

Name of evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

**MULTILATERAL COMENIUS SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS**  
**COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM**  
**2010**

**Partnership reference N°**

<b>Name of coordinating institution:</b>	
<b>Partnership title:</b>	

**Note on the points system:** Each criterion should be rated on the scale proposed. The ratings of the quality criteria result in a total number of points out of a maximum of 100. Each application is rated by 2 assessors and the average of the marks will be used as the final marking for quality. Experts should use numbers with decimals (e.g. 4.2) when giving points for one or more of the items in the quality assessment form in order to avoid too many assessments with the same total number of points. National Agencies will need to define an approach on how to deal with significant differences between the points given by the two assessors or with situations in which only one of the two experts has assessed the application as weak under point D.3 b (e.g. consolidation between the two assessors to agree on a final marking or having the application assessed by a third expert).

Please note that applications scoring less than 50 points in the quality assessment will not be selected for funding. Points for newcomers and national priority points will be awarded separately by the NA and input directly into LLPLink.

**Section D of the application form: Project description and section G: Participants and activities**

Question in the application form		Points	Max.	Breakdown			
<b>D.3.</b>	<b>a) The aims of the Partnership and the approach chosen to achieve them are clear and realistic.</b>		<b>12</b>	Very Good (10-12)	Good (7-9)	Fair (4-6)	Weak (0-3)
	<b>b) The subject is relevant for the Comenius programme.</b> (see Comenius objectives in Annex 1) <i>Applications assessed as "weak" on this criterion will be rejected without further assessment.</i>		<b>4</b>	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Weak (0-1)
<b>D.4.</b>	<b>The results are relevant for the Partnership in question.</b>		<b>6</b>	Very Good (6)	Good (4-5)	Fair (2-3)	Weak (0-1)
<b>D.5. &amp; D.6.</b>	<b>The expected impact and benefits of the Partnership on participating institutions and individual participants are clear and well defined.</b>		<b>7</b>	Very Good (6-7)	Good (4-5)	Fair (2-3)	Weak (0-1)
<b>F.1.</b>	<b>There is an appropriate balance between the roles and tasks of the different participants in terms of their involvement in the activities to be carried out.</b>  There is an appropriate and clearly defined distribution of tasks across the Partnership. The contribution of each partner is clearly explained.  The tasks are defined and distributed among the partners in such a way that the results can be achieved. The Partnership coordination is well assured by the coordinating institution.		<b>10</b>	Very Good (8-10)	Good (6-7)	Fair (4-5)	Weak (0-3)

<b>F.2.</b>	<p><b>Appropriate measures have been planned to ensure effective communication and cooperation between the participating institutions.</b></p> <p>Appropriate measures are foreseen to ensure communication and cooperation such as meetings, workshops, regular correspondence, newsletters and other forms of exchange of information.</p>		<b>7</b>	Very Good (6-7)	Good (4-5)	Fair (2-3)	Weak (0-1)
<b>F.3.</b>	<p><b>The application makes clear how pupils and/or relevant staff will be involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of activities.</b></p> <p>If the Partnership is rather pupil oriented, the application makes clear the role that pupils will play in the different stages of the Partnership (planning, implementation, evaluation)</p> <p>If the Partnerships focused on pedagogical or management issues, the application makes clear how all relevant staff will be involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of activities</p>		<b>12</b>	Very Good (10-12)	Good (7-9)	Fair (4-6)	Weak (0-3)
<b>F.4.</b>	<p><b>The Partnership is integrated into the curriculum and / or ongoing activities of the institutions involved.</b></p> <p>If the Partnership focuses on pupil involvement, the application makes clear how the Partnerships activities will be integrated into the curriculum of the participating pupils and what subjects of the curriculum will be concerned.</p> <p>In Partnerships dealing with pedagogical or management issues, the application makes clear how the project fits into the regular activities of the participating institutions.</p>		<b>12</b>	Very Good (10-12)	Good (7-9)	Fair (4-6)	Weak (0-3)

<b>F.5.</b>	<b>The Partnership has defined an approach to evaluate whether the aims and the expected impact of the Partnership will be achieved in the course of the project lifecycle.</b>  The evaluation plan is well defined and covers aspects such as follow-up of progress made and Partnership performance, satisfaction of participants and other target groups, attainment of objectives, measurement of impact.		<b>5</b>	Very Good (5)	Good (3-4)	Fair (2)	Weak (0-1)
<b>F.6.</b>	<b>The planned dissemination and exploitation activities are well defined and ensure optimal use of the results amongst the participating institutions.</b>  The dissemination activities are focused and well defined. The Partnership demonstrates the interest/potential to make use of the results, experiences and, where applicable, end products of the Partnership.		<b>7</b>	Very Good (6-7)	Good (4-5)	Fair (2-3)	Weak (0-1)
	<b>Other institutions will also benefit from the planned dissemination and exploitation activities and, if possible, the results will also be spread to the wider community.</b>		<b>4</b>	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Weak (0-1)
<b>G.2.</b>	<b>The work programme covers the whole period of 2 years and is appropriate for achieving the objectives. The planned activities and mobilities are relevant for the Partnership in question.</b>		<b>14</b>	Very Good (11-14)	Good (7-10)	Fair (4-6)	Weak (0-3)
	<b>TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT</b>		<b>100</b>				

**OVERALL COMMENTS:**

*Please be as specific and clear as possible. In the case of less good quality applications, please explain points which you feel could be improved (these comments may be sent as feedback to unsuccessful applicants). Please complete this section in the language of the Partnership proposal, or in English.*

*I hereby declare to the best of my knowledge that I have no conflict of interest (including family, emotional life, political affinity, economic interest or any other shared interest) with the organisation(s) or any of the persons having submitted this grant application. Furthermore, I confirm that I will not communicate to any third party any information that may be disclosed to me in the context of my work as an evaluator.*

---

Date

---

Name and signature

**DECISION No 1720/2006/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 15 November 2006 establishing an action programme in the field of lifelong learning<sup>1</sup>**

(Excerpt)

*Article 17*

**Objectives of the Comenius programme**

1. In addition to the objectives of the Lifelong Learning Programme as set out in Article 1, the specific objectives of the Comenius programme shall be:

- (a) to develop knowledge and understanding among young people and educational staff of the diversity of European cultures and languages and its value;
- (b) to help young people acquire the basic life-skills and competences necessary for their personal development, for future employment and for active European citizenship.

2. The operational objectives of the Comenius programme shall be:

- (a) to improve the quality and to increase the volume of mobility involving pupils and educational staff in different Member States;
- (b) to improve the quality and to increase the volume of partnerships between schools in different Member States, so as to involve at least 3 million pupils in joint educational activities during the period of the programme;
- (c) to encourage the learning of modern foreign languages;
- (d) to support the development of innovative ICT-based content, services, pedagogies and practice for lifelong learning;
- (e) to enhance the quality and European dimension of teacher training;
- (f) to support improvements in pedagogical approaches and school management.

---

<sup>1</sup> in L 327/46 Official Journal of the European Union of 24.11.2006