

Name of evaluator: _____

**GRUNDTVIG LEARNING PARTNERSHIPS
COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM
2010**

Partnership reference N°

Name of coordinating organisation:	
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 (at least one of whom must be external to the NA) 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 points D3 and E1 (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.

Note on the assessment criteria: The Quality Assessment Form follows broadly the sequence of sections in the Application Form. For information, a cross-reference is made in each case to the corresponding award criterion as contained in the LLP Guide.

Section in the application form		Points	Max.	Breakdown			
D3 and E1	<p>The concrete objectives of the Partnership and the approach chosen to achieve them are clear and realistic.</p> <p><i>(See Grundtvig objectives in Annex 1)</i></p> <p>[Award criterion 1a – Relevance - Clarity and realism of objectives]</p>		12	Very Good (10-12)	Good (7-9)	Fair (4-6)	Weak (0-3)
	<p>The subject is relevant for adult learning (as defined in the Grundtvig programme) in the countries participating in the Partnership.</p> <p><i>Applications assessed as "weak" on this criterion will be rejected without further assessment.</i></p> <p>[Award criterion 1b – Relevance - Relevance for adult learning]</p>		4	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Weak (0-1)
D4	<p>The results envisaged are relevant for the Partnership in question.</p> <p>[Award criterion 1c – Relevance of results for adult learning]</p>		6	Very Good (6)	Good (4-5)	Fair (2-3)	Weak (0-1)
D5 and D6	<p>The expected impact and benefits of the Partnership on participating organisations and individual participants are clear and well defined.</p> <p>[Award criterion 3a – Impact]</p> <p>The application shows that the Partnership will achieve results which would not be attained by activities carried out entirely within one and the same country.</p> <p>[Award criterion 3b –European added value]</p>		7	Very Good (6-7)	Good (4-5)	Fair (2-3)	Weak (0-1)

F1 and C14, C24, C34, etc	<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. It is demonstrated that there will be active involvement from all the partners.</p> <p>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 in such a way that the results can be achieved within the time-frame for the project. The Partnership coordination is well assured by the coordinating institution.</p> <p>The participating organisations are appropriate for the topic on which the Partnership will be working.</p> <p><i>[Award criterion 2a – Quality of the Partnership – partner roles]</i> <i>[Also contributes to Award criterion 4 – Quality of the Work programme]</i></p>		10	Very Good (8-10)	Good (6-7)	Fair (4-5)	Weak (0-3)
F2	<p>Appropriate measures have been planned to ensure effective communication and cooperation between the participating organisations.</p> <p>(Such measures may for example include meetings, workshops, regular correspondence, newsletters and other forms of exchange of information.)</p> <p><i>[Award criterion 2b – Quality of the Partnership – communication and cooperation]</i></p>		7	Very Good (6-7)	Good (4-5)	Fair (2-3)	Weak (0-1)
F3	<p>The application makes clear how learners and/or relevant staff will be involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of project activities.</p> <p>If the Partnership is rather learner-oriented, the application makes clear the role that learners will play in the different stages of the Partnership (planning, implementation, evaluation)</p> <p>If the Partnerships focuses 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> <p><i>[Award criterion 2c – Quality of the Partnership – Learner and staff]</i></p>		12	Very Good (10-12)	Good (7-9)	Fair (4-6)	Weak (0-3)

	<i>involvement]</i>						
F4	<p>The Partnership is integrated into learning and / or other ongoing activities of the organisations involved.</p> <p>If the Partnership focuses on learner involvement, the application makes clear how the Partnership’s activities will be integrated into the curriculum of the participating learners 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 organisations.</p> <p><i>[Award criterion 3b – Impact and Added European value - Integration into the participating organisations]</i></p>		12	Very Good (10-12)	Good (7-9)	Fair (4-6)	Weak (0-3)

F5	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>[Award criterion 3c – Impact and European added value – Evaluation]</i></p>		5	Very Good (5)	Good (3-4)	Fair (2)	Weak (0-1)
F6	<p>The planned dissemination and exploitation activities are well defined and ensure optimal use of the results amongst the participating organisations.</p> <p>The dissemination activities are focused and well defined. The Partnership demonstrates the interest/potential to make use of the results, experiences and, where applicable, products of the Partnership.</p> <p><i>[Award criterion 5a – Dissemination exploitation of results – participating organisations]</i></p>		7	Very Good (6-7)	Good (4-5)	Fair (2-3)	Weak (0-1)
	<p>Other organisations will also benefit from the planned dissemination and exploitation activities and, if possible, the results will also be spread to the wider community.</p> <p><i>[Award criterion 5b – Dissemination exploitation of results – broader dissemination]</i></p>		4	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Weak (0-1)
G2	<p>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 type in question.</p> <p><i>[Award criterion 4a – Quality of the Work programme]</i></p>		14	Very Good (11-14)	Good (7-10)	Fair (4-6)	Weak (0-3)
	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT		100				

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 learning¹

(Excerpt)

*Article 29***Objectives of the Grundtvig programme**

1. In addition to the objectives of the Lifelong Learning Programme set out in Article 1, the specific objectives of the Grundtvig programme shall be:
 - (a) to respond to the educational challenge of an ageing population in Europe;
 - (b) to help provide adults with pathways to improving their knowledge and competences.

2. The operational objectives of the Grundtvig programme shall be:
 - (a) to improve the quality and accessibility of mobility throughout Europe of individuals involved in adult education and to increase its volume so as to support the mobility of at least 7 000 such individuals per year by 2013;
 - (b) to improve the quality and to increase the volume of cooperation between organisations involved in adult education throughout Europe;
 - (c) to assist people from vulnerable social groups and in marginal social contexts, in particular older people and those who have left education without basic qualifications, in order to give them alternative opportunities to access adult education;
24.11.2006 EN Official Journal of the European Union L 327/59
 - (d) to facilitate the development of innovative practices in adult education and their transfer, including from a participating country to others;
 - (e) to support the development of innovative ICT-based content, services, pedagogies and practice for lifelong learning;
 - (f) to improve pedagogical approaches and the management of adult education organisations.

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