

Privitak 1.

NACIONALNIM PRAVILIMA ZA PRIJAVITELJE IZ REPUBLIKE HRVATSKE ZA DECENTRALIZIRANE AKTIVNOSTI PROGRAMA ZA CJELOŽIVOTNO UČENJE ZA 2012. GODINU

Izmjene i nadopune Privitka 1. Nacionalnih pravila za prijavitelje iz Republike Hrvatske

Verzija	Datum zadnjeg unosa	Napomena
1.0	09. prosinca 2011.	Službena objava Privitka I

Sadržaj

1 COMENIUS

1.1.	Comenius stručno usavršavanje (In-service training) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	4
1.2.	Comenius stručno usavršavanje (In-service training) - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	7
1.3.	Comenius asistenti - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	11
1.4.	Comenius asistenti - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	14
1.5.	Ugošćivanje Comenius asistenata - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	17
1.6.	Ugošćivanje Comenius asistenata - lista kriterija za provjeru kvaliteta prijave i odabir škola koje mogu ugostiti Comenius asistente	20
1.7.	Comenius bilateralna školska partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	24
1.8.	Comenius bilateralna školska partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	28
1.9.	Comenius multilateralna školska partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti...	37
1.10.	Comenius multilateralna školska partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	41
1.11.	Regio partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	51
1.13.	Regio partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	54
1.14.	Individualna mobilnost učenika - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	60
1.15.	Individualna mobilnost učenika - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	64

2 ERASMUS

2.1.	Mobilnost studenata i osoblja - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti.....	68
2.2.	Intenzivni programi (IP) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti.....	71
2.3.	Intenzivni programi (IP) - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete.....	74
2.4.	Erasmus intenzivni tečajevi jezika (EILC) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	85
2.5.	Erasmus intenzivni tečajevi jezika (EILC) - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete.....	87
2.6.	Erasmus potvrda konzorciju za stručne prakse - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	91
2.7.	Erasmus potvrda konzorciju za stručne prakse - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	92

3 LEONARDO DA VINCI

3.1.	Leonardo da Vinci projekti mobilnosti: Početno strukovno obrazovanje (IVT), Stručnjaci u strukovnom obrazovanju i osposobljavanju (VETPRO) i Osobe na tržištu rada (PLM) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti.....	98
3.2.	Leonardo da Vinci projekti mobilnosti: Početno strukovno obrazovanje (IVT), Stručnjaci u strukovnom obrazovanju i osposobljavanju (VETPRO) i Osobe na tržištu rada (PLM) - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete.....	101

3.3.	Leonardo da Vinci potvrda za mobilnost – lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	113
3.4.	Leonardo da Vinci potvrda za mobilnost – lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	115
3.5.	Leonardo da Vinci potvrda za mobilnost – „fact sheet“	122
3.6.	Partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	124
3.7.	Partnerstva – lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	127
3.8.	Prijenos inovacija (ToI) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	137
3.9.	Prijenos inovacija (ToI) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	139

4 GRUNDTVIG

4.1.	Posjeti i razmjene (Visits and exchanges) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	150
4.2.	Posjeti i razmjene (Visits and exchanges) - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	153
4.3.	Stručno usavršavanje (In-service training) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	158
4.4.	Stručno usavršavanje (In-service training) - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	161
4.5.	Partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	166
4.6.	Partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	169
4.7.	Volonterski projekti za starije - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	180
4.8.	Volonterski projekti za starije - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	182
4.9.	Radionice - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	187
4.10.	Radionice - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	190
4.11.	Asistenti - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	194
4.12.	Asistenti - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	197

5 PRIPREMNI POSJETI

5.1.	Pripremni posjeti - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	202
5.2.	Pripremni posjeti - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete	205

6 STUDIJSKI POSJETI

6.1.	Studijski posjeti - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti	209
6.2.	Studijski posjeti - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete prijave	212

1.1. Comenius stručno usavršavanje (In-service training) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-COM-IST-quality assessment – Version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

COMENIUS
IN SERVICE TRAINING
COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST
2012

IST reference N°

Name of the applicant:

	YES
The applicant is a national of a country participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme or a national of another country employed or living in a country participating in the LLP, under the conditions fixed by the participating country.	
If the applicant is an employed person, his/her employer institution is eligible for participation in the Comenius programme.	
The applicant belongs to at least one of the staff categories eligible for the Comenius IST grant for the given IST activity.	
The training activity is eligible under the Comenius IST action.	
The training activity takes place in one of the countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme and is organised by an institution/company which is located in a country participating in the LLP.	
The training activity takes place in a country other than the country where the applicant is resident or works.	
For job shadowing, either the home or destination country is an EU Member State.	
The training activity takes place within the eligible period.	
The training activity is eligible in terms of duration. - for structured courses – from 5 working days up to 6 weeks; - for job shadowing/work placements and conferences/seminars – up to 6 weeks.	
The applicant is a national of a country participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme or a national of another country employed or living in a country participating in the LLP, under the conditions fixed by the participating country.	
If the applicant is an employed person, his/her employer institution is eligible for participation in the Comenius programme.	
The applicant belongs to at least one of the staff categories eligible for the Comenius IST grant for the given IST activity.	
The training activity is eligible under the Comenius IST action.	
The training activity takes place in one of the countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme and is organised by an institution/company which is located in a country participating in the LLP.	
The training activity takes place in a country other than the country where the applicant is resident or works.	
For job shadowing, either the home or destination country is an EU Member State.	
The applicant persons didn't receive a grant for Comenius IST within the Call 2010 and 2011.	
An applicant person has submitted an application only for one training activity	

under current deadline..	
The application isn't similar or identical in the content part (preparation, aims, impact) to another application.	

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

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 person who has 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

1.2. Comenius stručno usavršavanje (In-service training) - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete

GfNA-II-B-COM-IST-quality assessment – Version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

COMENIUS IN-SERVICE TRAINING COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM 2012

IST reference N°

Name of the applicant:

The IST activity applied for:

☐ Structured training course

☐ Job-shadowing / work placement

☐ European conference or seminar

Note on the points system: The ratings of the application against the quality criteria result in a total number of points out of a maximum of 100. National Agencies may add **15** points for national criteria.

Each main criterion is given a total maximum number of points.

Please note that applications scoring less than 60 points (out of 100; points for national priorities are not included) in the quality assessment should not be selected for funding.

Section 3 of the Application Form: Description of the proposed training activity

		Points	Max.
	Content and duration		30
	The activity programme is well structured. It employs adequate methodology/activities in relation to the stated training objectives, and the duration is coherent with the foreseen activities.		10
	The content of the training activity is related to the applicant's professional activity and is also compatible with the objectives of the Comenius programme. <i>If the training activity does not meet these criteria at all (i.e. 0 points are allocated), the application should be rejected at this</i>		10
	The applicant intends to undertake concrete and adequate preparatory activities before the actual training activity.		5
	The applicant has the necessary language competence to be able to benefit from the training activity.		5
	Relevance and impact		40
	There is a clear match between the training selected and the applicant's training needs in the field of school education.		10
	It is clearly described how the beneficiary intends to incorporate the results of the training in his/her professional activities in the field of school education.		10
	It is clearly demonstrated that the applicant will benefit from the training in terms of personal and professional development.		10
	It is clear that the training activity will have a positive impact on other stakeholders, i.e. pupils/learners, the beneficiary's institution, other institutions.		10
	European added value		10
	The training activity has a strong European focus in terms of subject matter, and the profile of participants and trainers, and it will have a greater potential value than similar training in the applicant's home country.		5
	It is clearly demonstrated that the applicant's participation in the training activity will contribute to increasing the European dimension of his/her home institution.		5

	Dissemination of results		10
	The applicant has a well defined plan how to effectively disseminate the results of the training upon return, so as to maximise its impact on the home institution.		10

Additional points for applications for training events resulting from EU-funded projects (Socrates/LLP Centralised Actions)

	The applicant applies for a training event resulting from a Socrates or an LLP centralised project		10
	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT		100

National award criteria for 2012

	<i>NAs to insert the national criteria and priorities here. (for example, priority to be given to applicants who have not received a COM-IST grant over the past two years).</i>		15
	Applicants from institutions without any previous participation in the Comenius programme under LLP (15 points).		15
OVERALL COMMENTS: <i>Please be as specific and clear as possible, avoid personal judgement and use neutral language. In the case of less good quality applications, please explain points which you feel could be improved.</i> <u><i>Your comments may be sent as feedback to unsuccessful applicants.</i></u>			

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 person who has 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

1.3. Comenius asistenti - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-COM-ASS-eligibility check – Version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

COMENIUS
ASSISTANTSHIPS (ASSISTANT)
COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST
2012

Reference N°

Name of the applicant:

	YES
The application has been submitted by the applicant by the published deadline.	
The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
The application has been submitted according to the instructions published by the National Agency.	
The application has been submitted either in the country of residence or in the country of studies (the applicant signed a declaration that only one application has been submitted).	
The form is not hand written.	
The form is completed in full.	
The application has been completed using one of the official languages of the EU, or, in the case of the EFTA/EEA or candidate countries, in the national language of the country concerned.	
Either the country of origin or the country of destination is a Member State of the EU.	
The applicant is either a national of a country participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme or a national of other countries enrolled in regular courses in institutions of higher education, working or living in a participating country under the conditions fixed by each participating country.	
The applicant is domiciliated in a country participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme.	
The applicant either holds a teaching qualification or has completed at least two years of higher education studies which could lead to such a qualification.	
The applicant has not been previously employed as a teacher.	
The applicant has not previously received a Comenius Assistantship grant.	
The funded activity takes place in one of the countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme.	
The application form submitted to the National Agency bears the applicant's original signature.	
The applicant has sent the copy of his/her relevant university diploma or the certificate issued by the higher education institution confirming the status of a student.	

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

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 person who has 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

1.4. Comenius asistenti - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete

GfNA-II-B-COM-ASS-quality assessment – Version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

<p style="text-align: center;">COMENIUS ASSISTANTSHIPS (ASSISTANT) COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM 2012</p>
--

Reference N°

Name of the applicant:	
-------------------------------	--

<p>Note on the points system: The ratings of application against the quality criteria result in a total number of points out of a maximum of 100. National Agencies may add 15 points for national criteria.</p>

<p>Each main criterion is given a total maximum number of points.</p>

<p>Please note that applications scoring less than 60 points (out of 100, points for national priorities are not included) in the quality assessment should not be selected for funding.</p>
--

Section 3 of the Application Form: Description of the planned Assistantship

Section 4 of the Application Form: Background of the applicant

		Points	Max.
	1. Quality of the mobility (assistantship)		60
	The assistant provides a clear and justified motivation for the assistantship.		15
	The assistant presents clearly and positively his/her willingness to adapt to the new environment and his/her ability to work with young people.		15
	The assistant provides a description of concrete cultural, pedagogic and linguistic activities for the preparation of the assistantship.		15
	The assistant's contribution (e.g. planned curricular and extracurricular activities) to the host institution is clear, realistic and compatible with his/her profile.		15
	2. Impact and relevance		40
	The expected impact on personal and professional competences including languages and intercultural benefits is clearly defined by the candidate and is also compatible with the objectives of the Comenius programme.		10
	The expected impact on the candidate's future career as a teacher is described.		10
	The assistantship will reinforce the diversity of European cultures and languages in the host institution/community.		10
	The assistantship will contribute to future European cooperation between schools.		10
	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT		100
	National criteria including national priorities for 2012		15
	<i>n/a</i>		

OVERALL COMMENTS:

Please be as specific and clear as possible, avoid personal judgment and use 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).

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 person who has 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

1.5. Ugošćivanje Comenius asistenata - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-COM-ASS-host school-eligibility check – Version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

COMENIUS
ASSISTANTSHIPS (HOST SCHOOL)
COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST
2012

Reference N°

Name of the applicant
institution:

	YES
The application has been submitted by the applicant institution by the published deadline.	
The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
The application has been submitted according to the instructions published by the National Agency.	
The form is not hand written.	
The form is completed in full.	
The application has been completed using one of the official languages of the EU, or, in the case of the EFTA/EEA or candidate countries, in the national language of the country concerned.	
Either the country of origin or the country of destination is a Member State of the EU.	
The institution is located in one of the countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme.	
The institution belongs to one of types of institutions specified by the relevant National authorities.	
The form has been signed by the legal representative of the applicant institution or a person duly authorised by the legal representative.	
<i>(If applicable, add national administrative priorities)</i>	

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

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

1.6. Ugošćivanje Comenius asistenata - lista kriterija za provjeru kvaliteta prijava i odabir škola koje mogu ugostiti Comenius asistente

GfNA-II-B-COM-ASS-host school-quality assessment – Version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

<p style="text-align: center;">COMENIUS ASSISTANTSHIPS (HOST SCHOOL) COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM 2012</p>
--

Reference N°

Name of the applicant institution:	
------------------------------------	--

Note on the points system: The ratings of application against the quality criteria result in a total number of points out of a maximum of 100. National Agencies may add 15 points for national criteria.

Each main criterion is given a total maximum number of points.

Please note that applications scoring less than 60 points (out of 100, points for national priorities are not included) in the quality assessment should not be selected for funding.

Section 2.3 of the Application Form: Context of the host organisation

Section 3 of the Application Form: Description of the planned assistantship

		Points	Max.
	Quality of the mobility (assistantship)		60
	The host school provides clear and justified reasons for wishing to host an assistant (including socio-economic aspects).		15
	The host school sets out clearly the curricular and extra-curricular activities to be carried out by the assistant.		20
	The activities proposed by the host school are realistic, reasonable and compatible with the targeted students' age group, with the profile of the institution and the expected profile of the assistant.		10
	The host school explains clearly how the assistantship will be monitored and, if applicable, how the assistant's workload will be managed if the assistant is shared with other institutions.		15
	Impact and relevance		40
	The expected impact and concrete outcomes that the host school wishes to achieve are clearly defined and are compatible with the objectives of the Comenius programme.		10
	There is an explicit link between the motivation to host an assistant, the activities proposed and the expected impact and outcomes.		15

	The school explains in detail how the assistant will contribute to the intercultural experience at the school.		15
	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT		100
	National criteria including national priorities for 2012		15
	<i>n/a</i>		

OVERALL COMMENTS:

Please be as specific and clear as possible, avoid personal judgment and use 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).

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 person who has 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

1.7. Comenius bilateralna školska partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-COM-bilat-school-partnership-eligibility-check – Version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

BILATERAL COMENIUS SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST 2012

Partnership reference N°

Name of applicant institution:	
Partnership title:	

	Yes/ No
The application has been submitted by the applicant institution on 21 February 2012 at the latest (postmark date).	
The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
The form is not hand written.	
All compulsory fields have been filled.	
The application form has been completed using one of the official languages of the EU.	
The Partnership consists of two institutions located in at least two of the countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme.	
At least one of the participating institutions is located in a Member State of the European Union.	
The main teaching language of the two participating institutions is not the same.	
The applicant institution is eligible to receive funding from this National Agency to participate in a Comenius School Partnership.	
The table G.3. - Mobilities include a reciprocal exchange of classes or groups of minimum 10 days each.	
The class or group of the applicant institution participating in the exchange involves a minimum of 10 pupils.	
The form has been signed by the legal representative of the applicant institution or a person duly authorised by the legal representative.	
The applicant institution has fulfilled its contractual obligations in relation to any	

earlier grants received from the National Agency.(exclusion criterion)	
The application has been submitted by the applicant institution on 21 February 2012 at the latest (postmark date).	
The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
The form is not hand written.	
A maximum of two Comenius School Partnership applications per school have been submitted.	
If the application is drafted in another language than English or Croatian, the applicant has submitted both the original application and a translation into English or Croatian.	

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

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

1.8. Comenius bilateralna školska partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete

Partnerships application quality assessment form Version October 2011 - Call 012



Name of evaluator: _____

Bilateral Comenius school PARTNERSHIPS Common european quality assessment form 2012

Partnership reference N°: _____

Name of coordinating institution:

Partnership title:

Note on the points system: Each criterion should be rated by the evaluators on the scale proposed (1 to 8). **The excel sheet will automatically apply the weighing and will provide the final weighted points.** 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 D2 and D3. Please note that applications scoring less than 50 weighted 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.

Indicative question in the application form					Unweighted points resulting from the evaluator's assessment	Weighting	Max weighted points	Weighted points (to be entered into LLPLink by NAs)
	Quality of the work programme	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak			

D.2 and D.3, as well as an overall view of the whole application.	a) The subject is relevant for the Comenius programme. <i>Applications assessed as "weak" on this criterion will be rejected without further assessment.</i> The application clearly indicates how the subject relates to the objectives of the programme The application should address the relevant target group.	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	
	b) The aims of the Partnership and the approach chosen to achieve them are clear and realistic. The aims and objectives are clearly stated and are achievable within the time-frame of the project. The application provides an explanation on how the aims will be achieved.	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	
D.4.	The results are relevant for the Partnership in question. The results are clearly linked to the aims and objectives of the partnership and should be appropriate for the target group involved.	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	
G.2.	a) The work programme covers the whole period of 2 years and is appropriate for achieving the objectives. The work programme includes activities consistent with the Partnership's overall aims and objectives, and covers the whole period of 2 years.	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	
	b) The planned activities and mobilities are relevant for the Partnership in question. The planned activities (including mobility) are linked directly to the aims and objectives of the proposal and are specific and relevant to the aims and the target groups involved.	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1,5	12	
	Impact and European added value	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
D.5	The Partnership will generate European added value	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	

	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.								
D.6.	The expected impact and benefits of the Partnership on participating institutions and individual participants are clear and well defined. The application provides a clear and well defined explanation on the expected impact and benefits of the partnership on: - the participating staff and pupils/learners/trainees, - the participating organisations/institutions.	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	
	Quality of the Partnership	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
E.5	The application shows that adequate linguistic preparation will be provided to participating pupils. The applicant schools have planned linguistic preparation in the partner's language (minimum 20 hours, if the partner's language is not included on the curriculum of the involved pupils). The format of the linguistic preparation is sufficient for the purposes of the Partnership.	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	
F.1	There is an appropriate balance between the roles and tasks of the two schools in terms of their involvement in the activities to be carried out. There is an appropriate and clearly defined distribution of roles and tasks across the Partnership to match each partner's own competences. The contribution of each partner is clearly explained.	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	

	<p>The tasks are defined and distributed among the partners in such a way that the results can be achieved within the time-frame of the project. The Partnership coordination is well assured by the coordinating institution.</p> <p>The participating schools are appropriate for the subject on which the Partnership will be working.</p>								
F.2.	<p>Appropriate measures have been planned to ensure effective communication and cooperation between the participating institutions.</p> <p>Appropriate measures are foreseen to ensure communication and cooperation such as meetings, workshops, conference calls, regular correspondence, newsletters, and other forms of exchange of information (such as use of ICT).</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	
F.3.	<p>The application makes clear how pupils will cooperate in practice during the class exchanges.</p> <p>The application makes it clear that pupils of the two schools will work together during the class exchanges in order to contribute to the results of the Partnership</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	
F.4.	<p>The application makes clear how pupils will be involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of activities.</p> <p>The application makes clear the role that pupils will play in the different stages of the Partnership (planning, implementation, evaluation).</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	
F.5.	<p>The project is integrated into the curriculum/learning activities of the participating pupils in each of the schools.</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	

	The application makes clear how the Partnership activities will be integrated into the curriculum of the participating pupils and what subjects of the curriculum will be concerned.								
F.6.	<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>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	
	Dissemination and exploitation of results	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
F.7.	<p>a) The planned dissemination and exploitation activities are well defined and ensure optimal use of the results amongst the participating institutions.</p> <p>The dissemination activities are focused and well defined. The Partnership clearly explain and demonstrates the interest/potential to disseminate and make use within their own institutions of the results, experiences and, where applicable, the end products of the Partnership.</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	
	<p>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.</p> <p>The partnership plans to disseminate the results to organisations/networks outside of the partnership and has provided clear plans as to how they will achieve this.</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	
	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT							100	0

OVERALL COMMENTS:

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.

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 [1]

(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.

1.9. Comenius multilateralna školska partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-COM-multilat –school-partnership-eligibility check – Version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

MULTILATERAL COMENIUS SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST 2012

Partnership reference N°

Name of applicant institution:	
Partnership title:	

	Yes / No
The application has been submitted by the applicant institution on 21 February 2012 at the latest (postmark date).	
The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
The form is not hand written.	
All the compulsory fields in the eForm have been filled.	
The application form has been completed using one of the official languages of the EU.	
The Partnership consists of institutions located in at least three of the countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme.	
At least one of the participating institutions is located in a Member State of the European Union.	

The applicant institution is eligible to receive funding from this National Agency to participate in a Comenius School Partnership.	
The form has been signed by the legal representative of the applicant institution or a person duly authorised by the legal representative.	
The applicant institution has fulfilled its contractual obligations in relation to any earlier grants received from the National Agency. (exclusion criterion)	
A maximum of two schools from Republic of Croatia are in the same partnership.	
A maximum of two Comenius School Partnership applications per school have been submitted.	
If the application is drafted in another language than English or Croatian, the applicant has submitted both the original application and a translation into English or Croatian.	

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

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

1.10. Comenius multilateralna školska partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete



Name of evaluator: _____

Multilateral Comenius school PARTNERSHIPS Common european quality assessment form 2012

Partnership reference N°: _____

Name of coordinating institution:

Partnership title:

Note on the points system: Each criterion should be rated by the evaluators on the scale proposed (1 to 8). **The excel sheet will automatically apply the weighting and will provide the final weighted points.** 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 D2 and D3.

Please note that applications scoring less than 50 weighted 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.

Partnerships application quality assessment form Version October 2011 - Call 2012

Indicative question in the application form						Unweighted points resulting from the evaluator's assessment	Weighting	Max weighted points	Weighted points (to be entered into LLPLink by NAs)
	Quality of the work programme	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
D.2 and D.3, as well as an overall view of the whole application.	a) The subject is relevant for the Comenius programme. <i>Applications assessed as "weak" on this criterion will be rejected without further assessment.</i> The application clearly indicates how the subject relates to the objectives of the programme The application should address the relevant target group.	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	0
	b) The aims of the Partnership and the approach chosen to achieve them are clear and realistic. The aims and objectives are clearly stated and are achievable within the time-frame of the project. The application provides an explanation on how the aims will be achieved.	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0

D.4.	<p>The results are relevant for the Partnership in question.</p> <p>The results are clearly linked to the aims and objectives of the partnership and should be appropriate for the target group involved.</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0
G.2.	<p>a) The work programme covers the whole period of 2 years and is appropriate for achieving the objectives.</p> <p>The work programme includes activities consistent with the Partnership's overall aims and objectives, and covers the whole period of 2 years.</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	0
	<p>b) The planned activities and mobilities are relevant for the Partnership in question.</p> <p>The planned activities (including mobility) are linked directly to the aims and objectives of the proposal and are specific and relevant to the aims and the target groups involved.</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1,5	12	0
	Impact and European added value	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
D.5	<p>The Partnership will generate European added value</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>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0
D.6.	<p>The expected impact and benefits of the Partnership on participating institutions and individual participants are clear and well defined.</p> <p>The application provides a clear and well defined explanation on the expected impact and benefits of the partnership on:</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the participating staff and pupils/learners/trainees, - the participating organisations/institutions. 								
	Quality of the Partnership	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
F.1	<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>There is an appropriate and clearly defined distribution of roles and tasks across the Partnership to match each partner's own competences. The contribution of each partner is clearly explained.</p> <p>The tasks are defined and distributed among the partners in such a way that the results can be achieved within the time-frame of the project. The Partnership coordination is well assured by the coordinating institution.</p> <p>The participating organisations are appropriate for the subject on which the Partnership will be working.</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0
F.2.	<p>Appropriate measures have been planned to ensure effective communication and cooperation between the participating institutions.</p> <p>Appropriate measures are foreseen to ensure communication and cooperation such as meetings, workshops, conference calls, regular correspondence, newsletters, and other forms of exchange of information (such as use of ICT).</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	0

F.3.	<p>The application makes clear how relevant staff and/or trainees will be involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of activities</p> <p>If the Partnership is focused on cooperation on a specific subject (e.g. training or education content) or cooperation within a specific field or economic sector, the application makes clear how all relevant staff will be involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of activities</p> <p>If the Partnership is rather pupil / trainee oriented, the application makes clear the role that pupils / trainees will play in the different stages of the Partnership (planning, implementation, evaluation)</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0
F.4.	<p>The Partnership is integrated into the curriculum and / or ongoing activities of the institutions involved.</p> <p>In Partnership dealing with cooperation on a specific subject (e.g. training or education content) or cooperation within a specific field or economic sector, the application makes clear how the project fits into the regular activities of the participating institutions.</p> <p>If the Partnership focuses on pupil / trainee involvement, the application makes clear how the Partnerships activities will be integrated into the curriculum of the participating pupils / trainees and what subjects of the curriculum will be concerned.</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0
F.5.	<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>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0

	The evaluation plan/approach 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.								
	Dissemination and exploitation of results	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
F.6.	<p>a) The planned dissemination and exploitation activities are well defined and ensure optimal use of the results amongst the participating institutions.</p> <p>The dissemination activities are focused and well defined. The Partnership clearly explain and demonstrates the interest/potential to disseminate and make use within their own institutions of the results, experiences and, where applicable, the end products of the Partnership.</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0
	<p>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.</p> <p>The partnership plans to disseminate the results to organisations/networks outside of the partnership and has provided clear plans as to how they will achieve this.</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	0
	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT							100	0
NATIONAL PRIORITIES FOR 2012:			Max. 15 points for all national priorities.						

Partnerships that ensure the participation of pupils with special learning needs or other disadvantages.		5
Applicants without any previous participation in the Comenius school partnership. .		10
TOTAL POINTS FOR 2012 NATIONAL PRIORITIES		15
TOTAL QUALITY AND PRIORITY POINTS		115

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.

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 [1]

(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.

1.11. Regio partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-COM-Regio-partnership-eligibility check – Version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

<p>COMENIUS REGIO PARTNERSHIPS COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST 2012</p>

Partnership reference N°

Name of applicant institution:	
Partnership title:	

	Yes
The application has been submitted by the applicant institution on 21 February at the latest (postmark date).	
The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
The application has been submitted according to the instructions published by the National Agency.	
The form is not hand written.	
The form is completed in full.	
The application form has been completed using one of the official languages of the EU.	
The Partnership consists of two partner regions located in two of the countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme.	
In each partner region, at least one school and one other organisation will be involved in activities (in addition to the applying local or regional authority).	
At least one of the partner regions is located in a Member State of the European Union.	
The applicant institution is eligible to receive funding from this National Agency to participate in a Comenius Regio Partnership.	
At least one of the schools involved in the Comenius Regio Partnerships in each applicant region is eligible in Comenius School Partnerships.	
Part E (Requested funding) includes the Partnership type or the grant amount requested by the applicant institution for mobilities.	
Part E (Requested funding) includes a budget for additional project costs or states that no grant for additional project costs is requested.	
The form has been signed by the legal representative of the applicant institution or a person duly authorised by the legal representative.	
The participating institutions have fulfilled their contractual obligations in relation to any earlier grants received from the National Agency. ¹ (exclusion criterion)	
If the application is drafted in another language than English or Croatian, the applicant has submitted both the original application and a translation into English or Croatian.	

¹ i.e. the institution in question has no outstanding repayments to the NA. This exclusion criterion refers mainly to the applicant institution, the local or regional authority. It should be applied to participating schools or other local partners only in very exceptional cases (to be decided by the NA).

1.12. The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

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

1.13. Regio partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete



Name of evaluator: _____

**COMENIUS REGIO PARTNERSHIPS
COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM
2012**

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

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	a) The objectives of the Partnership are relevant for the Comenius Programme and in compliance with the objectives of Comenius Regio Partnerships. <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> <i>Applications assessed as "weak" (less than 3 points) on this criterion will be rejected without further assessment.</i>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 -1
	b) The objectives of the Partnership are relevant to the participating regions. <i>Context and motivation indicate clearly that the objectives concern important issues in the participating regions.</i>		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	The approach chosen to achieve the objectives is clear and realistic. <i>General approach, activities and outcomes/results are well planned and have a clear potential to reach the objectives of the project.</i>		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,</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 - 1

	<i>attainment of objectives, measurement of impact.</i>						
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	The work programme covers the whole period of 2 years. The planned activities (including mobility if foreseen) of each partner are relevant.		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 learning ²

(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.

² in L 327/46 Official Journal of the European Union of 24.11.2006

Requested EU funding – <u>to be checked and filled by NA</u>				
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.			

1.14. Individualna mobilnost učenika - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-COM-IPM-eligibility check – Version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

COMENIUS
INDIVIDUAL PUPIL MOBILITY
COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST
2012

Reference N°

Name of the applicant institution:	
---	--

I. Overall eligibility

Please note that if the sending school and at least one host school are eligible, the application is eligible.

Ref.		YES
1.	The application has been submitted by the applicant institution on 1 December 2011 at the latest (postmark date).	
2.	The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
3.	The application has been submitted according to the instructions published by the National Agency.	
4.	The application is not hand written (except for the signature of the Declaration and the letter of intent).	
5.	The application is completed in full.	
6.	The sending school and the host school (s) are (or have been) members of the same Comenius School Partnership	
7.	The application form has been completed using one of the official languages of the EU.	
8.	Either the country of origin or the country of destination is a Member State of the EU.	
9.	The institution is located in one of the countries participating in the Comenius Individual Pupil Mobility (all LLP countries except for Cyprus, Germany, Ireland and United Kingdom).	
10.	The application form has been signed by the legal representative of the applicant institution (sending school) or a person duly authorised by the legal representative. The legal representative of the host school or a person duly authorised by the legal representative has signed the letter of intent.	
11.	The applicant school caters for the age group of pupils eligible for the action (i.e. at least 14 years on the day of departure)	
12.	The applicant institution has fulfilled its contractual obligations in relation to any earlier grants received from the National Agency. (exclusion criterion)	
	<i>(If applicable, add national administrative priorities)</i>	

II. Eligibility check per host school (check the points 6, 8, 9, 10) from the list above)

Add lines if there are more than three host schools.

Host school number	Host school name	Eligible YES/NO	If not eligible, indicate the reference number from part I.
1			
2			
3			

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

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

1.15. Individualna mobilnost učenika - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete

GfNA-II-B-COM-IPM-quality assessment – Version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

**COMENIUS INDIVIDUAL PUPIL MOBILITY
COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT SHEET
2012**

Reference N°

**Name of the applicant
institution:**

Note on the points system:

part I. Overall assessment

The ratings of the application against the quality criteria result in a total number of points out of a maximum of 100.

Each criterion is given a maximum number of points.

Please note that applications scoring less than 60 points in the quality assessment should not be selected for funding.

Part II. Assessment per host school

The ratings of the application (host school – section 7 of the application form) against the quality criteria result in a total number of points out of a maximum of 60.

Each criterion is given a maximum number of points.

Please note that applications scoring less than 35 points in the quality assessment should not be selected for funding.

Part I. Overall assessment

	Points	Max.
Quality of the mobility		60
1. The objectives of the mobility are clear and realistic. The involvement of the sending school and the host school/s is well explained and appropriate to achieve the set objectives.		15
2. There is evidence of existing cooperation between the sending school and the host school/s. The content of the planned mobilities is linked to the existing cooperation between the schools.		15
3. Appropriate measures are proposed to ensure effective cooperation and communication between the sending and the host school/s.		10
4. The application sets out clear and relevant criteria and a realistic procedure how the pupils will be selected.		10
5. The measures taken by the sending school to recognise the studies abroad are clear and appropriate. The implication of all actors (sending school, host school and pupil) in the establishment of the learning agreement is clear and well defined.		10
Support of participants and protection of pupils		20
6. Appropriate measures are proposed by the sending school to ensure the necessary support to staff involved. The application makes it clear how the school will recognise the work of the contact teacher.		10
7. The measures to ensure the necessary support and protection/safety of the pupil/s by the sending school are clear and detailed.		10
Impact and European added value		20
8. The impact and benefits of European cooperation on the participating actors are clear and well defined.		10
9. The application makes it clear how the mobility will contribute to sustainable cooperation between both schools in the future.		10
TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT (Part I)		100

Part II. Assessment per host school

Section 7 of the Application Form: Description and implementation of the planned Comenius pupil mobility/ies by the host school/s

Add lines/columns if there are more than three host schools.

Names of the host school/s	
Host school 1:	
Host school 2:	
Host school 3:	

	Max. points	Host school 1	Host school 2	Host school 3
Quality of the mobility	30			
1. The planned pupil mobility/ies will contribute to further improvement of the existing cooperation between the schools.	10			
2. The application sets out clear and relevant criteria and a realistic procedure how the host families will be identified and selected.	15			
3. The planned mobility/ies are reciprocal.	5			
Support of participants and protection of pupils	30			
4. Appropriate measures are proposed to ensure the necessary support to host families.	10			
5. Appropriate measures are proposed to ensure the necessary support to participating pupil/s. The measures to ensure the protection/safety of the pupil/s are clear and detailed.	10			
6. Appropriate measures are proposed to ensure the necessary support to staff involved. The application makes it clear how the school will recognise the work of the mentor.	10			
Total points for the quality assessment per host school (Part II)	60			

OVERALL COMMENTS:

Please be as specific and clear as possible, avoid personal judgment and use 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).

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

2.1. Mobilnost studenata i osoblja - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti



FORMAL ELIGIBILITY CHECK
APPLICATION FORM FOR ERASMUS INDIVIDUAL MOBILITY
CALL YEAR 2012

Klasa:

Ur broj:

IDENTIFICATION DATA

Full legal name of the applicant institution:	
Erasmus ID Code:	
EUC reference number:	
Reference number of the application:	
ELIGIBILITY CHECK	

1.	The application has been submitted by the applicant institution on March 9, 2012 at the latest (postmark date).	
2.	The application has been submitted according to the instructions published by the National agency.	
3.	The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
4.	All relevant fields in the application form are duly filled in, especially the mobility flow tables	
5.	The form has been signed by the legal representative of the applicant institution or a person duly authorized by the legal representative.	
6.	The application bears the stamp of the applicant institution.	
7.	The form is not handwritten.	
8.	The application form has been drawn up in English or Croatian.	
9.	The applicant institution is located in the country of the National Agency to which the application is addressed.	
10.	The applicant institution has a valid EUC.	

11.	For non public bodies requesting a grant exceeding 25.000 Euro: a copy of the official accounts for the most recent financial year for which accounts have been closed is added to the application form.	
-----	--	--

CONCLUSION: The application is	is eligible	
	is not eligible	

Comments: In case you consider the proposal as not eligible, or if you cannot come to any conclusion, please provide justifications

EVALUATOR IDENTIFICATION

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.

Name of evaluator (in block letters): _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

2.2. Intenzivni programi (IP) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-ERA-IP-eligibility check – version December 2010

ERASMUS INTENSIVE PROGRAMMES FORMAL ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST (minimum requirements)	
NEW IP	<input type="checkbox"/>
RENEWAL IP (application for a 2 nd or 3 rd year of funding)	2 nd year <input type="checkbox"/> 3 rd year <input type="checkbox"/>
TITLE OF IP:	
APPLICANT INSTITUTION:	
REFERENCE NUMBER:	
SUBJECT AREA:	
FORMAL ELIGIBILITY CHECK DONE BY: Date : / / (dd/mm/yyyy)	

FORMAL ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST

(NA staff)

- ☐ Application submitted on the application deadline at the latest (postmark date).
- ☐ The application form has been submitted using the correct application form.
- ☐ The form is completed in full.
- ☐ The application is submitted by a body which is a legal entity.
- ☐ The application form bears the original signature of the person legally authorised to sign on behalf of the applicant institution/organisation, as well as the original stamp of this institution/organisation (NA to define if it was required).
- ☐ All participating higher education institutions (coordinator and partners) hold an Erasmus University Charter.
- ☐ IP activity (e.g. not a conference or research activity).
- ☐ The IP takes place within the eligibility period (1 September 2012 – 31 August 2013).
- ☐ Eligible duration (not less than 10 continuous full days of subject-related work and not more than 6 weeks; subject-related work days can only be separated by weekends. Days without subject related work or days with only cultural activities as part of the IP may not be taken into account).
- ☐ Eligible number of participating countries (coordinator plus minimum of two partners from two different LLP countries).
- ☐ Eligible composition of participating countries (at least one of the participating countries is an EU Member State).
- ☐ The planned location of the IP is in a country eligible to participate in the Lifelong Learning Programme.
- ☐ The number of eligible students travelling from countries other than the country where the IP takes place is not less than 10.
- ☐ The IP is not part of an Erasmus Mundus Master or Doctoral Course.
- ☐ The applicant declared that the proposed IP or any other IP with the same or very similar partnership and the same or very similar topic has not yet received funding for 3 consecutive years from any of the LLP National Agencies and that there is no evidence to the contrary.
- ☐ The applicant declared that this project with the same or very similar topic or the same or very similar partnership has not been submitted to any other LLP National Agency under the current Call for proposals and that there is no evidence to the contrary.
- ☐ **If the application has been submitted by the faculty, it contains the endorsment letter signed by the rector.**

DECISION on formal eligibility

☐ **YES**

☐ **NO**

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary.

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

2.3. Intenzivni programi (IP) - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete

GfNA-II-B-ERA-IP-quality assessment – version November 2011

ERASMUS INTENSIVE PROGRAMMES	
QUALITY ASSESSMENT	
NEW IP	<input type="checkbox"/>
RENEWAL IP (application for a 2 nd or 3 rd year of funding)	2 nd year <input type="checkbox"/>
	3 rd year <input type="checkbox"/>
TITLE OF IP:	
APPLICANT INSTITUTION:	
REFERENCE NUMBER:	
SUBJECT AREA:	
INDEPENDENT EXPERT'S NAME:	
Date : / / (dd/mm/yyyy)	

I/1. QUALITY ASSESSMENT FOR NEW APPLICATIONS

1) Relevance	Comments
<p>The benefits of European cooperation in providing intensive teaching on the subject concerned – i.e. the added value of offering the IP, compared to existing courses at the level of the participating institutions - are clear and well defined.</p> <p>Application form section 4.1</p>	
<p>The link to the operational objectives of Erasmus in the LLP is clear and well defined.</p> <p>Application form section 4.1</p>	
<p>The IP presents a strong multidisciplinary approach, fostering the interaction of students from different academic disciplines.</p> <p>Application form section 4.1</p>	
Overall score for group 1	/20 points
Explain your assessment:	

2) Quality of the objectives and innovative character	Comments
<p>The objectives and rationale of the IP are clear and realistic, and the background is clear.</p> <p>Application form section 4.4</p>	
<p>The IP clearly addresses a relevant subject for which there is a demonstrable need.</p> <p>Application form section 4.3 and 4.4</p>	
<p>The IP will provide something significantly new in terms of learning opportunities, skills development, access to information etc., for the participating students and teachers.</p>	

Application form section 4.4	
Overall score for group 2	/20 points
Explain your assessment:	

3) Methodology and work programme	Comments
The methodology is appropriate for achieving the objectives; the pedagogical and didactical approach is clearly described. Application form section 4.5	
The target groups are identified; the selection method of the participant students is well defined. Application form section 4.5	
The ratio of staff to students guarantees active classroom participation. Application form section 4.5	
The work programme is of good quality and will ensure the delivery of the stated objectives and learning outcomes. Application form section 4.4 and 4.6	
Overall score for group 3	/20 points
Explain your assessment:	

4) Learning outcomes, ECTS and recognition	Comments
The expected learning outcomes are appropriate. Application form section 4.4	
The proposal describes the provisions how the workload of participating students undertaken within the IP will be recognised through ECTS (or otherwise equivalent) credits and how the studies undertaken within the IP will be	

recognised in the curricula of the participating students by their home institution. Application form section 4.5	
In addition to the learning outcomes on subject-related competences, the proposed IP favours adequately the transmission of transversal competences. Application form 4.5	
Overall score for group 4	/20 points
Explain your assessment:	

5) Partnership, project management, monitoring and evaluation	Comments
The partnership is of good quality. The task distribution among the partners is organised in such a way that the results can be achieved and all partners are actively involved. Application form section 4.7 and 4.8	
There is an appropriate balance between partners in terms of their competences and their involvement in the activities to be carried out. Application form section 4.7	
Among the partners, appropriate measures have been planned to ensure effective communication and cooperation. Application form section 4.7 and 4.8	
The financial and contractual arrangements are clearly spelled out and will ensure an effective management of the IP. The applicant makes sure that the funds received for the mobility activities (subsistence and travel costs) will be used for this purpose and managed in a transparent way (The calculations for subsistence and travel costs do not need to be checked, as it will be done by the National Agency. The coherence between the budget and the work programme and project	

deliverables shall be assessed.) Application form section 4.8	
There is a clear description of effective monitoring and evaluation measures of the IP. Application form section 4.9	
Higher points can be given to partnerships involving HEIs that have not yet participated in Erasmus IPs. Application form section 1	
Overall score for group 5	/20 points
Explain your assessment:	

6) Dissemination and Exploitation of Results; Impact of the IP	Comments
The planned dissemination and exploitation activities are well defined and ensure optimal use of the results in the participating institutions and, if possible, in the wider community. Application form section 4.10	
Use ICT tools and services to support the follow-up of the IP, thereby contributing to the creation of a sustainable learning community in the subject area concerned. Application form section 4.10	
The results envisaged are relevant and will have a demonstrable potential impact on the quality of teaching provided in the subject area concerned at the participating institutions. Application form section 4.10	
The applicant indicates multiplier effects and possible spin-offs of the Intensive Programme. Application form section 4.10	
Overall score for group 6	/20 points

Explain your assessment:

I/2. ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Final score (overall score for groups 1-6)

/120 points

I/3. OVERALL COMMENTS

The comments should relate to your assessment of the strengths, weaknesses and potential of the application, relative to the award criteria. The comments should justify the assessment conclusion.

Please formulate them very carefully as your comments will be sent to the applicant if rejected.

Comments on the proposal:

I/4. SIGNATURE OF THE EXPERT

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.

Signature of the independent expert:

Name:

Date / / (dd/mm/yyyy)

**II/1. QUALITY ASSESSMENT FOR
SECOND YEAR RENEWAL APPLICATIONS**

1. Reference to the first year IP	YES	NO
If the first year IP has already taken place and the applicant has already submitted the final report: The final report of the first year IP indicates that the IP is running without any major problems; the continuation of funding is justified.		
If the first year IP has already taken place but the applicant has not submitted the final report yet: The information under section 5 of the application form indicates that the IP is running without any major problems; the continuation of funding is justified.		
If the first year IP has not taken place yet: The information under section 5 of the application form indicates that the IP is running without reveal any major problems; the continuation of funding is justified.		
If you indicated NO, please explain the problems:		

2. Changes planned compared to the first year IP	YES	NO
If the applicant indicated any changes compared to the first year IP (application form section 5): The proposed changes indicate that the IP will be running without any major impact on the quality of the IP, the continuation of funding is justified.		
If you indicated NO, please explain your assessment:		
<p style="text-align: center;">II/2. ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION</p>		
	YES	NO
Can the second year IP be supported?		

<p style="text-align: center;">II/3. SIGNATURE OF THE ASSESSOR</p>
<i>I hereby declare to the best of my knowledge that I have no conflict of interest (including family, emotional</i>

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.

Signature of the expert:

Name:

Date / / (dd/mm/yyyy)

III/1. QUALITY ASSESSMENT FOR THIRD YEAR RENEWAL APPLICATIONS

1. Reference to the first year IP	YES	NO
--	------------	-----------

The final report of the first year IP indicates that the IP is running without any major problems; the continuation of funding is justified.		
If you indicated NO, please explain the problems:		

2. Reference to the second year IP	YES	NO
If the second year IP has already taken place and the applicant has already submitted the final report: The final report of the second year IP indicates that the IP is running without any major problems; the continuation of funding is justified.		
If the second year IP has already taken place but the applicant has not submitted the final report yet: The information under section 5 of the application form indicates that the IP is running without any major problems; the continuation of funding is justified.		
If the second year IP has not taken place yet: The information under section 5 of the application form indicates that the IP is running without any major problems; the continuation of funding is justified.		
If you indicated NO, please explain the problems:		

3. Changes planned compared to the second year IP	YES	NO
If the applicant indicated any changes compared to the second year IP (application form section 5): The proposed changes indicate that the IP will be running without any major impact on the quality of the IP, the continuation of funding is justified.		

If you indicated NO, please explain your assessment:

III/2. ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

	YES	NO
Can the third year IP be supported?		

III/3. SIGNATURE OF THE ASSESSOR

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.

Signature of the expert:

Name:

Date / / (dd/mm/yyyy)

2.4. Erasmus intenzivni tečajevi jezika (EILC) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-ERA-EILC-eligibility check – version November 2011

<div>ERASMUS INTENSIVE LANGUAGE COURSES</div> <div>FORMAL ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST <i>(minimum requirements)</i></div>
APPLICANT INSTITUTION:
REFERENCE NUMBER:
FORMAL ELIGIBILITY CHECK DONE BY: Date : / / (dd/mm/yyyy)

FORMAL ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST

(BY THE NA)

- ☐ Application submitted on the application deadline at the latest (postmark date).
- ☐ The application form has been submitted using the correct application form.
- ☐ The form is completed in full.
- ☐ The application form bears the original signature of the person legally authorised to sign on behalf of the applicant institution/organisation, as well as the original stamp of this institution/organisation (NA to define if it was required).
- ☐ The Organising Institution is either a higher education institution that holds an Erasmus University Charter or another organisation specialised in language training in the less widely used and taught languages of the host country.
- ☐ The duration is 2-6 weeks, with a minimum of 60 teaching hours in total and at least 15 teaching hours a week.
- ☐ The number of planned participants per course is 10 or more.
- ☐ **If the application has been submitted by the faculty, it contains the endorsement letter signed by the rector.**

DECISION on formal eligibility

☐ **YES**

☐ **NO**

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary.

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

2.5. Erasmus intenzivni tečajevi jezika (EILC) - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete

GfNA-II-B-ERA-EILC-quality assessment – version November 2011

<div>ERASMUS INTENSIVE LANGUAGE COURSES</div> <div>QUALITY ASSESSMENT <i>(minimum requirements)</i></div>
APPLICANT INSTITUTION:
REFERENCE NUMBER:
INDEPENDENT EXPERT'S NAME:
Date : / / (dd/mm/yyyy)

I. QUALITY ASSESSMENT

1) Relevance	
The link to the operational objectives of Erasmus in the LLP is clear and well defined.	
The cost-effectiveness of the course can be proved (mainly based on the information of the expected number of participants).	
Overall score for group 1	/20 points
Explain your assessment:	

2) Objectives and work programme	
The objectives are clear, realistic, address a relevant language and are oriented towards the needs of the target group.	
The learning outcomes of the course are indicated.	
The work programme is of good quality and will ensure the delivery of the stated objectives.	
There is an appropriate cultural component of the course.	
Overall score for group 2	/20 points
Explain your assessment:	

3) Methodology	
The methodology is appropriate to attaining the objectives; the pedagogical and didactical approach is clearly described.	
The methods for the assessment of the participants' language skills at the end of the	

course are clearly described.	
ECTS credits will be awarded to students participating in the EILC.	
Overall score for group 3	/20 points
Explain your assessment:	

4) Quality of the course provider	
The provider of the course has suitably qualified and experienced teachers for providing the language training envisaged.	
The provider of the course has appropriate technical equipment (in terms of teaching aids, existence of a library and language laboratory etc.).	
Overall score for group 4	/20 points
Explain your assessment:	

5) Impact	
The described learning outcomes appear likely to have the desired positive impact on participants' competence in the target language concerned.	
The proposal points out activities for the dissemination and exploitation of the course results.	
Overall score for group 5	/20 points
Explain your assessment:	

II. ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

OVERALL SCORE

/100 points

III. OVERALL COMMENTS

The comments should relate to your assessment of the strengths, weaknesses and potential of the application, relative to the award criteria. The comments justify the assessment conclusion.

Please formulate very carefully, your comments will be sent to the applicant.

Comments on the proposal:

IV. SIGNATURE

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.

Signature of the independent expert:

Name:

Date / / (dd/mm/yyyy)

2.6. Erasmus potvrda konzorciju za stručne prakse - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-ERA-placement-consortia-eligibility check – version November 2011

ERASMUS STUDENT PLACEMENT CONSORTIA FORMAL ELIGIBILITY CHECK		
APPLICANT INSTITUTION: Project ref. n°: FORMAL ELIGIBILITY CHECK DONE BY: Date : / / (dd/mm/yyyy)		
SUBJECT AREA :	TITLE OF PROJECT:	

I. FORMAL ELIGIBILITY CHECK FOR ERASMUS Placement Consortia		
<input type="checkbox"/> The proposal has been submitted by the deadline <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal has been submitted using the official application form <input type="checkbox"/> All sections of the application form have been completed <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal is dated and signed by the legal representative of the co-ordinating institution of the consortium <input type="checkbox"/> The consortium is eligible (at least one higher education institution) and the activities are eligible (student placements) <input type="checkbox"/> The sending higher education institutions have an extended Erasmus University Charter* <input type="checkbox"/> The legal representative of the applicant organisation has signed the declaration on honour** (section 5 of the application form)		
* This point will be checked once the selection results are known ** If necessary, checking of financial capacity will be carried out before the final selection decision is taken		
DECISION on formal eligibility	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> RESERVE
<i>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>		
_____	_____	
Date	Name and signature	

2.7. Erasmus potvrda konzorciju za stručne prakse - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete

GfNA-II-B-ERA-placement-consortia-quality assessment– version November 2011

ERASMUS STUDENT PLACEMENT CONSORTIA		
EXPERT ASSESSMENT		
APPLICANT INSTITUTION: Project ref. n°: QUALITY ASSESSMENT DONE BY: Date : / / (dd/mm/yyyy)		
SUBJECT AREA :	TITLE OF PROJECT:	

II. ASSESSMENT CRITERIA and SUB-CRITERIA

Criterion 1: Quality of the application:	Very good 9, 10	Good 7, 8	Fair 5, 6	Weak 0,1,2,3,4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the aims and purpose of the consortium clearly defined and in relation to the beneficiaries needs? • Is the target group well defined? • Are the objectives in line with the objectives of the student placement mobility action as defined in the Call (part II, see description of this action)? • Are there clear indications on how the expected results will be disseminated? Can we expect that the foreseen measures will be effective? • Does the consortium have experience regarding the cooperation between higher education institutions and enterprises? • Does the consortium have experience in the organisation and management of placements for students in a national and/or international context? If yes, rate this experience. <p>If no, this subcriterion will not enter into the score total. In that case if the consortium is selected, it will be awarded a one-year certificate</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Score for criterion 1 <i>Please calculate the average score between 0 and 10</i>	Total: / 60 (for consortia with experience with student placements) or Total: / 50 (for consortia without experience with student placements)			
Average score 1 (round to 1 decimal) : /10				
Information points :				
- Experience in student placements under the Leonardo da Vinci II programme Yes/No				
- Information on horizontal issues? n/a /Yes/No				
Justify/explain your assessment:				

Criterion 2: Quality of the consortium and of its management	Very good 9,10	Good 7,8	Fair 5,6	Weak 0,1,2,3,4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the composition and structure of the consortium adequate to achieve the aims and purpose of the consortium? • Is the role of the consortium coordinating the project clear and do the expertise and competences of the coordinator justify the submission of a proposal? • Are the roles and responsibilities of each partner clearly defined? Is the distribution of work clear? • Is there relevant information on the administrative, technical and professional capacity of each partner to fulfil its responsibilities in the consortium? • Is there clear information on the management of the consortium? Are the responsibilities clear for contractual and financial management issues? • Does the proposal seek to demonstrate how the coordinator tries to ensure the sustained working of the consortium? 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Score for criterion 2 <i>Please calculate the average score between 0 and 10</i>	Total : /60 Average score 2 (round to 1 decimal): /10			
Justify/explain your assessment: 				

Score for criterion 3 <i>Please calculate the average score between 0 and 10</i>	Total : /80 Average score 3 (round to 1 decimal): /10
Justify/explain your assessment:	

III. OVERALL ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION	
Overall score <i>(add the 3 average scores: 1, 2 and 3 and divide by 3)</i>	Total : /30 Overall score (average total score round to the integer) : /10
IV. OVERALL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
<p>The comments and recommendations – at least two of each – should relate to your assessment of the strengths, weaknesses and potential of the proposal, relative to the award criteria. The comments and recommendations should justify the assessment conclusion. Please formulate them very carefully as your comments and recommendations will be sent to the applicant if rejected.</p> <p>1. Comments on the proposal:</p> <p>2. Recommendations to the applicant:</p> <p>3. Opinion on a potential Certificate:</p> <p>3.a) Do you think that the consortium offers guarantees for good working in the time frame of the LLP?</p> <p>3.b) Indicate if the consortium has previous experience in student placements: YES/ NO</p> <p>3.c) In case of no previous experience, indicate if it should be awarded a one year Erasmus Consortium Placement Certificate - motivate your recommendation: YES/ NO</p> <p>4) Information points :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Experience in student placements under the Leonardo da Vinci II programme YES/NO - Information on horizontal issues? n/a /YES/NO 	

V. SIGNATURE

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.

Signature of the independent expert: _____

Name:

Date / / **(dd/mm/yyyy)**

3.1. Leonardo da Vinci projekti mobilnosti: Početno strukovno obrazovanje (IVT), Stručnjaci u strukovnom obrazovanju i osposobljavanju (VETPRO) i Osobe na tržištu rada (PLM) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-LDV-mobility-eligibility check – version November 2011



Lifelong Learning Programme 2007-2013

Leonardo da Vinci

ELIGIBILITY FORM

MOBILITY

Version 2012

LIFELONG LEARNING PROGRAMME – LEONARDO DA VINCI MOBILITY

IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROJECT

Proposal Number:	
Title	
Applicant Organisation	
Target Group	IVT <input type="checkbox"/> PLM <input type="checkbox"/> VETPRO <input type="checkbox"/>

ELIGIBILITY CHECK

1	The proposal is submitted in the form requested by the NA in addition to the signed paper version.	YES	NO
2	The proposal is submitted on the official Leonardo da Vinci application form for mobility.	YES	NO
3	All relevant fields in the application form are duly filled in, especially the financial section.	YES	NO
4	The form is not handwritten.	YES	NO
5	The proposal bears the original signature of the authorised person designed in the application form.	YES	NO
6	The proposal has been submitted within the deadlines as indicated in the call for proposals.	YES	NO
7	The applicant is located in the country of the National Agency to which the application is addressed.	YES	NO
8	The proposal is submitted by a legal entity.	YES	NO
9	The proposal complies with the requirements of transnational dimension, i.e. partners from at least 2 countries, including at least one from the EU.	YES	NO
10	The proposal is drawn up in one of the official languages of the EU or In one of the EFTA/EEA or accession country languages + a summary in EN, FR or DE.	YES	NO

3.2. Leonardo da Vinci projekti mobilnosti: Početno strukovno obrazovanje (IVT), Stručnjaci u strukovnom obrazovanju i osposobljavanju (VETPRO) i Osobe na tržištu rada (PLM) - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete



LEONARDO DA VINCI

Lifelong Learning Programme 2007-2013

Leonardo da Vinci

ASSESSMENT FORM MOBILITY

VERSION 2012

ASSESSMENT FORM FOR LEONARDO DA VINCI MOBILITY PROPOSALS

A. PROJECT OUTLINE

Proposal number	
Title	

Applicant Organisation	
Type of participants (target group) <i>In case of IVT indicate also if apprentice or school-based (or both)</i>	
Programme objective addressed [1]	
National priorities addressed	
Total number of partners	
N. of countries involved	
Planned duration of stays (weeks) [2]	
Total funding requested €) [2]	
Host countries [2]	
Fields of Education [3]	
Proposal number	
Title	

PROJECT SUMMARY

Please provide a short summary indicating the proposal's objectives, target groups, content of the planned training placements or stays abroad and partnership (max. 10 lines).

--



[1] See Application form part E

[2] See application form tables in part H

[3] See application form tables in part E.2

DETAILED ASSESSMENT

Proposal Number:	
Proposal Title:	

Please complete the assessment form by giving comments and a score for each of the following sections Your assessment will be based on the key issues given for each section.

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. Please note that applications scoring less than 50 points in the quality assessment will not be selected for funding.

	Award Criteria	Max Score	Score	Total	Comments
B.	PARTNERSHIP (part C of the application)	15	13. Very good	5	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the partnership seem to be capable to implement the project? In your assessment please consider the respective roles of applicant, coordinating partner (if applicable), sending partners, receiving partners, intermediate organisations (if applicable), • Are the roles and responsibilities of the partners clearly described and is there an appropriate balance between the roles and tasks of the participating organisations? • Does the partnership include intermediate organisations and what is the degree of their commitment, i.e. their role in the project (to find enterprises, the follow-up of participants) ? • Do the partners seem truly involved and committed (see also letters of intent, if attached)? 				
C.	AIMS AND BACKGROUND (parts D and E of the application)	15	08. Fair	8	

- Is there a clear description of the expected participants and their needs? (Apprentices, school- based IVT, PLM, special needs, type of VETPRO, etc) (D.2)
- Does the application show a clear relevance of the project content for participants' professional training needs? (D.2)
- Do the activities described in the proposal meet the participants' needs and provide added value in their education/training? (D.3)
- Is the duration of the stays abroad and the choice of receiving partners reasonable to meet the aims? (D.3)
- Is there a relevance of the project not only for the participants but also in other contexts (sectoral or national/regional or other)? (E.1)
- Are the project objectives and activities in line with the Leonardo da Vinci programme objective(s) and the priorities of the Community Call addressed by the proposal? (E.1)

SPECIFIC NEEDS OR OTHER HORIZONTAL ISSUES (if applicable)
(PART E.3 OF APPLICATION FORM)

In case of participants with a disability or other specific needs, are the measures intended to be taken sufficient to achieve successful placements?

In case another horizontal issue as promoting equality and combating discrimination is specifically addressed, are the measures intended to be taken coherent to it?

D.	PROJECT ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT (parts F and G of the application)				
D1.	SELECTION, PREPARATION AND PRACTICAL SUPPORT	10	06. Good	6	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the plans of selection and preparation of the participants well elaborated, in order to give good bases for a good quality transnational training period? (F.3) • Is the planned pedagogical, cultural and linguistic preparation adequate and of satisfactory quality? (F.4) 				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the planned quality of practical support given (information, arrangements for travel, insurance, visa, accommodation, identification of host organisation etc.) (F.5) 			
D2.	TRAINING CONTENT AND MONITORING	15	10. Good	10
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the applicant explain how the training content (or content of the period abroad for VETPRO) has been or will be agreed with the receiving partners? (F.2) Is the training content (or content of the period abroad for VETPRO) satisfactorily described? (G.) If applicable, are the methods for tutoring and mentoring (supervision) and/or accompanying during the placement period clearly explained? (F.5) 			
D3.	VALIDATION OF ACQUIRED SKILLS (part D.4 of the application)	10	09. Very good	9
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there clear evidence about the strategy for efficient validation and/or recognition of the training period abroad? Is this validation strategy adequate? Is the Implementation of Europass – Mobility envisaged? 			
D4.	PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION (part F of the application)	15	13. Very good	13
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the overall management of the placements organised in an efficient manner? Assess the quality of management arrangements, including contractual and financial arrangements. (F.5) Evaluate the adequacy and feasibility of workplan and timetable. (F.1) Is an adequate process for evaluation at participant and project level foreseen? Is an evaluation follow-up and use of its results foreseen? (F.6) 			
	TOTAL SCORE SECTION D	50		38
E.	DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS (part F.7 of the application)	10	07. Good	7
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the expected results described in a satisfactory manner? Assess the plan for dissemination of the results. 			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the degree of sustainability of the activities. Table C.15. on similar projects finances previously can serve as an indicator. 					
F.	BUDGET AND FLOWS <i>(part H of the application)</i>	10	07. Good	7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the tables on the flows and the budget sheet completed? • Do they give a clear picture of the flows and the related costs? • Are minimum and maximum durations respected? • Are the amounts for scale of unit costs fixed at national level (for subsistence, management, preparation) respected? • Is there adequacy and consistency with the activities to be carried out • Adequacy and consistency with the number of participants planned 					
Total (points)				73	
Total (%)				73,0%	
G.	NATIONAL PRIORITIES	15	09. Good	9	
TOTAL, including national priorities (points)					82
TOTAL, including national priorities (%)					82,0%

Sections G and H will be forwarded to the applicants

Feedback form

Proposal Number:

Proposal Title:

G. OVERALL COMMENTS AND JUSTIFICATION OF FINAL RATING

Please provide an overall assessment summarising your conclusions on the proposal as a whole, and justify your final rating.

H. By making reference to the following table, please indicate:

1) the main strengths (+);

2) the main weaknesses (-) of the proposal

	[+]	[-]
Partnership		
<i>Comments (compulsory if you indicate + or -)</i>		
Aims and Background		
<i>Comments (compulsory if you indicate + or -)</i>		

Selection, preparation and practical support			
<i>Comments (compulsory if you indicate + or -)</i>			
Training content and Monitoring			
<i>Comments (compulsory if you indicate + or -)</i>			
Validation of acquired skills			
<i>Comments (compulsory if you indicate + or -)</i>			
Project management and evaluation			
<i>Comments (compulsory if you indicate + or -)</i>			

Dissemination of results			
<i>Comments (compulsory if you indicate + or -)</i>			
Budget and Flows			
<i>Comments (compulsory if you indicate + or -)</i>			
National priorities			
<i>Comments (compulsory if you indicate + or -)</i>			

I. Assessment (summary)

	Max Score	Total
B. Partnership	15	13
C. Aims and Background	15	8
D. Project Organisation and Management	50	38
D.1 Selection, preparation and practical support	10	6
D.2 Training Content and Monitoring	15	10
D.3 Validation of acquired skills	10	9
D.4 Project Management and evaluation	15	13
E. Dissemination of results	10	7
F. Budget and flows	10	7
Total (points)	100	73
E. National priorities	0	0
TOTAL, including national priorities (points)	100	73

<p style="text-align: center;">Expert Identification Declaration of non-conflict of interest and Declaration of confidentiality</p>
--

I (Name 1 _____) 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: __/__/____

Signature: _____

Name of the expert's organisation:

[1] Please use block letters

3.3. Leonardo da Vinci potvrda za mobilnost – lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-LDV-mobility-certificate-eligibility check – version November 2011

**LIFELONG LEARNING PROGRAMME 2007-2013
LEONARDO DA VINCI MOBILITY
ELIGIBILITY FORM
CERTIFICATE IN MOBILITY**

IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROJECT AND CERTIFICATE APPLICATION

Certificate application:	
Proposal Number:	
Applicant Organisation	

ELIGIBILITY CHECK

1	The application for certification is submitted on the official Leonardo da Vinci application form for mobility certification.	YES	NO
2	The application for certification is submitted in the form requested by the NA in addition to the signed paper version. (where applicable)	YES	NO
3	The application for certification bears the original signature of the authorised person designed in the application form.	YES	NO
4	The application for certification has been submitted within the deadlines as indicated in the call for proposals.	YES	NO
5	The application is drawn up in one of the official languages of the EU or In one of the EFTA/EEA or accession country languages + a summary in EN, FR or DE.	YES	NO
6	A regular mobility proposal has been submitted together with the application for certification by the same legal entity.	YES	NO
7	The applicant has already completed at least one (figure can vary according to NA) previous LDV mobility project in the last three years. (can vary according to NA)	YES	NO

(National Agencies may add any supplementary national eligibility criteria as they see fit.)

Conclusion:

The application for certification	is eligible	
	is not eligible	

Comments:

<p>In case you consider the application for certification as not eligible, or if you cannot come to any conclusion, please provide justifications:</p>

Evaluator Identification

I the undersigned hereby declare that I have no link with the application for certification or any personal interest in its success or otherwise that could influence my impartiality. I will not disclose any information concerning this application for certification or my assessment or any other matter relating to it outside the agreed assessment procedure.

Name of evaluator (in block letters): _____

Date: ____/____/____ Signature: _____

3.4. Leonardo da Vinci potvrda za mobilnost – lista kriterija za povjeru kvalitete

GfNA-II-B-LDV-mobility-certificate-quality assessment – version 2011

LIFELONG LEARNING PROGRAMME – LEONARDO DA VINCI MOBILITY

ASSESSMENT FORM - CERTIFICATE APPLICATION
--

IDENTIFICATION

Certification Application	
Number:	
Applicant organisation:	
Target group (from project application form/s):	IVT <input type="checkbox"/> PLM <input type="checkbox"/> VETPRO <input type="checkbox"/>

Please note that below ‘**the applicant**’ can also refer to a consortium or partnership as a whole, as appropriate in relation to the project and application in question.

ASSESSMENT

A - EXPERIENCE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF TRANSNATIONAL MOBILITY (MAX 60 POINTS)

1. LEVEL OF PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE (MAX 10 POINTS)

To what extent does the applicant demonstrate an appropriate level of experience (number of projects, amounts of mobility, size of budgets etc) through involvement in Leonardo mobility initiatives?

Non-existent 0	Very weak 1-2	Weak 3-4	Satisfactory 5-6	Good 7-8	Excellent 9-10

Comments:

Any other relevant experience of the applicant?

Comments:

2. NATURE OF PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE (MAX 10 POINTS)

Does the previous experience of the applicant in implementing Leonardo mobility projects adequately reflect the nature of the present application? Please make reference to the target groups, target countries, partners, sectors, durations of placements, work programme/tasks, preparation periods and any other relevant information?

Non-existent 0	Very weak 1-2	Weak 3-4	Satisfactory 5-6	Good 7-8	Excellent 9-10

Comments:

3. QUALITY AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE (MAX 30 POINTS)

a) To what extent does the applicant demonstrate an appropriate level of successful experience (success rate, use of budget, quality of management etc) through their involvement in Leonardo mobility and other mobility initiatives?

Non-existent 0	Very weak 1-3	Weak 4-6	Satisfactory 7-9	Good 10-12	Excellent 13-15

Comments:

b) Do the achievements of and/or improvements to the previous Leonardo mobility activities and other mobility initiatives adequately demonstrate a commitment to quality and long-term development?

Non-existent 0	Very weak 1-3	Weak 4-6	Satisfactory 7-9	Good 10-12	Excellent 13-15

Comments:

4. ABILITY TO IDENTIFY AND DESCRIBE IMPACT AS WELL AS DISSEMINATE RESULTS (MAX 10 POINTS)

Does the applicant demonstrate a proven ability to describe and report on impact as well as to disseminate outcomes and results of activities?

Non-existent 0	Very weak 1-2	Weak 3-4	Satisfactory 5-6	Good 7-8	Excellent 9-10

Comments:

B - INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGY, STRATEGY DEVELOPMENTS AND COMMITMENT TO TRANSNATIONAL MOBILITY (MAX 30 POINTS)

Does the application and the supporting documentation reflect a genuine and good quality approach to the following aspects of the applicants activities:

5. MISSION AND STRATEGY (MAX 10 POINTS)

General approach and commitment to long-term development in relation to mission and strategy

Non-existent 0	Very weak 1-2	Weak 3-4	Satisfactory 5-6	Good 7-8	Excellent 9-10

Comments:

6. QUALITY MANAGEMENT (MAX 10 POINTS)

General approach and commitment to long-term development in relation to quality management

Non-existent 0	Very weak 1-2	Weak 3-4	Satisfactory 5-6	Good 7-8	Excellent 9-10

Comments:

7. ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES (MAX 10 POINTS)

General approach and commitment to long-term development in relation to organisational issues

Non-existent 0	Very weak 1-2	Weak 3-4	Satisfactory 5-6	Good 7-8	Excellent 9-10

Comments:

C - PLANNED PROJECT DEVELOPMENTS (MAX 10 POINTS)

8. CLARITY, CONSISTENCY AND RELEVANCE OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS (MAX 10 POINTS)

Are the envisaged developments to this project/projects explained clearly and are they consistent with the overall nature and quality of the proposed activities? Do the planned developments to this project/projects display appropriate relevance in relation to the applicant's long-term strategic approach?

Non-existent 0	Very weak 1-2	Weak 3-4	Satisfactory 5-6	Good 7-8	Excellent 9-10

Comments:

SUMMARY

Total points (max. 100)	
--------------------------------	--

Based on the above evaluation the project and applicant	fulfills the criteria and can be proposed for the Leonardo Mobility Certificate	
	does not fulfill the criteria and cannot be proposed for the Leonardo Mobility Certificate	

Global comments and justification:

EVALUATOR IDENTIFICATION

I the undersigned declare that I have no link with the application for certification or any personal interest in its success or otherwise that could influence my impartiality. I will not disclose any information concerning this application for certification or my assessment or any other matter relating to it outside the agreed assessment procedure.

Name of evaluator (in block letters): _____

Date: ____/____/____ Signature: _____

3.5. Leonardo da Vinci potvrda za mobilnost – „fact sheet“

GfNA-II-B-LDV-mobility-certificate-fact sheet – version November 2011

Lifelong Learning Programme Leonardo da Vinci Leonardo da Vinci Certificate in mobility NA - Fact Sheet

The Fact Sheet should be completed by the respective National Agency in relation to the applications submitted for LdV mobility certificate. The fact sheet should refer to all LdV mobility projects completed by the applicant organisation in the past 4 calendar years⁴.

Past performance of the applicant

1. Key figures of the project implementation

Please give the respective figures:

Contract numbers of the completed LdV mobility projects of the applicant (in the past 4 calendar years)	(Contract number 1)	(Contract number 2)	(Contract number 3)	(Contract number 4)	(Contract number 5) ⁵	Average
1. a) Total funding granted ⁶ (€)						

Please use block letters
und projects completed since 2006

⁵ In case of more than 5 projects please add new table

1. b) Total paid (grant – €) ⁷						
1. c) Total paid / Total funding (%)						
2. a) Number of beneficiaries and accompanying persons (granted) ⁸						
2. b) Number of registered placements ⁹						
2. c) Number of beneficiaries and accompanying persons (granted) / Number of registered placements (%)						
3. Overall satisfaction of the participants (according to Rap4Leo questionnaires - %)						
4. Any significant delay in reporting (days)						
5. Non-recovered amounts (€)						
6. Serious problems? Financial irregularities? Fraud? Payment problems?						
7. Other issues: Qualitative management, Feedback from beneficiaries, outcomes of monitoring, audit and in-situ checks, national and European awards, other relevant information.						

⁶ LdV grant according to the contract

⁷ Final LdV grant after the assessment of the final report

⁸ Number of participants according to the contract

⁹ Number of participants after the assessment of the final report

3.6. Partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-LDV-partnership-eligibility check – Version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>LEONARDO DA VINCI</u> PARTNERSHIPS COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST 2012</p>

Partnership reference N°

Name of applicant institution:	
Partnership title:	

	Yes/No
The application has been submitted by the applicant institution on 21 February 2012 at the latest (postmark date).	
The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
The form is not hand written.	
All the compulsory fields in the eForm have been filled.	
The application form has been completed one of the official languages of the EU).	
The Partnership consists of institutions located in at least three of the countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme.	
At least one of the participating institutions is located in a Member state of the European Union.	
The applicant institution is eligible to receive funding from this National Agency to participate in a Leonardo da Vinci Partnership.	
The form has been signed by the legal representative of the applicant institution or a person duly authorised by the legal representative.	
The applicant institution has fulfilled its contractual obligations in relation to any earlier grants received from the National Agency. (exclusion criterion)	
A maximum of two Croatian institutions are eligible in the same partnership. If three or more Croatian institutions apply in the same partnership, the NA will contact the applicants and ask them to choose which application should be put forward.	
A maximum of two partnership applications per institution will be accepted. If an institution submits more than two applications, the NA will contact the institution and ask it to choose which applications should be put forward.	
Applications must be submitted in English or Croatian; if otherwise, original version + translation into English or Croatian is required. If the translation is not provided, the applicant will be asked to deliver the translation; if not, the application will be considered ineligible.	
If the application has been submitted by the faculty, it contains the	

endorsment letter signed by the rector	
--	--

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

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



Name of evaluator: _____

Leonardo da Vinci PARTNERSHIPS Common european quality assessment 2012

Partnership reference N°:

Name of coordinating institution:

Partnership title:

Note on the points system: Each criterion should be rated by the evaluators on the scale proposed (1 to 8). **The excel sheet will automatically apply the weighing and will provide the final weighted points.** 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 D2 and D3. Please note that applications scoring less than 50 weighted 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.

Partnerships application quality
assessment form
Version December 2011 - Call 2012

Indicative question in the applica-tion form						Unweighted points resulting from the evaluator's assessment	Weightin g	Max weight ed points	Weighte d points (to be entered into LLPLink by NAs)
	Quality of the work programme	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
D.2 and D.3, as well as an overall view of the whole application.	<p>a) The subject is relevant for the Leonardo da Vinci programme.</p> <p><i>Applications assessed as "weak" on this criterion will be rejected without further assessment.</i></p> <p>The application clearly indicates how the subject relates to the objectives of the programme (see Leonardo da Vinci Programme in Annex 1). The application shall be „weak“ (not more than 2.9 points) if none of the objectives is addressed.</p> <p>The application respects the priority of the Call: <i>As Comenius Partnerships cover the cooperation between schools, Partnership projects in Leonardo da Vinci must focus on the cooperation between vocational education and training and the world of</i></p>	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		0,5	4	0

work and involve partners from both sides.

World of work partners may include, for example, enterprises; VET providers associated with enterprises (e.g. providing work-based training; apprenticeships); sector representations; branches; professional associations; representatives of working life (e.g. chambers of commerce and trade organisations); and other organisations providing evidence of links to working life and employment (e.g. some local authorities).

The application shall be „weak“ (not more than 2.9 points) if there is not at least one 'world of work' full partner (not „silent“, unfunded) and at least one VET provider.

The application should address the Leonardo da Vinci target group: If Higher Education Institutions are involved the project should clearly focus on **vocational training** („vocational training“ means any form of initial vocational education or training, including technical and vocational teaching and apprenticeships, which contributes to the achievement of a vocational qualification recognised by the competent authorities in the Member State in which it is obtained, as well as any continuing vocational education or training undertaken by a person during his or her working life [LLP Decision, Art. 2, point 2]). The project can therefore not target those attending or working in higher education (i.e. undergraduate students, university professors etc). **The application shall be „weak“ (not more than 2.9 points)**

	if this criterion is not met.								
	<p>b) The aims of the Partnership and the approach chosen to achieve them are clear and realistic.</p> <p>The aims and objectives are clearly stated and are achievable within the time-frame of the project. The application provides an explanation on how the aims will be achieved.</p>	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		1	8	0
D.4.	<p>The results are relevant for the Partnership in question.</p> <p>The results are clearly linked to the aims and objectives of the partnership and should be appropriate for the target group involved.</p>	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		1	8	0
G.2.	<p>a) The work programme covers the whole period of 2 years and is appropriate for achieving the objectives.</p> <p>The work programme includes activities consistent with the Partnership's overall aims and objectives, and covers the whole period of 2 years.</p>	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		0,5	4	0
	<p>b) The planned activities and mobilities are relevant for the Partnership in question.</p> <p>The planned activities (including mobility) are linked directly to the aims and objectives of the proposal and are specific and relevant to the aims and the target groups involved. Please check that the tables G1, G.2 and H are consistent.</p>	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		1,5	12	0
	Impact and European added value	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
D.5	The Partnership will generate European added value	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		1	8	0

	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.								
D.6.	<p>The expected impact and benefits of the Partnership on participating institutions and individual participants are clear and well defined.</p> <p>The application provides a clear and well defined explanation on the expected impact and benefits of the partnership on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the participating staff and pupils/learners/trainees, - the participating organisations/institutions. 	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		1	8	0
	Quality of the Partnership	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
F.1	<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>There is an appropriate and clearly defined distribution of roles and tasks across the Partnership to match each partner's own competences. The contribution of each partner is clearly explained. The consortium is relevant for achieving the objectives.</p> <p>The tasks are defined and distributed among the partners in such a way that the results can be achieved within the time-frame of the project. The Partnership coordination is well assured by the coordinating institution.</p> <p>The participating organisations are appropriate for the subject on which the Partnership will be working.</p>	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		1	8	0

F.2.	<p>Appropriate measures have been planned to ensure effective communication and cooperation between the participating institutions.</p> <p>Appropriate measures are foreseen to ensure communication and cooperation such as meetings, workshops, conference calls, regular correspondence, newsletters, and other forms of exchange of information (such as use of ICT).</p>	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		0,5	4	0
F.3.	<p>The application makes clear how relevant staff and/or trainees will be involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of activities</p> <p>If the Partnership is focused on cooperation on a specific subject (e.g. training or education content) or cooperation within a specific field or economic sector, the application makes clear how all relevant staff will be involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of activities</p> <p>If the Partnership is rather pupil / trainee oriented, the application makes clear the role that pupils / trainees will play in the different stages of the Partnership (planning, implementation, evaluation)</p>	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		1	8	0
F.4.	<p>The Partnership is integrated into the curriculum and / or ongoing activities of the institutions involved.</p> <p>In Partnership dealing with cooperation on a specific subject (e.g. training or education content) or cooperation within a specific field or economic sector, the application makes clear how the project fits into the regular activities of the participating institutions.</p> <p>If the Partnership focuses on pupil / trainee involvement, the application makes clear how the Partnerships activities will be integrated into the curriculum of the participating pupils / trainees</p>	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		1	8	0

	and what subjects of the curriculum will be concerned.								
F.5.	<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/approach 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>	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		1	8	0
	Dissemination and exploitation of results	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
F.6.	<p>a) The planned dissemination and exploitation activities are well defined and ensure optimal use of the results amongst the participating institutions.</p> <p>The dissemination activities are focused and well defined. The Partnership clearly explain and demonstrates the interest/potential to disseminate and make use within their own institutions of the results, experiences and, where applicable, the end products of the Partnership.</p>	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		1	8	0
	<p>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.</p> <p>The partnership plans to disseminate the results to organisations/networks outside of the partnership and has provided clear plans as to how they will achieve this.</p>	8-7	6,9-5	4,9-3	2,9-1		0,5	4	0
	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT							100	0

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.

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 [1]

(Excerpt)

Article 25

Objectives of the Leonardo da Vinci programme

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

(a) to support participants in training and further training activities in the acquisition and the use of knowledge, skills and qualifications to facilitate personal development, employability and participation in the European labour market;

(b) to support improvements in quality and innovation in vocational education and training systems, institutions and practices;

(c) to enhance the attractiveness of vocational education and training and mobility for employers and individuals and to facilitate the mobility of working trainees.

2. The operational objectives of the Leonardo da Vinci programme shall be:

(a) to improve the quality and to increase the volume of mobility throughout Europe of people involved in initial vocational education and training and in continuing training, so as to increase placements in enterprises to at least 80 000 per year by the end of the Lifelong Learning Programme

(b) to improve the quality and to increase the volume of cooperation between institutions or organisations providing learning opportunities, enterprises, social partners and other relevant bodies throughout Europe;

(c) to facilitate the development of innovative practices in the field of vocational education and training other than at tertiary level, and their transfer, including from one participating country to others;

(d) to improve the transparency and recognition of qualifications and competences, including those acquired through non-formal and informal learning;

(e) to encourage the learning of modern foreign languages;

(f) to support the development of innovative ICT-based content, services, pedagogies and practice for lifelong learning.

[\[1\] in L 327/46 Official Journal of the European Union of 24.11.2006](#)

1,1	Weak
1,2	Weak
1,3	Weak
1,4	Weak
1,5	Weak
1,6	Weak
1,7	Weak
1,8	Weak
1,9	Weak
2,0	Weak
2,1	Weak
2,2	Weak
2,3	Weak
2,4	Weak
2,5	Weak
2,6	Weak
2,7	Weak
2,8	Weak
2,9	Weak
3,0	Fair
3,1	Fair
3,2	Fair
3,3	Fair
3,4	Fair
3,5	Fair
3,6	Fair
3,7	Fair
3,8	Fair
3,9	Fair
4,0	Fair
4,1	Fair
4,2	Fair
4,3	Fair
4,4	Fair
4,5	Fair
4,6	Fair
4,7	Fair
4,8	Fair
4,9	Fair
5,0	Good
5,1	Good
5,2	Good
5,3	Good
5,4	Good
5,5	Good
5,6	Good
5,7	Good
5,8	Good
5,9	Good
6,0	Good
6,1	Good
6,2	Good
6,3	Good
6,4	Good
6,5	Good
6,6	Good

3.8. Prijenos inovacija (ToI) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-LDV-TOI-eligibility check – version November 2011

LLP SELECTION 2012 Leonardo da Vinci - Transfer of Innovation	
Identification	
Project reference number (as in LLPlink):	Language:
Eligibility Check	
Submission of the application according to the procedures laid down in the Call for Proposals 2012, LLP Guide 2012, Part I, section 3.A.	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Submission of the application on the official 2012 application form for Multilateral Projects for Transfer of Innovation (in paper, electronically, on-line,...)	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Application is also submitted in paper form	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Application is sent to the appropriate National Agency	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Compliance of the paper version with the deadline: 2 February 2012 (postmark date not later than this date)	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Submission of the application in the working language of the consortium	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Compliance with the minimum and maximum duration of projects	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Applicant organisation has the status of a legal body	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Compliance with the minimum number of eligible countries and consortium members: The consortium must consist of members originating from at least 3 countries, including at least 1 consortium member from an EU Member State. European associations with members established in several LLP participating countries who are actively participating in the project shall be considered to fulfil the requirement regarding the minimum number of countries, without having to involve other bodies in the consortium.	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Application includes the detailed budget	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Grant requested is indicated	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Total cost of the project is indicated	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Financial data are expressed in €	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Application, including the Declaration of honour, is signed in original by one person in the applicant organisation who is authorised to enter into legally binding commitments	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Submission of letters of intent of at least the minimum number of consortium members (see above), signed by persons in the partner organisations who are authorised to enter into legally binding commitments (a signed fax or scanned version can be accepted at application stage provided that at contracting stage the originals are available)	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
For private bodies with grant request exceeding EUR 25.000, a copy of the official I accounts for the most recent financial year for which the accounts have been closed, should be attached to the application	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
If the application has been submitted by the faculty, it contains the endorsement letter signed by the rector	
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Comments	

¹ "official" means accounts certified by an appropriate external body, and/or published, and/or approved by the organisations general meeting

Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> The proposal is eligible <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal is <u>not eligible</u> for the following reason:	Signature:
	<input type="checkbox"/> The proposal is <u>provisionally not eligible</u> for the following reason:	Date:
Check	Has the application been submitted <u>electronically</u> ?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

3.9. Prijenos inovacija (ToI) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti



NA LOGO

Lifelong Learning Programme 2008-2013

Leonardo da Vinci

ASSESSMENT FORM

Multilateral Projects Transfer of Innovation

Version 2012

Expert name:

Project number:

Project Title:

Applicant name:

Short project summary

Assessment grids and scoring mechanism for the selection of Transfer of Innovation applications in the LLP-Leonardo da Vinci programme

The assessment grids below show the scoring mechanism that will be used by the evaluators assessing the Transfer of Innovation (TOI) applications submitted to the National Agencies (NA) under the annual LLP general call for proposals.

European award criteria for Leonardo da Vinci Transfer of Innovation project applications are specified in the annual LLP Guide, Part IIb – Explanations on the Action, Leonardo da Vinci Transfer of Innovation. For each award criterion, the assessment grids list a number of points that the evaluators assessing the submitted proposals will be asked to address and comment upon. The list of points to be addressed in the assessment is however not to be considered as exhaustive and, when writing the comments on a specific award criterion, evaluators will be free to address any other issue they feel relevant for this specific award criterion. The column "Score" in the assessment grid has a built-in scroll-down menu where the evaluator can select scores from "No evidence" to "Very good".

Scores are defined as follows for award criteria 3. Quality of Consortium, 6. Quality of Valorisation Plan and 8. Cost-Benefit Ratio:

0 = No evidence: fails to include a minimum amount of evidence to enable the criterion to be evaluated
1-3 = Very weak: addresses the criterion but with significant or many weaknesses
4-5 = Weak: addresses the criterion but with some weaknesses
THRESHOLD: 6
6-7 = Satisfactory: addresses the criterion satisfactorily
8-9 = Good: addresses the criterion with some aspects of high quality
10 = Very good: addresses the criterion with all aspects of high quality

Scores are defined as follows for award criteria 1. Relevance and 4. European Added Value:

0 = No evidence: fails to include a minimum amount of evidence to enable the criterion to be evaluated
1-3 = Very weak: addresses the criterion but with significant or many weaknesses
4-6 = Weak: addresses the criterion but with some weaknesses
THRESHOLD: 7
7 = Satisfactory: addresses the criterion satisfactorily
8-9 = Good: addresses the criterion with some aspects of high quality
10 = Very good: addresses the criterion with all aspects of high quality

Scores are defined as follows for award criteria 2. Innovative Character and 7. Impact:

0 = No evidence: fails to include a minimum amount of evidence to enable the criterion to be evaluated
1-5 = Very weak: addresses the criterion but with significant or many weaknesses
6-9 = Weak: addresses the criterion but with some weaknesses
THRESHOLD: 10
10-11 = Satisfactory: addresses the criterion satisfactorily
12-13 = Good: addresses the criterion with some aspects of high quality

14-15 = Very good: addresses the criterion with all aspects of high quality

Scores are defined as follows for award criterion 5. Quality of the Work Programme:

0 = No evidence: fails to include a minimum amount of evidence to enable the criterion to be evaluated

1-6 = Very weak: addresses the criterion but with significant or many weaknesses

7-12 = Weak: addresses the criterion but with some weaknesses

THRESHOLD: 13

13-15 = Satisfactory: addresses the criterion satisfactorily

16-18 = Good: addresses the criterion with some aspects of high quality

19-20 = Very good: addresses the criterion with all aspects of high quality

Assessment grid Leonardo da Vinci programme Multilateral Projects for Transfer of Innovation

Project Number:	
Project Title:	

	Award Criteria	Max Score	Score	Threshold	Total	Comments
1	RELEVANCE	10	00. No evidence	7 points		
<p>The grant application is clearly positioned in one of the priority areas of the Call for Proposals. The results are relevant to the specific, operational and broader objectives of the Programme.</p> <p><i>Points to be addressed in the assessment (non-exhaustive list):</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal clearly falls within the scope of the Leonardo da Vinci programme.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal clearly addresses the European priority that the applicant has indicated in section D.2.3 of the application form. If this is not the case a score under this threshold should be given.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/> Project results are relevant to the target beneficiaries, to the sector/s and/or the geographical area.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/> Problems / challenges addressed by the proposal are clearly described and documented (published research findings, surveys, consultation, background information), and the proposed solutions are clearly described and appropriate.</p>						
2	INNOVATIVE CHARACTER AND IMPROVEMENT OF NATIONAL VET SYSTEMS THROUGH TRANSFER OF INNOVATION	15	00. No evidence	10 points		
<p>The proposal seeks to find solutions to clearly identified needs of the target groups identified, by offering innovative solutions as regards training and competence development. These solutions will result from adapting and transferring innovative approaches which already exist in other countries or sectors of the economy</p>						

Points to be addressed in the assessment (non-exhaustive list):

☐ Clear and convincing description of how the proposal offers something new to targeted beneficiaries (learners / user-groups and / or their educators and / or decision-makers) in terms of learning opportunities, skills development, access to information, etc., by adapting and/or transferring new processes or products, good practices, new ways of delivering existing learning opportunities to new target groups, sectors or geographical areas. As the proposal is based upon innovative content or previous project results, it represents a significant innovative added value towards a new target group, economic sector or a new geographic area and will contribute to improving the quality of vocational training and education and/ or the VET system in the country/ies of implementation.

☐ The proposal should contribute to the national VET system.

Please note: if the National Agency has published a/ national priority/ies and if the proposal addresses it/one of/them do note rate it/them here. Follow the instructions of the National Agency.

☐ Are the innovative aspects of the content and products to be transferred evident and relevant for the targeted beneficiaries?

☐ The quality of the products being transferred is established and can be clearly identified such as through evidence of successful implementation and sustainability

☐ If the initial developer of the chosen content and product(s) is not part of the current partnership, is there a clear description of the relationship that the consortium partners will establish with the initial developer (intellectual property rights etc.)

3	QUALITY OF THE CONSORTIUM	10	00. No evidence	6 points	
<p>The consortium brings together all the skills and competences required to carry out the work programme, and there is an appropriate distribution of tasks across the partners.</p> <p><i>Points to be addressed in the assessment (non-exhaustive list):</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The consortium is a multi-actor consortium, possessing the skills and competences required to ensure that the work programme can be undertaken efficiently, effectively and professionally.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There is an appropriate distribution of tasks and a balanced involvement of the different partners with complementary competencies and countries in the implementation of the work programme.</p>					

<p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Individual tasks are allocated on the basis of the specific know-how of each partner. The expertise of the partners must be convincingly demonstrated.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> To your knowledge the different consortium partners have not shown a bad performance in past international or European projects.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> The consortium has adequate networks in transfer countries to ensure the successful implementation and valorisation of the transferred products.</p>					
4	EUROPEAN ADDED VALUE	10	00. No evidence	7 points	
<p>The benefits and need for European cooperation are clearly demonstrated.</p> <p><i>Points to be addressed in the assessment (non-exhaustive list):</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal should demonstrate why this work should be undertaken within a trans-national partnership rather than on a national basis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal should explain how the European cooperation will add value to the activities of the consortium. In other words, the proposal should demonstrate which benefits (trans-national, interdisciplinary, trans-sectoral) it brings to the consortium partners to work together – also in the long run, after Leonardo funding.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Leonardo programme encourages development of products that can be further adapted/customised so that they can be used in wider European contexts (different countries, target groups, sectors). The proposal will effectively exploit products and add value to another context.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Linguistic and cultural aspects to ensure successful transfer and a maximum exploitation are addressed appropriately.</p>					
5	QUALITY OF THE WORK PROGRAMME	20	00. No evidence	13 points	
<p>The objectives are clear, realistic and address a relevant issue; the methodology is appropriate to achieving the objectives; the work programme defines and distributes tasks / activities among the partners in such a way that the results will be achieved on time and to budget.</p> <p><i>Points to be addressed in the assessment (non-exhaustive list):</i></p>					

<p><input type="checkbox"/> The work programme provides a good overview of the project management, a clear description of the objectives and results, and an adequate methodology for achieving the objectives stated in the proposal, such as adequate division of tasks and responsibilities between partners.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Work programme is broken down into clear and measurable work packages (measurable in quantitative and qualitative terms), including a valorisation (dissemination / exploitation of results) and quality management plan.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Each work package is coherent and balanced with respect to the overall timetable, adequate and realistic to carry out the planned activities and consistent with the financial framework of the project.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Individual work packages include identifiable indicators to measure the progress of the project as well as a quality management plan.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Solid management arrangements are foreseen as well as appropriate communication structure within the partnership.</p>					
6	QUALITY OF THE VALORISATION PLAN (DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS)	10	00. No evidence	6 points	
<p>The planned dissemination and exploitation activities will ensure optimal use of the results beyond the participants in the project, during and beyond the lifetime of the project.</p> <p><i>Points to be addressed in the assessment (non-exhaustive list):</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal includes a strategy for the dissemination / exploitation of results using appropriate and adequate resources.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The valorisation strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - identifies the target group(-s), sector (-s) and their needs - clearly identifies interested sectors and end-users, and their needs - ensures consultation and involvement of relevant stakeholders / end-users during the project term - demonstrates clear activities to ensure that the results / benefits will be spread beyond the consortium partner organisations and ensures sustainability. 					

<input type="checkbox"/> The exploitation plan includes measures to ensure that the benefits will endure beyond the life of the project and assures sustainability of project results.					
7	IMPACT	15	00. No evidence	10 points	
<p>The impact on vocational education and training approaches and systems is likely to be significant.</p> <p><i>Points to be addressed in the assessment (non-exhaustive list):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The project results adequately address actual needs of partners, of specific sectors/areas of training provision, of target groups, i.e. the beneficiaries are clearly identified. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal includes "product" or result testing with experts and direct target groups. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal involves relevant stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal demonstrates a clear and concrete contribution – in terms of its impact on the target beneficiaries – to achieve the objectives of the Leonardo da Vinci programme, of the Lifelong Learning Programme and of relevant Community policies referred to in the Call. <input type="checkbox"/> The foreseeable impact of the project on the target groups is significant. There are clear and concrete indicators for impact on the target group/s and/or sector/s; a clear explanation is provided of the basis on which these indicators have been established. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposal explains which project activities and results are supposed to be continued respectively maintained or further developed after the end of the EU funding and how and with which resources other than from the EU this will be done (i.e. continuation of new courses, up-dating of new tools...). 					
8	THE COST-BENEFIT RATIO	10	00. No evidence	6 points	
<p>The grant application demonstrates value for money in terms of the activities planned relative to the budget foreseen.</p> <p><i>Points to be addressed in the assessment (non-exhaustive list):</i></p>					

<p><input type="checkbox"/> There is a consistency between the work programme and the financial plan; all aspects of the budget are clearly related to justified activities in the work programme.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The budget provides for adequate resources (personnel, equipment, travel, financial, etc.) necessary for success, it is neither overestimated nor underestimated.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal demonstrates overall an efficient and effective use of resources to implement the project and guarantees value for money.</p>		
	Total (points)	
	Total (%)	

Feedback form

Project Number:
Project Title:

Applicants will receive feedback on their proposal in the following format, which includes – in addition to the total score – comment and score for each award criterion.

	Award Criteria	Total	Max Score	Threshold
1	RELEVANCE		10	7 points
	<i>Comments:</i>			
	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-
2	INNOVATIVE CHARACTER AND IMPROVEMENT OF NATIONAL VET SYSTEMS THROUGH TRANSFER OF INNOVATION		15	10 points
	<i>Comments:</i>			
3	QUALITY OF THE CONSORTIUM		10	6 points
	<i>Comments:</i>			
4	EUROPEAN ADDED VALUE		10	7 points
	<i>Comments:</i>			
5	QUALITY OF THE WORK PROGRAMME		20	13 points
	<i>Comments:</i>			

6	QUALITY OF THE VALORISATION PLAN (DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS)		10	6 points
	<i>Comments:</i>			
7	IMPACT		15	10 points
	<i>Comments:</i>			
8	THE COST-BENEFIT RATIO		10	6 points
	<i>Comments:</i>			
	Total (points)		100	

Signature:

Date:

4.1. Posjeti i razmjene (Visits and exchanges) - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti



Name of evaluator: _____

GRUNDTVIG
VISITS AND EXCHANGES
COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST
2012

GRU-VIS Reference N°

Name of the applicant:	Family name: First name:
-------------------------------	---

	YES
The application has been submitted to the National Agency (NA) of the country where the applicant is resident. If the applicant works in a country other than that in which he/she is resident, the application has been sent to the NA in the country where the applicant works.	
The application has been submitted on time.	
The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
The application form is not handwritten.	
The application form is completed in full and includes all the requested attachments, including notably the required letter of acceptance from the host organisation for the Visit (not needed if the purpose of the Visit is to attend a conference / seminar).	
The application form has been completed using one of the official languages of the EU or, in the case of the EFTA/EEA or candidate countries, in the national language of the country concerned.	EU lang Other lang <input type="checkbox"/>
If submitted in the national language of an EFTA/EEA or candidate country, a translation into EN or FR or DE is supplied	
The application bears the applicant's original signature.	
If the applicant is an employed person, the application form is also signed by the applicant's employer organisation.	
The applicant is a national of a country participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme or a national of another country working or living in a participating country in compliance with that country's legal requirements (please refer to relevant National Agency website).	
The applicant belongs to one of the staff categories eligible for a grant under the Grundtvig Visits & Exchanges Action.	
The type of activity to be undertaken is eligible under the Grundtvig Visits & Exchanges Action.	
The Visit will take place in one of the countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme.	
The country of origin and/or the country of destination is a Member State of the EU, except in the case of applicants applying for a grant to participate in official Grundtvig events at European level (category 8 of section 3.1.2 in the Application Form).	
The Visit will take place in a country other than the country where the applicant is living / working.	
The Visit will take place within the eligible period.	
The Visit is eligible in terms of duration (from 1 full working day up to 90 days)	

Applications is submitted in English or Croatian; if otherwise, original version + translation into English or Croatian is required.	
---	--

ASSESSMENT

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

Date

Name and signature

4.2. Posjeti i razmjene (Visits and exchanges) - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete



Name of evaluator: _____

<p style="text-align: center;">GRUNDTVIG VISITS & EXCHANGES COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM 2012</p>

VIS reference N°

Name of the applicant:	Family name:
	First name:

Note on the points system: The ratings of the application against the quality criteria result in a total number of points out of a maximum of **100**. National Agencies may add **15** points for national criteria.

Each main criterion is given a total maximum number of points.

Please note that applications scoring less than **60** points (out of 100; points for national priorities are not included) in the quality assessment should not be selected for funding.

Note: The present form should not be used in the case of grants awarded for the purpose of attending official Grundtvig events organised at European level by or in cooperation with the European Commission. For these cases the NA will be notified by the Commission of the procedure to be used.

Section in Application form		Points	Max.
3.1	Content and duration		40
3.2	The objectives and activity programme for the Visit are presented clearly and are reasonable.		
3.3	The duration of the mobility is realistic and coherent with the foreseen activities and the Visit's objectives.		
3.4	The content of the Visit is relevant for the applicant's professional activity in the field of adult education.		
3.5	The content of the Visit is compatible with the objectives of the Grundtvig programme. <i>Applications assessed as weak on this criterion will</i>		
4.1	The applicant intends to undertake concrete and adequate preparatory activities before the Visit.		
5.1	The applicant has the profile necessary for attaining the objectives of the Visit.		
5.2	The applicant has the necessary language competence to be able to benefit from the Visit.		
5.3	The host organisation (or conference/seminar to be attended) is appropriate for attaining the objectives of the Visit.		
5.4	If the Visit is to be carried out jointly with other people (section 3.5), the justification for involving more than one person is convincing.		
5.5			
6.4			
	Impact and relevance		40
4.1	The Visit is embedded in broader cooperation between the home and host organisation.*		
4.2	It is clearly described how the applicant intends to incorporate the results of the Visit in his/her professional activities.		
4.3	It is clearly demonstrated that the applicant will benefit from the experience which the Visit will provide in terms of personal and professional development.		
4.5	It is clearly demonstrated that the applicant's home organisation (if any) and his/her learners there will benefit from the added insights / knowledge / competences obtained by the person carrying out the		
6.1	It is clearly demonstrated that the organisation which will host the Visit will benefit from the expertise of the person carrying out the		
6.3	The Visit will also have an impact on the local community of the host organisation.*		
	The applicant has a realistic and clear plan how to disseminate the results of the Visit upon return.		

4.4	European added value		20
4.2	The Visit activity abroad will have positive effects which could not be derived from similar activity within the applicant's own country of residence/work.		
	The Visit will contribute to strengthening cooperation between the applicant's home organisation and the host organisation of the Visit.*		
	The Visit will contribute to increasing the European dimension of the applicant's home organisation (if applicable, i.e. if the applicant is working in an organisation concerned with adult education)		
	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT		100

* Not applicable to Visits to conferences and seminars.

National priorities for 2012

	<i>NAs to insert the national criteria and priorities here.</i>		15
	Croatian NA has no national priorities.		

OVERALL COMMENTS:

Please be as specific and clear as possible, ensure that your comments are consistent with the marks given, and use polite language. In the case of less good quality applications, please explain points which you feel could be improved.

Your comments may be sent as feedback to unsuccessful applicants.

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 person who has 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 learning¹⁰

(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.

¹⁰ in L 327/46 Official Journal of the European Union of 24.11.2006

Description of the Grundtvig VIS action as included in the *LLP Guide 2012 Guide* (excerpt).

4.3. Stručno usavršavanje (In-service training - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti)



Name of evaluator: _____

GRUNDTVIG
IN SERVICE TRAINING
COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST
2012

IST reference N°

Name of the applicant:	Family name:
	First name:

YES

The application has been submitted by the published deadline.	
The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
The application form is not handwritten.	
The application form is completed in full and includes all the requested attachments.	
The application form has been completed using one of the official languages of the EU or, in the case of the EFTA/EEA or candidate countries, in the national language of the country concerned.	EU lang <input type="checkbox"/> Other lang <input type="checkbox"/>
The application submitted to the National Agency bears the applicant's original signature.	
If the applicant is an employed person, the application form is also signed by the applicant's employer organisation.	
The applicant is a national of a country participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme or a national of another country working or living in a participating country in compliance with that country's legal requirements (please refer to the relevant National Agency website).	
The applicant belongs to at least one of the staff categories eligible for a grant under the Grundtvig In-Service Training Action.	
The training activity is eligible under the Grundtvig In-Service Training Action.	
The training activity takes place in one of the countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme.	
The training activity is organised by an institution/company which is located in a country participating in the LLP.	
The training activity takes place in a country other than the country where the applicant is living / working.	
The training activity takes place within the eligible period.	
The training activity is eligible in terms of duration (structured course from 5 working days up to 6 weeks)	
The applicant person didn't receive a grant for Grundtvig IST in the Call 2010. and 2011.	
The applications is not similar or identical in the content part (preparation, aims, impact) to other application.	
One organization submitted maximum of two applications for the same IST deadline. If an organization submitted more than two applications for the same IST deadline, the NA will go back to the applicants and let them choose which applications should be put forward.	

ASSESSMENT

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

Date

Name and signature

4.4. Stručno usavršavanje (In-service training) - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete



Name of evaluator: _____

**GRUNDTVIG IN-SERVICE TRAINING
COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM
2012**

IST reference N°

Name of the applicant:	Family name:
	First name:

Note on the points system: The ratings of the application against the quality criteria result in a total number of points out of a maximum of **100**. National Agencies may add **15** points for national criteria.

Each main criterion is given a total maximum number of points.

Please note that applications scoring less than **60** points (out of 100; points for national priorities are not included) in the quality assessment should not be selected for funding.

		Points	Max.
	Content and duration		30
	The activity programme is well structured. It employs adequate methodology/activities in relation to the stated training objectives and the duration is coherent with the foreseen activities..		10
	The content of the training activity is relevant for the applicant's professional activity in the field of adult education and is also compatible with the objectives of the Grundtvig sectoral programme.		10
	The applicant intends to undertake concrete and adequate preparatory activities before the actual training activity.		5
	The applicant has the necessary language competence to be able to benefit from the training activity.		5
	Impact and relevance		40
	There is a clear match between the training selected and the applicant's training needs in the field of adult education.		10
	It is clearly described how the beneficiary intends to incorporate the results of the training in his/her professional activities in the field of adult education.		10
	It is clearly demonstrated that the applicant will benefit from the training in terms of personal and professional development		10
	It is clear that the training activity will have a positive impact on other stakeholders, ie. learners, the beneficiary's institution, other organisations.		10
	European added value		10
	The training activity has a strong European focus in terms of subject matter and/or the profile of participants and trainers and it will have a greater potential value than similar training in the applicant's home country.		5
	The applicant's participation in the training activity will clearly contribute to increasing the European dimension of his/her home organisation (if applicable, i.e. if the applicant is working in an organisation concerned with adult education)		5
	Dissemination of results		10
	The applicant has a realistic plan how to disseminate the results of the training upon return.		10
<u>Additional points for applications for training events resulting from EU-funded projects (ie. Socrates and LLP Multilateral Projects and Networks)</u>			
	The applicant applies for a training event resulting from a Socrates or LLP centralised project.		10

	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT		100
--	--	--	------------

National award criteria for 2012

	<i>NAs to insert the national criteria and priorities here (for example, priority to be given to applicants who have not received a GRU-IST grant over the past two years).</i>		15
	Applicant institutions has not any previous experience of participation in the Grundtvig programme.		15

OVERALL COMMENTS:

Please be as specific and clear as possible, ensure that your comments are consistent with the marks given, and use polite language. In the case of less good quality applications, please explain points which you feel could be improved.

Your comments may be sent as feedback to unsuccessful applicants.

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 person who has 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 learning¹¹

(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.

¹¹ in L 327/46 Official Journal of the European Union of 24.11.2006

Description of the Grundtvig IST action as included in the *LLP Guide 2012 Guide* (excerpt).

4.5. Partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti



Name of evaluator: _____

GRUNDTVIG LEARNING PARTNERSHIPS

COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST 2012

Partnership reference N°

Name of applicant organisation:	
Partnership title:	

ASSESSMENT

	Yes
The application has been submitted by the applicant organisation on 21 February 2012 at the latest (postmark date).	
The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
The form is not handwritten.	
All the compulsory fields in the e-form have been filled in.	
The application form has been completed using one of the official languages of the EU.	
The Partnership consists of organisations located in at least three of the countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme.	
At least one of the participating organisations is located in a Member state of the European Union.	
The applicant organisation is a legal body and is eligible to receive funding from this National Agency to participate in a Grundtvig Learning Partnership.	
The form has been signed by the legal representative of the applicant organisation or a person duly authorised by the legal representative.	
The applicant organisation has fulfilled its contractual obligations in relation to any earlier grants received from the National Agency, i.e. the organisation has no outstanding repayments to the NA which should already have been made (exclusion criterion).	
Only one organisation from Croatia is in the same Grundtvig Learning Partnership. If more than one organisation is involved in the same partnership, the NA will go back to the applicants and let them choose which application should be put forward.	
One organization submitted maximum of two applications for Grundtvig Learning Partnerships for the call 2012. If an organisation submits more than two applications, the NA will go back to the applicant and let it choose which application should be put forward.	
Applications are submitted in English or Croatian; if otherwise, original version + translation into English or Croatian is required. If the translation is not provided, the applicant will be asked to deliver the translation; if not, the application will be considered ineligible.	

ASSESSMENT

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

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

4.6. Partnerstva - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete



GRUNDTVIG

Name of evaluator: _____

GRUNDTVIG LEARNING PARTNERSHIPS Common european quality assessment form 2012

Partnership reference N°: _____

Name of coordinating institution:

Partnership title:

Note on the points system: Each criterion should be rated by the evaluators on the scale proposed (1 to 8). **The excel sheet will automatically apply the weighing and will provide the final weighted points.** 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 D2 and D3. Please note that applications scoring less than 50 weighted 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.

Indicative question in the application form						Unweighted points resulting from the evaluator's assessment	Weighting	Max weighted points	Weighted points (to be entered into LLPLink by NAs)
	Quality of the work programme	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
D.2 and D.3, as well as an overall view of the whole application	<p>a) The subject is relevant for the adult learning (as defined in the Grundtvig programme).</p> <p><i>Applications assessed as "weak" on this criterion will be rejected without further assessment.</i></p> <p>The application clearly indicates how the subject relates to the objectives of the programme</p> <p>The application should programme's target group.</p> <p><i>{Award criterion 1b- Relevance - Relevance for adult learning}</i></p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	0

	<p>b) The aims of the Partnership and the approach chosen to achieve them are clear and realistic. (See Grundtvig objectives in Annex 1) The aims and objectives are clearly stated and are achievable within the time-frame of the project. The application provides an explanation on how the aims will be achieved.</p> <p><i>{Award criterion 1a- Relevance - Clarity and realism of objectives}</i></p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0
D.4.	<p>The results are relevant for the Partnership in question. The results are clearly linked to the aims and objectives of the partnership and should be appropriate for the target group involved.</p> <p><i>{Award criterion 1c- Relevance of results for adult learning}</i></p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0
G.2.	<p>a) The work programme covers the whole period of 2 years and is appropriate for achieving the objectives. The work programme includes activities consistent with the Partnership's overall aims and objectives, and covers the whole period of 2 years.</p> <p><i>{Award criterion 4 -Quality of the work programme}</i></p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	8	0
	<p>b) The planned activities and mobilities are relevant for the Partnership in question.</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1,5	12	0

	<p>The planned activities (including mobility) are linked directly to the aims and objectives of the proposal and are specific and relevant to the aims and the target groups involved.</p> <p><i>{Award criterion 4 -Quality of the work programme}</i></p>								
	Impact and European added value	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
D.5	<p>The Partnership will generate European added value</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><i>{Award criterion 3c -European added value}</i></p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0
D.6.	<p>The expected impact and benefits of the Partnership on participating institutions and individual participants are clear and well defined.</p> <p>The application provides a clear and well defined explanation on the expected impact and benefits of the partnership on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the participating staff and learners, - the participating organisations. <p><i>{Award criterion 3a - Impact}</i></p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0

	Quality of the Partnership	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
F.1	<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>There is an appropriate and clearly defined distribution of roles and tasks across the Partnership to match each partner's own competences. The contribution of each partner is clearly explained.</p> <p>The tasks are defined and distributed among the partners in such a way that the results can be achieved within the time-frame of the project. The Partnership coordination is well assured by the coordinating institution.</p> <p>The participating organisations are appropriate for the subject on which the Partnership will be working.</p> <p><i>{Award criterion 2a - Quality of the Partnership - partner roles}</i></p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0
F.2.	<p>Appropriate measures have been planned to ensure effective communication and cooperation between the participating institutions.</p> <p>Appropriate measures are foreseen to ensure communication and cooperation such as meetings, workshops, conference calls, regular correspondence, newsletters, and other forms of exchange of information (such as use of ICT).</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	0

	<i>{Award criterion 2b - Quality of the Partnership - communication and cooperation}</i>								
F.3.	<p>The application makes clear how relevant staff and/or trainees will be involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of 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). If the Partnership is 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 involvement}</i></p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0
F.4.	<p>The Partnership is integrated into learning and / or ongoing activities of the organisations involved.</p> <p>In 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>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0

	<p>In Partnership 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 2d - Quality of the Partnership - Integration into the participating organisations}</i></p>								
F.5.	<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/approach 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 3b - Impact and European added value - Evaluation}</i></p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0
	Dissemination and exploitation of results	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak				
F.6.	<p>a) 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 clearly explain and demonstrates the interest/potential to disseminate and make use within their own organisations of the results, experiences and, where</p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		1	8	0

	<p>applicable, the end products of the Partnership.</p> <p><i>{Award criterion 5a - Dissemination, exploitation of results - participating organisations}</i></p>								
	<p>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.</p> <p>The partnership plans to disseminate the results to organisations/networks outside of the partnership and has provided clear plans as to how they will achieve this.</p> <p><i>{Award criterion 5b - Dissemination, exploitation of results - broader dissemination}</i></p>	8-7	6-5	4-3	2-1		0,5	4	0
	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT							100	0

NATIONAL PRIORITIES FOR 2011:		Max. 15 points for all national priorities.
Applicant institution has no experience of previous participation in the activity of Grundtvig partnerships.		15
TOTAL POINTS FOR 2011 NATIONAL PRIORITIES		15
TOTAL QUALITY AND PRIORITY POINTS		115

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.

Date

Name and signature

ANNEX 1

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 [1]

(Excerpt)

Article 29

Objectives of the Grundtvig programme

1. In addition to the objectives of the Lifelong Learning Programme as 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.

4.7. Volonterski projekti za starije - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti



Name of evaluator: _____

GRUNDTVIG SENIOR VOLUNTEERING PROJECTS

COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST 2012

Project reference N°

Name of applicant organisation:	
Project title:	

	Yes
The application has been submitted by the applicant organisation on 30 March 2012 at the latest (postmark date).	
The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
The application has been submitted according to the instructions published by the National Agency.	
The form is not handwritten.	
The form has been completed in full and includes all the requested attachments.	
The application form has been completed using the communication language of the Project (this must be one of the official languages of the EU).	
The Project consists of organisations located in two different countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme.	
At least one of the participating organisations is located in a Member State of the European Union.	
Each organisation is planning to send <u>and</u> host at least 2 volunteers.	
The planned volunteering periods are minimum 3 weeks and the project duration is 2 years.	
The applicant organisation is a legal body and is eligible to receive funding from this National Agency to participate in a Grundtvig Senior Volunteering Project.	
The form has been signed by the legal representative of the applicant organisation or a person duly authorised by the legal representative.	
The applicant organisation has fulfilled its contractual obligations in relation to any earlier grants received from the National Agency, i.e. the organisation has no outstanding repayments to the NA which should already have been made (exclusion criterion).	

ASSESSMENT

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

Date

Name and signature

4.8. Volonterski projekti za starije - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete



Name of evaluator: _____

GRUNDTVIG SENIOR VOLUNTEERING PROJECTS COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM 2012

Project reference N°

Name of coordinating organisation:	
Project 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.

Please note that applications scoring less than 60 points in the quality assessment will not be selected for funding.

Scale of evaluation:

<i>Maximum score</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Weak</i>
5	5	3-4	2	0-1
10	8-10	6-7	4-5	0-3
15	12-15	8-11	3-7	0-2

Question	Ref. in the application form	Max. points	Points given
<p>The partners</p> <p>The main aims and activities of the two partner organisations are clearly described.</p> <p>The partner organisations have clear interest in the topic of the project and clear expertise in working with the target groups.</p> <p>They demonstrate capacity to both host and send volunteers.</p> <p>Both organisations are appropriate for the topic of the project.</p>	Sections 2 and 3	10	
<p>Objectives</p> <p>The project is relevant to the Grundtvig programme and objectives.</p> <p>The concrete objectives of the Project and the approach chosen to achieve them are clear and realistic.</p> <p>There is a clear rationale for the project.</p> <p>The partnership activities beyond the exchange of volunteers are well described and relevant to the objectives of the project.</p> <p>The results envisaged are relevant for the project in question.</p>	5.2 and 5.3	15	
<p>Project management</p> <p>The work programme is appropriate for achieving the project's objectives. The planned activities and volunteering activities are relevant for the project in question.</p> <p>The tasks have been clearly defined and allocated in such a way that the results envisaged can be achieved within the time-frame foreseen.</p> <p>Appropriate measures have been foreseen to ensure effective communication and cooperation.</p>	5.6	15	

Question	Ref. in the application form	Max. points	Points given
<p>Volunteers identification</p> <p>There is a clear and acceptable presentation of the volunteers' profile or guidelines for selection of volunteers.</p> <p>The project intends to involve volunteers from a disadvantaged background and is planning relevant measures to accommodate the volunteers' needs.</p>	5.9	10	
<p>Volunteer activities</p> <p>The content of the volunteering activities, including the aims, theme, and the specific tasks of the volunteers, are clearly described and relevant to the project's objectives.</p> <p>The volunteering activities are clearly non-profit making and are not job substitution.</p> <p>Their value in terms of learning for the participants is clearly described and convincing.</p> <p>If the volunteers are hosted in different organisations, there is a clear rationale for it and clear arrangements.</p>	5.10	15	
<p>Training and support</p> <p>The preparation / training / debriefing cycle before, during and after the volunteering placement are clearly described and appropriate to the (foreseen) volunteers' profile and activities.</p> <p>This includes the linguistic and cultural preparation. It is clear how the language barrier will be overcome</p>	5.11	10	
<p>Practical arrangements</p> <p>The practical arrangements are clearly described and appropriate to the (foreseen) volunteers' profile and activities.</p>	5.12	5	
<p>Impact</p> <p>Expected impacts and benefits of the project on the volunteers are well defined.</p> <p>Expected impacts and benefits of the project on both institutions are well defined. The project is integrated into the activities of the applicant institutions / organisations.</p>	5.13	5	

Question	Ref. in the application form	Max. points	Points given
Monitoring and evaluation The partners have defined an approach to evaluate whether the aims and the expected impact of the project will be achieved in the course of the project lifecycle. The applicants have clear plans on how to recognise the volunteers' learning experience and on how to evaluate the impacts.	5.14	5	
Dissemination and use of results The planned activities for dissemination and exploitation of results are relevant and well defined. They involve both organisations, the volunteers, and the wider community.	5.15	5	
Sustainability Appropriate measures have been foreseen to ensure sustainability of the cooperation.	5.15	5	
TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT	-	100	

National priorities for 2012

<i>NAs to insert the national criteria and priorities here</i>	15	
Croatian NA has no National priorities.		

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 Project 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 Grundtvig in other countries.

Date

Name and signature

4.9. Radionice - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti



Name of evaluator: _____

GRUNDTVIG WORKSHOPS

COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST

2012

Grundtvig Workshop reference N°

Name of applicant organisation:	
Workshop title:	

The application has been submitted by the applicant organisation on 21 February 2012 at the latest (postmark date).	
The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
The application has been submitted according to the instructions published by the National Agency.	
The form is not handwritten.	
The form has been completed in full and includes all the requested attachments.	
The subject and the target group are relevant for a GRUNDTVIG Workshop	
The planned duration of the workshop is from 5 to 10 days (excluding travel).	
It is envisaged that at least 10 learners from countries other than the host country of the workshop will participate.	
The learners come from at least 3 LLP participating countries other than the country where the Workshop is to be held.	
Not more than one third of the learners will come from one single country.	
The Workshop will take place in the same country as the one where the applicant organisation is located.	
The Workshop takes place within the eligible period.	
The applicant organisation is a legal body and is eligible to receive funding from this National Agency to organise a Grundtvig Workshop.	
The form has been signed by the legal representative of the applicant organisation or a person duly authorised by the legal representative.	
The applicant organisation has fulfilled its contractual obligations in relation to any earlier grants received from the National Agency, i.e. the organisation has no outstanding repayments to the NA which should already have been made (exclusion criterion).	
One organization submitted only one application for Grundtvig Workshops for the call 2012. If an organisation submits more than two applications, the NA will go back to the applicant and let it choose which application should be put forward.	

ASSESSMENT

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

Date

Name and signature

4.10. Radionice - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete



Name of evaluator: _____

GRUNDTVIG WORKSHOPS

COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

2012

Workshop reference N°

Name of Workshop organiser:	
Workshop 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.

Please note that applications scoring less than 50 points in the quality assessment will not be selected for funding.

Scale of evaluation:

<i>Maximum score</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Weak</i>
5	5	3-4	2	0-1
10	8-10	6-7	4-5	0-3

III – Impact and European added-value	-	15	
The results envisaged are relevant and will have a demonstrable impact on the learning experience of the participants in the subject area concerned.	4.4 & 4.6	5	
The benefits of organising a <i>European</i> Grundtvig Workshop are clear and well defined	4.6	5	
Measures for dissemination and exploitation of the Workshop's results are clear and appropriate to the workshop's topic and target group	4.9	5	
IV – Quality of the communication plan	-	15	
The communication plan for advertising and publicising the Workshop is well defined	4.5	5	
It should be efficient in recruiting participants	4.5	10	
TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT	-	100	
Question	Ref. in the application form	Max. points	Points given
I – Quality and relevance of the Workshop	-	45	
The objectives of the Workshop are relevant to the operational objectives of the Grundtvig programme	4.3	5	
<i>Applications assessed as 2 or below on this criterion will be rejected</i>			
The Workshop's objectives are clear and realistic	4.4	5	
The methodology is appropriate to achieve the objectives. The pedagogical and didactical approach is clearly described		5	
The Workshop will provide a stimulating learning experience		5	
The Workshop will provide an added value in terms of learning opportunities, development of key competences, skills development, access to information, competence development for personal fulfilment, social change, intercultural awareness & knowledge, active citizenship etc...) for the participating learners		10	
Workshops which consist primarily of leisure or tourism activities in which the necessary learning dimension is insufficiently emphasized should be assessed as weak			
The definition of the target group is clear and appropriate to the topic of the Workshop. Guidelines for selection of the learners are clear and appropriate	4.4 & 4.10	10	
Workshops addressing a specific professional group for the purpose of providing continuous vocational training should be assessed as 0 to 2			
Workshops should not be scored 8 or more on this criteria unless they are primarily addressing disadvantaged learners			
The preparatory, recognition and follow-up measures related to the learners are appropriate to the topic of the Workshop and to	4.4 & 4.8	5	

the target group			
II – Quality of the organisation of the project	-	25	
The Workshop's organiser presents adequate qualifications to organise a European Workshop	4.2	5	
The logistics of the Workshop are clear and appropriate to the target group (incl. travel, accommodation, and hosting of participants with special needs)	4.7 & 4.10	10	
The work programme is appropriate for organising a good quality Workshop within the time-frame envisaged	5.1	10	

III – Impact and European added-value	-	15	
The results envisaged are relevant and will have a demonstrable impact on the learning experience of the participants in the subject area concerned.	4.4 & 4.6	5	
The benefits of organising a <i>European</i> Grundtvig Workshop are clear and well defined	4.6	5	
Measures for dissemination and exploitation of the Workshop's results are clear and appropriate to the workshop's topic and target group	4.9	5	
IV – Quality of the communication plan	-	15	
The communication plan for advertising and publicising the Workshop is well defined	4.5	5	
It should be efficient in recruiting participants	4.5	10	
TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT	-	100	

National priorities

<i>National Agencies to insert the national criteria and priorities here</i>	15	
Croatian NA has no national priorities.		

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 Project 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

4.11. Asistenti - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti



Name of evaluator: _____

<p style="text-align: center;">GRUNDTVIG <u>ASSISTANTSHIPS</u> COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST 2012</p>

GRU-ASST Reference N°

Name of the applicant:	Family name:
	First name:

	YES
--	------------

The application has been submitted to the National Agency (NA) of the country where the applicant is resident. If the applicant is working / studying in a country other than that in which he/she is resident, the application has been sent to the NA in the country where the applicant is working / studying.	
The application has been submitted by the published deadline.	
The application has been submitted using the correct application form.	
The application form is not handwritten.	
The application form is completed in full and includes all the requested attachments, including notably the required letter of acceptance from the host organisation for the Assistantship.	
The application form has been completed using one of the official languages of the EU or, in the case of the EFTA/EEA or candidate countries, in the national language of the country concerned.	EU lang <input type="checkbox"/> Other lang <input type="checkbox"/>
If submitted in the national language of an EFTA/EEA or candidate country, a translation into EN or FR or DE is supplied	
The application bears the applicant's original signature.	
If the applicant is an employed person, the application form is also signed by the applicant's employer organisation.	
The applicant is a national or permanent resident of a country participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme or a national of another country working or living in a participating country in compliance with that country's legal requirements (please refer to relevant National Agency website).	
The applicant belongs to one of the categories eligible for a grant under the Grundtvig Assistantships Action.	
The type of activity to be undertaken is eligible under the Grundtvig Assistantships Action.	
The Assistantship will take place in one of the countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme.	
The country of origin and/or the country of destination is a Member State of the EU.	
The Assistantship will take place in a country other than the country where the applicant is living / working.	
The Assistantship will take place within the eligible period.	
The Assistantship is eligible in terms of duration (13(full weeks (91 days) to 45 weeks (315 days))	
In the case of universities, the application may be submitted by the faculty, and the signature of the dean will be considered acceptable.	

ASSESSMENT

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
No ☐

If the application is not eligible on the basis of one or several of the criteria above, please give details if necessary:

Date

Name and signature

4.12. Asistenti - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete



Name of evaluator: _____

<p style="text-align: center;">GRUNDTVIG ASSISTANTSHIPS COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM 2012</p>

GRU-ASS reference N°

Name of the applicant:	Family name:
	First name:

Note on the points system: The ratings of the application against the quality criteria result in a total number of points out of a maximum of **100**. National Agencies may add **15** points for national criteria.

Each main criterion is given a total maximum number of points.

Please note that applications scoring less than **60** points (out of 100; points for national priorities are not included) in the quality assessment should not be selected for funding.

Appl. Form	CRITERION	Points	Max.
3.1-3.4	CONTENT AND DURATION		40
4.1	The applicant provides a clear and justified motivation for the Assistantship.		
5.1-5.5	The applicant presents clearly his/her capacity to adapt to living abroad and working with people in the host organisation.		
6.4	The objectives and activity programme for the Assistantship are presented clearly and are reasonable.		
	The duration of the mobility is realistic and coherent with the foreseen activities and the Assistantship's objectives.		
	The content of the Assistantship is relevant for the applicant's (future) professional activity.		
	The content of the Assistantship is compatible with the objectives of the Grundtvig programme. <i>Applications assessed as weak on this criterion will be</i>		
	The applicant intends to undertake concrete and adequate preparatory activities before the Assistantship.		
	The applicant has the profile necessary for attaining the objectives of the Assistantship.		
	The applicant has the necessary language competence to be able to benefit from the Assistantship.		
	The host organisation is appropriate for attaining the objectives of the Assistantship.		
	IMPACT AND RELEVANCE		40
4.1	It is clearly demonstrated that the applicant will benefit from the experience which the Assistantship will provide in terms of personal and professional development, including as regards linguistic and intercultural competence. . It is clearly described how the applicant intends to incorporate the results of the Assistantship in his/her professional activities in the field of adult education..		
4.2			
4.3			
4.5			
6.1	It is clearly demonstrated that the activity foreseen for the Assistantship is relevant for the host organisation and that the host organisation will benefit from the Assistantship.		
6.3			
	The Assistantship will also have an impact on the local community of the host organisation.		
	The applicant's home organisation (if any) and his/her learners there will benefit from the added insights / knowledge / competences obtained by the person carrying out the Assistantship.		
	The applicant has a realistic and clear plan how to disseminate the results of the Assistantship upon return		
	EUROPEAN ADDED VALUE		20
4.4	The Assistantship abroad will have positive effects which could not be derived from a similar activity within the applicant's own country of residence/work.		
4.2			
	The Assistantship will contribute to strengthening cooperation between the applicant's home organisation and the host organisation of the Assistantship.		

	The Assistantship will contribute to strengthening the European dimension of the applicant's home organisation (if applicable, i.e. if the applicant is working in an organisation concerned with adult education).		
	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT		100

National priorities for 2012

	<i>NAs to insert the national criteria and priorities here.</i>		15
	Croatian NA has no national priorities.		

OVERALL COMMENTS:

Please be as specific and clear as possible, ensure that your comments are consistent with the marks given, and use polite language. In the case of less good quality applications, please explain points which you feel could be improved.

Your comments may be sent as feedback to unsuccessful applicants.

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 person who has 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 learning¹²

(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.

¹² in L 327/46 Official Journal of the European Union of 24.11.2006

Description of the Grundtvig ASS action as included in the *LLP Guide 2012 Guide* (excerpt).

5.1. Pripremni posjeti - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti



Name of evaluator: _____

PREPARATORY VISITS Common European eligibility checklist 2012

Reference N°/Submission ID:	
Name of applicant organisation:	
LLP Sub-programme and Action	<input type="checkbox"/> COMENIUS - SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP (MULTILATERAL OR BILATERAL) - COMENIUS REGIO - INDIVIDUAL PUPIL MOBILITY - MULTILATERAL PROJECT - COMENIUS NETWORK - ACCOMPANYING MEASURES <input type="checkbox"/> ERASMUS - NEW INTER-INSTITUTIONAL AGREEMENTS RELATING TO STUDENT AND/OR STAFF MOBILITY - INTENSIVE PROGRAMMES - STUDENT PLACEMENTS - NETWORKS - MULTILATERAL PROJECTS - ACCOMPANYING MEASURES <input type="checkbox"/> LEONARDO DA VINCI - MOBILITY PROJECT - PARTNERSHIP PROJECT - TRANSFER OF INNOVATION PROJECT - DEVELOPMENT OF INNOVATION PROJECT - THEMATIC NETWORK - ACCOMPANYING MEASURES <input type="checkbox"/> GRUNDTVIG - LEARNING PARTNERSHIP - SENIOR VOLUNTEERING PROJECT - MULTILATERAL COOPERATION PROJECT - NETWORK - ACCOMPANYING MEASURES
Type of visit:	<input type="checkbox"/> Preparatory visit to future partner organisation <input type="checkbox"/> Participation in contact seminar

European eligibility criteria	YES	NO
1. The grant application has been submitted by the applicant organisation in compliance with the submission procedures in the		

2012 LLP Guide and respecting the closing date(s) set out by the National Agency.		
2. The grant application has been submitted using the correct 2012 application form.		
3. The grant application is completed in full.		
4. The grant application has been drawn up in one of the official languages of the EU/in the national language of the applicant in case of grant applications submitted to National Agencies in EFTA/EEA and candidate countries.		
5. The grant application includes a grant expressed in Euro.		
6. The applicant and the host organisation(s) are located in countries participating in the Lifelong Learning Programme. (Institutions located in Cyprus, Germany, Ireland and the United Kingdom are not eligible for a Preparatory Visit grant for the preparation of a Comenius Individual Pupil Mobility grant application, as these countries are not participating in the Comenius Individual Pupil Mobility action)		
7. The visit destination(s) is/are located in one/maximum two countries.		
8. In the case of participation in a contact seminar, the contact seminar is organised by a LLP NA.		
9. The grant application has been signed and stamped (only if applicable), in original, by the person legally authorised to sign on behalf of the applicant organisation.		
10. The applicant organisation is a legal body.		
11. The applicant organisation has not submitted another grant application for the activity intended to be prepared during the preparatory visit.		
National eligibility criteria		
Only one application per institution for the same contact seminar will be accepted. If an institution submits more than one application for the same contact seminar deadline, the NA will go back to the applicants and let them choose which application should be put forward. *Applicable to Comenius/Leonardo da Vinci/Grundtvig		
Only two grants for Preparatory Visits per institution within Comenius, Grundtvig and Leonardo da Vinci Programmes are possible within the same programme year. If an institution applies for a third grant for Preparatory Visits within any of the		

above mentioned Programmes, it will be considered ineligible.		
---	--	--

The application is eligible: Yes ☐
 No ☐

IF THE APPLICATION IS NOT ELIGIBLE ON THE BASIS OF ONE OR SEVERAL OF THE CRITERIA ABOVE, PLEASE GIVE DETAILS IF NECESSARY:

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

5.2. Pripremni posjeti - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete



Name of evaluator: _____

<p style="text-align: center;">PREPARATORY VISITS COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM 2012</p>

Reference N°/Submission ID:

Name of the applicant institution/organisation:	
--	--

<p>Note on the points system: The ratings of the award criteria result in a total number of points out of a maximum of 100. National Agencies may add 15 points for national award criteria.</p>

<p>Each main criterion is given a total maximum number of points.</p>

<p>Please note that grant applications scoring less than 60 points in the quality assessment should not be selected for funding.</p>
--

Section E of the grant application: Visit content

Question in the grant application		Points	Max.
D.1 and the draft agenda	1. Content and duration		50
	1.1. The future cooperation idea to be developed during the preparatory visit/contact seminar is presented clearly. Reference is made to the type of the future project/partnership/network/individual pupil mobility, its theme, main aims and possible partner countries.		
	1.2. There is a clear planning of the activities to be developed during the preparatory visit. N.B.: Not applicable for contact seminars		
	1.3. The social and work activities programmed in the agenda of the visit are balanced. N.B.: Not applicable for contact seminars		
	1.4. The duration of the visit is sufficient to accomplish the proposed activities. N.B.: Not applicable for contact seminars		
C.1, C.1.4, C.3.1, C.3.1.2, D.1, E.1, F.1, G.1, H.	2. Relevance		50
	2.1. There is a clear link between the specificity of the applicant's home organisation (type of organisation, activities and strategy), the proposed partnership/project/network/individual pupil mobility and the purpose and content of the preparatory visit/contact seminar.		
	2.2. The activities proposed are realistic, reasonable and may contribute to draft the future project/partnership given the time frame of the visit. N.B.: Not applicable for contact seminars		
	2.3. The qualifications and the professional background of the participant are relevant for drafting the proposed project/partnership/network/individual pupil mobility.		

	2.4. In case of two staff persons from the same organisation, the role and responsibilities of the second person are relevant for drafting the proposed project/partnership/network/individual pupil mobility.		
	2.5. In case of two destinations, the explanation provided by the applicant organisation is clear and relevant for drafting the proposed project/partnership/network/individual pupil mobility.		
	2.6. The grant requested is realistic and coherent with the activity planned.		
	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT		100

National award criteria for 2012

	<i>NAs to insert the national criteria here. (for example, priority may be given to applicant organisations without any experience in projects/partnerships/networks).</i>		10
	The applicant institution without any previous participation in Grundtvig/Comenius/Leonardo da Vinci under the Lifelong Learning Programme. <i>*Applicable to Grundtvig/ComeniusLeonardo da Vinci PV.</i>		15
	Applications from polytechnics and colleges <i>*Only applicable to Erasmus PV.</i>		15

OVERALL COMMENTS:

Please be as specific and clear as possible, avoid personal judgment and use 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).

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

6.1. Studijski posjeti - lista kriterija za provjeru formalne prihvatljivosti

GfNA-II-B-SV-eligibility check – Version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

TRANSVERSAL PROGRAMME – KEY ACTIVITY 1
STUDY VISITS FOR EDUCATION AND VET SPECIALISTS
COMMON EUROPEAN ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST
2012 – 2013

--

Applicant's reference N°

Name of the applicant:	
-------------------------------	--

The application has been submitted by the applicant by the published deadline (both in electronic and printed format).	
---	--

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 person who has 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

6.2. Studijski posjeti - lista kriterija za provjeru kvalitete prijave

GfNA-II-B-SV-quality assessment-version November 2011



Name of evaluator: _____

TRANSVERSAL PROGRAMME – KEY ACTIVITY 1
STUDY VISITS FOR EDUCATION AND VET SPECIALISTS
COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM
2012-2013

Applicant's reference N°

Name of the applicant:	Family name:
	First name:

Note on the points system: The ratings of the application against the quality criteria result in a total number of points out of a maximum of **100**. National Agencies may add **15** points for national criteria.

Each main criterion is given a total maximum number of points.

Please note that applications scoring less than 60 points (out of 100; points for national priorities are not included) in the quality assessment should not be selected for funding.

Section in Application form		Points	Max.
	Content and relevance		40
5	The applicant has the necessary language competence to be able to benefit from the chosen Visit.		
9	The chosen Visits are relevant for the applicant's professional activity.		
11	The motivation for participation in the Visits is presented clearly and is reasonable.		
	Expected impact.		60
10	The likely multiplier capacity of the applicant and/or his/her institution is clear and well defined.		
12	It is clearly described how the applicant intends to incorporate the results of the Visit in his/her professional activities.		
12	It is clearly demonstrated that the applicant will benefit from the experience which the Visit will provide in terms of personal and professional development.		
13	It is clearly demonstrated that the applicant's home organisation (if any) and his/her learners there will benefit from the added insights / knowledge / competences obtained by the person carrying out the		
13	The applicant has a realistic and concrete plan how to disseminate the results of the Visit upon return.		

	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT		100
	For visits addressed to high level and policy and decision makers	Y	N
2;10	The applicant is in a position to take decisions in this area and initiate change in education and vocational training in their countries (at national, regional and local level) and is works on a regular basis in areas corresponding to the themes of the visits.		

National priorities for 2012

	<i>NAs to insert the national criteria and priorities here.</i>		15
	The applicant institution hasn't been awarded grant for Study Visit yet.		15

OVERALL COMMENTS:

Please be as specific and clear as possible, ensure that your comments are consistent with the marks given, and use polite language. In the case of less good quality applications, please explain points which you feel could be improved.

Your comments may be sent as feedback to unsuccessful applicants.

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 person who has 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 learning¹³

(Excerpt)

CHAPTER V

The transversal programme

Article 32

Objectives of the transversal programme

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

- (a) to promote European cooperation in fields covering two or more sectoral sub-programmes;
- (b) to promote the quality and transparency of Member States' education and training systems.

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

- (a) to support policy development and cooperation at European level in lifelong learning, notably in the context of the Lisbon process and Education and Training 2010 Work Programme, as well as the Bologna and Copenhagen

processes and their successors;

- (b) to ensure an adequate supply of comparable data, statistics and analyses to underpin lifelong learning policy development, as well as to monitor progress towards objectives and targets in lifelong learning, and to identify areas for particular attention;

- (c) to promote language learning and to support linguistic diversity in the Member States;

- (d) to support the development of innovative ICT-based content, services, pedagogies and practice for lifelong learning;

- (e) to ensure that the results of the Lifelong Learning Programme are appropriately recognised, demonstrated and implemented on a wide scale.

Article 33

Actions of the transversal programme

1. The following actions may be supported under the key activity of policy cooperation and innovation in lifelong learning, as referred to in Article 3(2)(a):

- (a) individual mobility, as referred to in Article 5(1)(a), including study visits for experts and officials designated by national, regional and local authorities, for directors of education and training establishments and guidance and experience accreditation services, and for social partners;

¹³ in L 327/46 Official Journal of the European Union of 24.11.2006