



Name of evaluator: _____

**COMENIUS REGIO PARTNERSHIPS
COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM
2013**

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. The Guide for evaluators explains the 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 a) of the heading C2 and C3.

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

Indicative question in the application form		Points	Max.	Breakdown			
Objectives of the Partnership and relevance to the objectives of the programme							
C.2 and C.3	<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.3.3 and C4.1	<p>The approach chosen to achieve the objectives is clear and realistic.</p> <p><i>General approach, activities and outcomes/results 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.4.2	<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.4.3	<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. 5.1 and 5.2	<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.5.3	<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.8and C.9	<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 (including mobility if foreseen) of each partner are relevant.</p>		15	Very Good 15-13	Good -12-9	Fair -8-4	Weak 3-1
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 provide comments on the quality of the application and outline the key strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement, which will enable the applicant to strengthen their project if it is approved or to provide them with information on how they can improve future applications should their application be rejected. Please integrate in particular the comments on individual criteria with very high score in the "Key strengths" section and those with very low score in the "Weaknesses and areas of improvements" section. These comments must be consistent with any scores awarded and serve as input to provide feedback to applicants. Particular attention should be given to clarity, consistency and appropriate level of detail and should be written in the language of the Partnership application, or in English, in a polite and neutral tone.

Key strengths:

Weaknesses and areas of improvement:

Other comments:

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

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.			