



Education and Culture
Lifelong Learning Programme
COMENIUS

Name of evaluator: _____

COMENIUS REGIO PARTNERSHIPS
COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM
2010

Partnership reference N°

Name of coordinating institution:	
Partnership title:	

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 5.3 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.

Section C of the application form: Description of proposed Partnership , section D: Proposed activity data and section E: Requested EU funding

Question in the application form		Points	Max.	Breakdown			
Objectives of the Partnership and relevance to the objectives of the programme							
C.1 and C.2	<p>a) The objectives of the Partnership are relevant for the Comenius Programme and in compliance with the objectives of Comenius Regio Partnerships.</p> <p><i>The objectives of the partnership are in compliance with the Comenius objectives and policy context outlined in the call. They correspond to the objectives and characteristics of Comenius Regio Partnerships.</i></p> <p><i>Applications assessed as "weak" (less than 3 points) on this criterion will be rejected without further assessment.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 -1
	<p>b) The objectives of the Partnership are relevant to the participating regions.</p> <p><i>Context and motivation indicate clearly that the objectives concern important issues in the participating regions.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 -1
Work programme and project management							
C.2.3 and C.3.1	<p>The approach chosen to achieve the objectives is clear and realistic.</p> <p><i>General approach and activities are well planned and have a clear potential to reach the objectives of the project.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 -1

C.3.2	<p>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.</p> <p><i>There is an appropriate and clearly defined distribution of tasks across the Partnership, between the partner regions as well as in each region. The contribution of each partner is clearly explained.</i></p> <p><i>The Partnership coordination is well assured by the coordinating institution.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 -1
C.3.3	<p>Appropriate measures have been planned to ensure effective communication and cooperation between the participating institutions.</p> <p><i>Appropriate measures are foreseen to ensure communication and cooperation such as meetings, workshops, regular correspondence, newsletters and other forms of exchange of information.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 -1
Impact and European added value							
C.4.1 and 4.2	<p>The expected results, impact and benefits of the Partnership on participating regions are clear, realistic and well defined.</p> <p><i>The participating regions have a clear view on the possible impacts and effect of the partnership activities. They demonstrate the ability to steer the project in a way that impacts are relevant for all stakeholders.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 -1
C.4.3	<p>The Partnership has defined an approach to monitor and evaluate whether the objectives and the expected impact of the Partnership will be achieved in the course of the project lifecycle.</p> <p><i>The monitoring and 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.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 -1

Dissemination and use of results - sustainability							
C.7 and C.8	<p>The planned dissemination and exploitation activities are well defined and ensure optimal use of the results amongst the participating regions.</p> <p><i>The dissemination activities are focused and well defined. They integrate different levels of dissemination (regional and national level).</i></p> <p><i>The Partnership demonstrates the interest/potential to make use of the results, experiences and, where applicable, end products of the Partnership.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 - 1
Proposed activity and mobility data							
D.1	<p>The work programme covers the whole period of 2 years. The planned activities of each partner are relevant.</p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 - 1
D.2	<p>The mobilities planned are relevant for the project.</p> <p><i>The planning indicates the minimum number of mobilities for the partnership type.</i></p>		5	Very Good 5	Good 4	Fair 3 - 2	Weak 1
Coherence of budget planning, value for money							
E	<p>The budget is in line with the work activities.</p> <p>The proposal offers good value for money</p>		5	Very Good 5	Good 4	Fair 3 - 2	Weak 1
	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT		100				

OVERALL COMMENTS:

Please be as specific and clear as possible. Please avoid personal judgement and use a neutral language. 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.

I agree that my name and current position will be communicated to National Agencies managing Comenius in other countries.

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 learning¹

(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.

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

DRAFT VERSION

Requested EU funding – to be checked and filled by NA				
E		YES	NO	NEGOTIATION NEEDED
	<i>The chosen lump sum amount corresponds to the number of planned mobilities and the distance.</i>			
	<i>The budget for other (non-mobility) project costs is justified and corresponds well to the project activities.</i> <i>The estimated costs appear to be realistic and in line with sound financial management.</i>			
	The budget is justified and acceptable.			