual assessments, the quality experts will coach and monitor the experts' work, ensuring that the grades awarded are compatible and consistent with the comments and that these are clear and constructive. EACEA will finally verify and accept the evaluation reports proofread by quality-experts ensuring that the outputs of assessments reach the desired level of quality. Editing of experts' assessments by few experts will be ensured to guarantee that the work delivered can be used to communicate with the applicants.

4. Final panel for debriefing and concluding remarks

Once the consolidated assessments are completed and submitted on-line by all experts present at the final meeting in Brussels on 2-3 May 2016, the quality-experts will collect the outstanding issues related to project contents, scoring and assessment exercise on the whole, including recommendations related to the assessment exercise in general (including the working methodology, workload, timing, tools etc.), to be presented in the Evaluation Committee meeting to established the short-list of project for consultation of authorities in Partner Countries, on 19 May 2016. All experts will have the possibility to express their opinions. The Agency staff will prepare the ranking list in order of merit according to the final scores endorsed by experts.

---

20 See section 3.1.3. of the present Handbook.
5. Consultation procedure

Based on the ranking list following experts’ assessment, the Evaluation Committee agrees on a short-list of quality projects on which different stakeholders in the Partner Countries might be consulted. The local stakeholders' contribution to the selection process is essential in order to ensure the feasibility of activities, the local ownership of the project results and their impact and sustainability at national/regional level. These stakeholders will be asked to give an opinion on the relevance award criterion only, as well as on the feasibility of the project in the local context.

6. Final panel of Evaluation Committee

The Evaluation Committee will meet in a final panel and decide on the list of projects recommended for funding. Deliberations will be based on the ranking of shortlisted proposals as it results from the expert assessment and will also take into consideration:

- the results from the consultation process (see above);
- the budget available for any given region of the world, as defined in the financial instruments of the EU external action;
- the need to achieve a geographical balance within a region in terms of number of projects per country, within the limits of the available budget and provided that sufficient quality is guaranteed;
- the need to ensure that the overall results of the selection guarantees a sufficient coverage of the priorities.

A maximum of three project proposals per applicant organisation will be recommended for funding.

The EACEA Head of Department/Director takes the award decision based Evaluation Committee's recommendation.

7. Feedback to applicants including editing of final comments

All applicants are informed in writing about the selection results once the award decision is signed. Unsuccessful applicants will receive immediately the evaluation reports (including the reasons for not being selected for funding) whilst the successful applicants will be simply notified; evaluation reports for the successful applicants (including recommendations for any improvement necessary during the implementation stages) will be sent with the Grant Agreement.

8. Publication of results

The publication of the projects recommended for funding will be published on the EACEA website after all applicants have been informed in writing.
ANNEX 2

Declaration of absence of conflict of interests and of confidentiality (for information, the declaration will form an integral part of the contract).

Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

Title of Call for proposals: Erasmus+ Capacity-building in Higher Education

Reference: Call for proposal 2016, EAC/A04/2015

I. Conflict of interests

I, the undersigned [Surname, family name], having been appointed as an expert for the abovementioned call, declare that I am aware of Article 57 of the Financial Regulation, which states that:

"1. Financial actors and other persons involved in budget implementation and management, including acts preparatory thereto, audit or control shall not take any action which may bring their own interests into conflict with those of the Union.

Where such a risk exists, the person in question shall refrain from such action and shall refer the matter to the authorising officer by delegation who shall confirm in writing whether a conflict of interests exists. The person in question shall also inform his or her hierarchical superior. Where a conflict of interests is found to exist, the person in question shall cease all activities in the matter. The authorising officer by delegation shall personally take any further appropriate action.

2. For the purposes of paragraph 1, a conflict of interests exists where the impartial and objective exercise of the functions of a financial actor or other person, as referred to in paragraph 1, is compromised for reasons involving family, emotional life, political or national affinity, economic interest or any other shared interest with a recipient."

I hereby declare that I do not fall under any of the following circumstances in which a conflict of interests might exist. I confirm that, if I discover before or during the evaluation that a conflict of interests exists, I will declare it immediately to the Agency.

1/Disqualifying conflict of interests:

— Involvement in the preparation of the proposal;
— Direct benefit in case of acceptance of the proposal;
— Close family relationship with any person representing a participating organisation in the proposal;
— Director, trustee or partner of a participating organisation;
— Current employment by a participating organisation;
— Current involvement in a contract or collaboration with a participating organisation;
— Any other situation that compromises my ability to evaluate the proposal impartially.

2/Potential conflict of interests:

— Employment by one of the participating organisation within the previous three years;
— Involvement in a contract or collaboration with a participating organisation within the previous three years;
— Any other situation that could cast doubt on my ability to evaluate the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of a third party (Ex. Past or current personal relationships, nationality, political affinity, etc.).

I hereby declare that I fall under one or more of the above circumstances (please specify which and explain):

| Ex. In case of employment by a structure including different departments or institutes, please specify the degree of autonomy between them. |

I hereby declare on my honour that the disclosed information is true and complete to the best of my knowledge.21

II. Confidentiality and personal data protection

I also confirm that I will keep all matters entrusted to me confidential and will process the personal data I receive only for the purposes of the performance of the present evaluation. If unnecessary or excessive personal data are contained in the documents submitted by the applicant, I will not process them further or take them into account for the evaluation of the proposal. I will not communicate outside the panel any confidential information that is revealed to me or that I have discovered. I will not make any adverse use of information given to me.

Signed: ………………………………… Date/Place:

Name (in capitals):

21 In case of false, incomplete or incorrect statements or failure to provide information in an attempt to obtain the contract or any benefit resulting therefrom, or where this was the effect of the action, this constitutes a breach of the contract between the Agency and the expert. The Agency may decide to terminate the contract and to recover any sums paid to the Contractor under the order (cf. Article 8 of the General Conditions).
ANNEX 3    Reference documents on policy priorities

Transversal policy priorities for education, training and youth

- Education and Training 2020 in EUROPE 2020
  
  o Europe 2020:
    http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm
  
  o Europe 2020 targets:
    http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/targets/eu-targets/
  
  o Country-specific recommendations 2013:
    http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm
  
  o Education and Training 2020 (ET2020):
  
  o "Council conclusions on the role of education and training in the implementation of the ‘Europe 2020’ strategy":
  
  o "Council conclusions of 26 November 2012 on education and training in Europe 2020 — the contribution of education and training to economic recovery, growth and jobs”:
  
  o "Council Conclusions on investing in education and training — a response to Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes and the 2013 Annual Growth Survey”:
  
  o Joint Council/Commission report on education and training 2020:
    http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52012XG0308%2801%29
  
  o Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes:
  
  
  o "Council conclusions on effective leadership in education”:
ANNEX 4

ANNEX 4.a Individual Assessment Form

ERASMUS+ PROGRAMME
Capacity-building in Higher Education
Joint and Structural Projects

Selection 2016

Individual Assessment Form

EXPERT'S NAME: ……………………………………………………..
DATE: ……………………………. VERSION NUMBER: …………..

PROPOSAL INFORMATION:
Activity Type: ☐ CBHE-JP ☐ CBHE-SP
Applicant organisation: ……………………………………………
Proposal Number: …………………………………………….
Proposal Title: …………………………………………………..

☐ I hereby confirm that I am not in a position of conflict of interest with regard to this proposal.

Date: .......................  

Please identify from the options below any areas of concern you have about the compliance of the project proposal with the Erasmus+ Erasmus+ Capacity-building in Higher Education Programme action.

In all cases (even in case you have chosen "no") please continue with the detailed assessment:

Is the proposal within the framework of the Erasmus+ Capacity-building in Higher Education Programme action?

Yes: ☐ No: ☐

(Please provide an explanation for your concern.)
Each section of the assessment form corresponds to an award criterion. For each section please give a score based on your assessment of how well the proposal addresses the criterion, and provide comments justifying the score for the section.

The maximum rating for each category is indicated on the right. The maximum total points that a proposal may obtain is 100. In principle, proposals which do not receive 60 points will not be considered for funding.

The scoring system:

The table below shows the ranges of scores for the individual quality standards depending on the maximum score of the award criterion.

Applications scored less than 50% of the maximum points in the criterion RELEVANCE OF THE PROPOSAL cannot be funded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum number of points for a criterion</th>
<th>Range of scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award criteria</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relevance of the project</td>
<td>/30 Min. threshold 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The proposed project and results foreseen will contribute efficiently to the pursued objectives of the Capacity Building action in the target country/ies
- The application clearly addresses the thematic national and geographic priorities set by the programme for its target country/ies or region(s)
- The proposal explains why the planned activities and expected results meet the needs of the target groups in the best way
- The project inscribes itself in the modernisation, development and internationalisation strategy of the targeted higher education institutions and is in line with the development strategies for higher education in the eligible Partner Countries
- The objectives of the project are clear, realistic and appropriate, based on a genuine and adequate needs analysis
- The project is innovative and/or complementary to other initiatives or projects already carried out under the present or past actions
- The application demonstrates that similar results could not be achieved through national, regional or local funding
2. Quality of the project design and implementation  /30

- The activities proposed over the lifetime of the project are of high quality, pertinent and appropriate to achieve the objectives and foreseen results.
- The proposed methodology is innovative, feasible and appropriate to achieve the foreseen results.
- The project is cost-effective and allocates appropriate resources to each activity.
- The overall project design ensures consistency between project objectives, methodology, activities and budget proposed.
- The work plan is clear and realistic, with well-defined activities, realistic time-lines, clear deliverables and milestones. It demonstrates a logical and sound planning capacity and includes appropriate phases for preparation, implementation, evaluation, follow-up and dissemination of results.
- Challenges/risks of the project are clearly identified and mitigating actions properly addressed. Quality control measures, including indicators and benchmarks, are in place to ensure that the project implementation is of high quality, completed in time and on budget. Reliable sources are given for verification of indicators to measure the outcomes of the action.

3. Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements  /20

- The project involves a strong and complementary partnership of higher education institutions.
- The project team has the necessary skills, experience, expertise and management support to successfully deliver all aspects of the project.
- Where relevant, the project also includes the most appropriate and diverse range of non-academic partners, in order to benefit from their different experiences, profiles and specific expertise.
- The distribution of responsibilities and tasks is clear, appropriate, and demonstrates the commitment and active contribution of all participating organisations in relation to their specific expertise and capacity.
- An effective mechanism is proposed to ensure good coordination, decision making and communication between the participating organisations, participants and any other relevant stakeholder.
- The participating organisations from eligible Partner Countries are satisfactorily involved in the implementation of the action and decision making (including measures for any conflict resolution).
- The project involves higher education institutions that have not benefited from support for capacity building in the past.
Please comment on each of the above bullet points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Impact and sustainability</th>
<th>/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The project will have a substantial impact on the capacities of participating organisations (notably higher education institutions) in the eligible Partner Countries, in particular on the development and modernisation of higher education, to assist them in opening themselves up to society at large, the labour market and the wider world and to support their capacity for international cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project will produce multiplier effects outside the participating organisations at local/regional/national or international level. Measures are in place to assess the effective impact achieved by the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The dissemination plan during and beyond the project lifetime is clear and efficient, with appropriate resources identified in each of the participating organisations, to ensure high quality dissemination of project experiences and outputs to relevant stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project will ensure a real sustainability of the proposed activities and outputs after the project lifetime, in particular through attracting co-funding or other forms of support. It will also ensure the mainstreaming and effective use/implementation of the project results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment on each of the above bullet points

Maximum total score /100

ADDITIONAL AWARD CRITERIA for SPECIAL MOBILITY STRAND

Optional, eligible only for projects involving partner countries from Regions 1, 2 and 3.

Mobility Strands components that score 5 points or less will not be considered for funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of the design and implementation of the Special Mobility Action</th>
<th>/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The mobility component fully contributes to the achievements of the project objectives and is well articulated with them in particular in terms of subject areas / topics addressed by the project. Course(s) to be taught by mobile teachers and/or to the mobile students demonstrate(s) an added value to the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The proposal includes transparent criteria and an effective procedure for the identification and selection of participants for mobility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality measures are put in place both at the sending and the receiving organisation to monitor the mobility activity, and take appropriate measures if the results are not reached as initially envisaged. Quality services are offered to the students in their host institution (induction session, local language/culture courses, tutoring and mentoring, support for accommodation, etc.).

The project demonstrates that mobility actions have a positive impact not only on individuals benefitting from them, but also on the eligible Partner Country institutions and explains how the successful mobility experiences will be recognised and valued at institutional level. Relevance of the contribution of the staff mobility to the host higher education institutions for the targeted students and to the home higher education institutions (valorisation/dissemination of the experience/competences gained within and beyond the higher education area) is clearly proved.

The proposal describes the strategy for efficient validation and/or recognition of the participants' learning outcomes and mobility periods, such as the definition of joint recognition and performance evaluation mechanisms (including the elaboration of grades conversion grids); usage of the transferable credits and Diploma Supplement.

Please comment on each of the above bullet points

Maximum total score /10

Do you recommend the funding of the proposed special mobility strand?

Yes: ☐ No: ☐

Section "Typology":

Review of the National / Regional / Cross-regional Priorities addressed by the application:

Depending on the Partner Countries involved in the project, national, regional or cross cutting priorities may be defined for both categories of projects (Joint Projects and Structural Projects). Should this be the case, projects will have to demonstrate how and to which extent they address these priorities.

Proposals not respecting the national and/or regional and cross-cutting priorities will not be considered for funding.

1. Please confirm that the priorities ticked in section C3 of the eForm complies with the regional or national requirements, i.e., as defined in the Excel tables Regional Priorities and National Priorities” published on the Call for proposals website:


Yes: ☐ No: ☐
2. Please confirm whether, to your understanding, the project rationale specifically addresses the selected priorities:

Yes: [ ]  Partially: [ ]  No: [ ]

In case of "No" or "Partially", please make sure that a relevant comment is included in the text box related to the criterion 1. "Relevance of the project".

3. Cross-Cutting priority "refugees"
Does the project address the integration in Higher Education of refugees from conflict affected countries?

Yes: [ ]  No: [ ]

In all cases, you should provide a full assessment of the whole project proposal:

**Involvement of people with fewer opportunities:**
Does the project involve people with fewer opportunities?

Yes: [ ]  No: [ ]

***************

**Comments for the Executive Agency on the budget** (to be also reported in the section Comments in the assessment tool):
Please detail here your comments on the proposed budget related to Award criteria 2.

***************

**General comments for the Executive Agency** (to be also reported in the section comments in the assessment tool):
Please write here any confidential remarks you may have on the proposal.
If you note any similarities (in terms of overall and specific objectives, activities, target groups and consortium compositions) amongst the projects you are assessing, please comment here.
ANNEX 4.b Consolidated Quality Assessment Form

ERASMUS+ PROGRAMME
Capacity-building in Higher Education
Joint and Structural Projects
Selection 2016
Consolidated Assessment Form

EXPERTS’ NAMES:
EXPERT 1 EXPERT 2 EXPERT 3
…………………………… ……………………………………… ……………………………..

DATE: …………………………….. VERSION NUMBER: …………..

PROPOSAL INFORMATION:
Activity Type: ☐ CBHE-JP ☐ CBHE-SP
Applicant organisation: ………………………………………..
Proposal Number: ……………………………………………
Proposal Title: …………………………………………………

Both of the experts involved in consolidation should sign below:
Signature Expert 1: ………………………………………………………….. Date: …………………
Signature Expert 2: ………………………………………………………….. Date: …………………
Signature Expert 3: ………………………………………………………….. Date: …………………

☐ I hereby confirm that I am not in a position of conflict of interest with regard to this proposal.
Date: …………………

Please identify from the options below any areas of concern you have about the compliance of the project proposal with the Erasmus+ Erasmus+ Capacity-building in Higher Education Programme action.

In all cases (even in case you have chosen "no") please continue with the detailed assessment:

Is the proposal within the framework of the Erasmus+ Capacity-building in Higher Education Programme action?

Yes: ☐ No: ☐
Consolidated Assessment

Each section of the assessment form corresponds to an award criterion. For each section please give a score based on your assessment of how well the proposal addresses the criterion, and provide comments justifying the score for the section.

The maximum rating for each category is indicated on the right. The maximum total points that a proposal may obtain is 100. In principle, proposals which do not receive 60 points will not be considered for funding.

**The scoring system:**

The table below shows the ranges of scores for the individual quality standards depending on the maximum score of the award criterion.

Applications scored less than 50% of the maximum points in the criterion RELEVANCE OF THE PROPOSAL cannot be funded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum number of points for a criterion</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>0-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>0-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Grid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award criteria</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relevance of the project</td>
<td>/30 Min. threshold 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The proposed project and results foreseen will contribute efficiently to the pursued objectives of the Capacity Building action in the target country/ies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The application clearly addresses the thematic and geographic priorities set by the programme for its target country/ies or region(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The proposal explains why the planned activities and expected results meet the needs of the target groups in the best way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project inscribes itself in the modernisation, development and internationalisation strategy of the targeted higher education institutions and is in line with the development strategies for higher education in the eligible Partner Countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The objectives of the project are clear, realistic and appropriate, based on a genuine and adequate needs analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project is innovative and /or complementary to other initiatives or projects already carried out under the present or past actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The application demonstrates that similar results could not be achieved through national, regional or local funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please comment on each of the above bullet points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Quality of the project design and implementation</th>
<th>/30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The activities proposed over the lifetime of the project are of high quality, pertinent and appropriate to achieve the objectives and foreseen results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The proposed methodology is innovative, feasible and appropriate to achieve the foreseen results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project is cost-effective and allocates appropriate resources to each activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The overall project design ensures consistency between project objectives, methodology, activities and budget proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The work plan is clear and realistic, with well-defined activities, realistic time-lines, clear deliverables and milestones. It demonstrates a logical and sound planning capacity and includes appropriate phases for preparation, implementation, evaluation, follow-up and dissemination of results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Challenges/risks of the project are clearly identified and mitigating actions properly addressed. Quality control measures, including indicators and benchmarks, are in place to ensure that the project implementation is of high quality, completed in time and on budget. Reliable sources are given for verification of indicators to measure the outcomes of the action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment on each of the above bullet points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements</th>
<th>/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The project involves a strong and complementary partnership of higher education institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project team has the necessary skills, experience, expertise and management support to successfully deliver all aspects of the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where relevant, the project also includes the most appropriate and diverse range of non-academic partners, in order to benefit from their different experiences, profiles and specific expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The distribution of responsibilities and tasks is clear, appropriate, and demonstrates the commitment and active contribution of all participating organisations in relation to their specific expertise and capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An effective mechanism is proposed to ensure good coordination, decision making and communication between the participating organisations, participants and any other relevant stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The participating organisations from eligible Partner Countries are satisfactorily involved in the implementation of the action and decision making (including measures for any conflict resolution)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project involves higher education institutions that have not benefited from support for capacity building in the past</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment on each of the above bullet points
### 4. Impact and sustainability

- The project will have a substantial impact on the capacities of participating organisations (notably higher education institutions) in the eligible Partner Countries, in particular on the development and modernisation of higher education, to assist them in opening themselves up to society at large, the labour market and the wider world and to support their capacity for international cooperation.
- The project will produce multiplier effects outside the participating organisations at local/regional/national or international level. Measures are in place to assess the effective impact achieved by the project.
- The dissemination plan during and beyond the project lifetime is clear and efficient, with appropriate resources identified in each of the participating organisations, to ensure high quality dissemination of project experiences and outputs to relevant stakeholders.
- The project will ensure a real sustainability of the proposed activities and outputs after the project lifetime, in particular through attracting co-funding or other forms of support. It will also ensure the mainstreaming and effective use/implementation of the project results.

*Please comment on each of the above bullet points*

| Maximum total score | /100 |

### ADDITIONAL AWARD CRITERIA for SPECIAL MOBILITY STRAND

Optional, eligible only for projects involving partner countries from Regions 1, 2 and 3.

**Mobility Strands components that score 5 points or less will not be considered for funding.**

| Quality of the design and implementation of the Special Mobility Action | /10 |

- The mobility component fully contributes to the achievements of the project objectives and is well articulated with them in particular in terms of subject areas / topics addressed by the project. Course(s) to be taught by mobile teachers and/or to the mobile students demonstrate(s) an added value to the project.
- The proposal includes transparent criteria and an effective procedure for the identification and selection of participants for mobility.
- Quality measures are put in place both at the sending and the receiving organisation to monitor the mobility activity, and take appropriate measures if the results are not reached as initially envisaged. Quality services are offered to the students in their host institution (induction session, local language/culture courses, tutoring and mentoring, support for accommodation, etc.).
- The project demonstrates that mobility actions have a positive impact not only on individuals benefitting from them, but also on the eligible Partner Country institutions and explains how the successful mobility experiences will be recognised and valued at institutional level. Relevance of the contribution of the staff mobility to the host higher education institutions for the targeted students and to the home higher education institutions (valorisation/dissemination of the experience/competences gained within and beyond the higher education area) is clearly proved.
- The proposal describes the strategy for efficient validation and/or recognition of the participants’ learning outcomes and mobility periods, such as the definition of joint recognition and performance evaluation mechanisms (including the elaboration of grades conversion grids); usage of the transferable credits and Diploma Supplement.

*Please comment on each of the above bullet points*

| Maximum total score | /10 |
Do you recommend the funding of the proposed special mobility strand?

Yes: ☐   No: ☐

Section "Typology":

Review of the National / Regional / Cross-regional Priorities addressed by the application:

Depending on the Partner Countries involved in the project, national, regional or cross cutting priorities may be defined for both categories of projects (Joint Projects and Structural Projects). Should this be the case, projects will have to demonstrate how and to which extent they address these priorities.

Proposals not respecting the national and/or regional and cross-cutting priorities will not be considered for funding.

1. Please confirm that the priorities ticked in section C3 of the eForm complies with the regional or national requirements, i.e., as defined in the Excel tables Regional Priorities and National Priorities" published on the Call for proposals website:


Yes: ☐   No: ☐

2. Please confirm whether, to your understanding, the project rationale specifically addresses the selected priorities:

Yes: ☐   Partially: ☐   No: ☐

In case of "No" or "Partially", please make sure that a relevant comment is included in the text box related to the criterion 1. "Relevance of the project".

3. Cross-Cutting priority "refugees"

Does the project address the integration in Higher Education of refugees from conflict affected countries?

Yes: ☐   No: ☐

In all cases, you should provide a full assessment of the whole project proposal:

Involvement of people with fewer opportunities:

Does the project involve people with fewer opportunities?

Yes: ☐   No: ☐

********************
Comments for the Executive Agency on the budget (to be also reported in the section Comments in the assessment tool):
Please detail here your comments on the proposed budget related to Award criteria 2.

General comments for the Executive Agency (to be also reported in the section comments in the assessment tool):
Please write here any confidential remarks you may have on the proposal.
If you note any similarities (in terms of overall and specific objectives, activities, target groups and consortium compositions) amongst the projects you are assessing, please comment here.
Postal Address:
Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency
Avenue de Bourget 1
BOUR
BE-1140 Brussels

Physical Address: (for visitors only)
Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency
Rue Colonel Bourg 135-139
BE-1140 Evere

General email address
eacea-info@ec.europa.eu

The agency can be reached by telephone via the Commission central service: +32 (0) 2 299 11 11

State that you wish to contact the EAC Executive Agency and give the name of the programme and action concerned to ensure that you are routed to the appropriate department.