



Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

GUIDE FOR EXPERTS ON QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF E+ ACTIONS

PART II

KA2 – CAPACITY BUILDING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

(V.1/2019)

Contents

ANNEX 1.A. CRITERIA TO ASSESS AN APPLICATION SUBMITTED UNDER THE ERASMUS+ CAPACITY BUILDING IN HIGHER EDUCATION ACTION 3	
ANNEX 1.B. DESCRIPTION OF THE SPECIFIC SELECTION PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY FOR THE ERASMUS+ CAPACITY BUILDING IN HIGHER EDUCATION (CBHE) ACTION	4
ANNEX 2. DECLARATION OF ABSENCE OF CONFLICT OF INTERESTS AND OF CONFIDENTIALITY (FOR INFORMATION, THE DECLARATION WILL FORM AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE CONTRACT).	11
ANNEX 3. REFERENCE DOCUMENTS ON POLICY PRIORITIES	13
ANNEX 4.A INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT FORM.....	14
ANNEX 4.B CONSOLIDATED QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM	20

ANNEX 1.A. CRITERIA TO ASSESS AN APPLICATION SUBMITTED UNDER THE ERASMUS+ CAPACITY BUILDING IN HIGHER EDUCATION ACTION

Criteria used to assess an application submitted under Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education (CBHE) action are described in the Programme Guide/call for proposals:

Eligibility Criteria:

Please refer to the Erasmus + Programme Guide / Call for proposals EAC/A03/2018 (Eligibility Criteria, pages 165-167) for the detailed criteria.

Award Criteria:

Please refer to the Erasmus + Programme Guide / Call for proposals EAC/A03/2018 (Award Criteria, pages 168-170) for the detailed criteria and elements of analysis.

See: http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/sites/erasmusplus2/files/erasmus-plus-programme-guide-2019_en.pdf

In relation with the Award criterion "Relevance of the project", experts will have to confirm whether the application specifically addresses the National or Regional priorities defined for each Partner Country/Region, with particular attention to the multi-country projects.

See: Regional Priorities and National Priorities, under section "GUIDELINES" following the link:

https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/funding/capacity-building-higher-education-2019_en

ANNEX 1.B. DESCRIPTION OF THE SPECIFIC SELECTION PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY FOR THE ERASMUS+ CAPACITY BUILDING IN HIGHER EDUCATION (CBHE) ACTION

ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE

The evaluation process for CBHE proposals consists of the following main steps:

- Appointment of the Evaluation Committee members by the EACEA Head of Department E+
- Selection of the panel of external experts (including a reserve list)
- Briefing of experts (onsite and on-line)
- Verification of applications concerning the eligibility, exclusion and selection criteria
- Remote assessment of applications by external experts against the award criteria:
 - Individual experts' assessments
 - Consolidation of assessments (including quality review)
- Final expert panel meeting in Brussels for finalising the consolidation, ranking of applications by region in order of merit; debriefing of Evaluation Committee members on the experts' panel selection results and concluding remarks
- Consultation of the EU Delegations on the feasibility of the proposals in the Partner countries and their recognition by the competent national authorities
- Regional Sub-Evaluation Committee meetings and Final Evaluation Committee meeting to establish the list of applications proposed for funding
- Feedback to Applicants by individual notification letters and publication of selection results on the Agency's website

1. Appointment of Evaluation Committee members

The Evaluation Committee is nominated by the Head of Department and composed of staff members from EACEA.A4, the mirror Unit in DG EAC, DG DEVCO, DG NEAR, EEAS and the ACP Secretariat. Substitutes are also nominated in case that one or more members become unable to participate or discover a conflict of interest. The Chairperson is the Head of Unit of EACEA.A4.

All members of the Evaluation Committee, the chairperson and staff performing checks of the eligibility and exclusion criteria sign a declaration on the absence of conflict of interest and confidentiality. The declarations are annexed to the Evaluation Report.

2. Selection of external experts

Unit A4 establishes a first list of experts on the basis of the Agency's EMI tool. The criteria for the selection of experts include a need analysis (based on the estimated number of expected proposals) and qualitative criteria such as the academic background, expertise in Higher Education fields and partner countries, experience in the evaluation of proposals, nationality and gender balance and a 'rotation rule' for experts.

Experts are then contacted for checking their availability, informing them at the same time on their conditions of work, including the timing of the selection process and the indicative list of the quality standards upon which their work will be deemed acceptable.

In the next step, among those experts which have confirmed their availability, the Agency will compose the final list of experts (including a reserve list) that is proposed to the Evaluation Committee members.

Once all Evaluation Committee members have validated the list of selected experts, it is presented for approval to the Authorising Officer Responsible (AOR, i.e. the EACEA Head of Department) together with the commitment file ('fiche recapitulative').

After the decision of the AOR experts are informed about their participation in the selection exercise and an expert contract is signed between each external expert and the Agency. All experts selected will sign a declaration on the absence of conflict of interest and on confidentiality.

3. Verification of eligibility, exclusion and selection criteria

Eligibility criteria

Under the supervision of the Evaluation Committee, staff of EACEA.A4 checks the compliance of the applications with the eligibility criteria indicated in the Erasmus+ Programme Guide of the Call and incorporated in the eForm. Although the eForm is configured so as to ensure that most of the eligibility criteria are checked automatically, the verification of the status, profile and type of participating organisations is done by Agency staff, in consultation (wherever applicable) with the competent authorities locally (e.g. the EU Delegations, the National Agencies, the National Erasmus+ Offices, National accreditation bodies, etc.). This concerns mainly the official recognition of higher education institutions in their respective countries.

Exclusion criteria

As concerns the exclusion criteria, the Declaration of Honour, which must be signed by the legal representative of the applicant organisation, is considered as part of the application and the validity of its signature is verified. Any information received during or after the selection process that may contradict the statements provided in the Declaration of Honour will be analysed by the Evaluation Committee and can lead to the rejection of the proposal or the termination of the grant agreement if the latter has already been signed.

Selection criteria

Through the selection criteria, the Evaluation Committee verifies if applicants have sufficient and stable technical and financial capacities in order to implement the project. The task will be completed by the Evaluation Committee before or after the evaluation of the award criteria. Public bodies are not subject to verification of their financial capacity.

Detailed information concerning the verification of the eligibility, exclusion and selection criteria is contained in the Part C of the [Programme Guide](#), page 261).

4. Verification of award criteria – the assessment process

4.1 Briefing of experts

Completely new experts (who have never assessed proposals for the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education action) are invited to Brussels for a two days onsite briefing, including a guided practical exercise to ensure that all experts reach the same understanding of the award criteria, the scoring system and the assessment mechanism. An online briefing is organised subsequently for those experts who benefitted already from an onsite briefing for the Capacity Building in Higher Education action.

4.2 Assessment of applications

Following the briefing exercise, experts will work in remote. Each application will be assessed independently by two different external experts who shall afterwards agree on a common position ('consensus') for each of the 4 award criteria. For the cases where a consensus could not be reached, or in the event of a substantial discrepancy in scoring¹/commentaries between the two individual experts, a third expert will be nominated for the same proposal.

¹ Obligatory for all cases in which there is a difference of 30 points and more between the experts' assessments.

After the assessment in remote experts will be invited to finalise the consolidated assessments (in particular the difficult cases) at the premises of the Agency. Some experts with a longstanding experience in assessing European cooperation proposals are appointed as "lead-experts" to assist the Evaluation Committee in their work.

The assessment of proposals by experts will be based on a two-phase procedure:

- Individual assessments

Two separate assessments per proposal carried out by experts working independently of one another to provide a commentary and a score against each of the published four award criteria.

- Consensus

Discussion between the two experts involved, which will result in a consolidated score and a single agreed commentary on each of the four award criteria.

Time schedule of experts' activities:

Phase / dates	Activity-tasks	Persons involved	Place
18-19.2.2019	Onsite briefing of new experts	New Experts; Lead-experts; Agency staff; Evaluation Committee members	Onsite - Agency Brussels
20.2.2019	On-line briefing of experienced experts	Experts who had an onsite briefing in 2016-2017-2018; Agency staff; Evaluation Committee members	Webinar
25.2-17.3.2019	Individual assessments Monitoring of individual assessments	All experts; Lead-experts; Agency staff/Evaluation Committee members	In remote
18-29.3.2019	Consensus bilateral discussions Drafting consolidated assessments, 3 rd assessment (wherever the case)	All experts; Lead-experts; Agency staff/ Evaluation Committee members	In remote
4-5.4.2019 9-10.4.2019 8-10.4.2019	Finalisation of consolidated assessments and signatures Ranking list by region Debriefing of Evaluation Committee members & concluding discussions	All Experts; Lead-experts; Agency staff; Evaluation Committee members	Onsite - Agency Brussels

4.2.1 Individual assessment phase

- Each expert completes the proposal's assessment using a MS Word version of the assessment form and finalises it in the on-line assessment tool (OEET);

The nature and characteristics of the commentaries expected from the external experts will be specified during the experts' briefing.

Experts will be asked to undertake their assessments according to the application 'reference number'. They start assessing from the lowest number to the highest one, so that discrepancies between their assessments can be identified as early as possible.

- ii. A quality check is done by the lead-expert nominated by the Evaluation Committee for the Region concerned on:

- Coherence between comments and the scoring
- Appropriateness, clarity and completeness of comments
- Comments expressed in clear, neutral and respectful language
- Providing both strong and weak points in their comments

If a problem is identified, corrections are introduced by the expert and resubmitted to the lead-expert for a final quality check.

- iii. After validation by the lead-experts, experts upload the individual assessments on-line and submit it. At the same time, the Word version of the individual assessment is sent to the Evaluation Committee (for monitoring purposes).

4.2.2 Consolidation phase

Once both individual assessments have been finalised and submitted electronically, the Agency puts the experts online in contact to consolidate their views on the application and to produce an agreed score and commentary for each of the four award criteria.

Consolidations take place partly in remote (preparation and drafting) and for difficult cases onsite at the premises of the Agency (finalisation and submission of consolidated assessments).

Each expert is nominated as "Expert 1" or "Expert 2" for a given application. "Expert 1" (the consolidator) is in charge of drawing up the draft consolidated assessment in terms of scores and commentaries, based on the two already completed individual assessments².

- The Evaluation Committee and the lead-experts verify if there is a significant discrepancy between the two expert assessments or if the consensus between two experts on the same application is difficult or cannot be reached.

(a) No significant discrepancy between individual assessments

The experts are requested to perform the following operations:

- Expert 1 prepares a *draft consolidation report* with consolidated scores and commentaries for each award criteria. He then sends the draft consolidation report by e-mail to Expert 2. After receiving the draft consolidation report, Expert 2 sends back his/her commentaries to Expert 1. The consolidator and Expert 2 liaise to arrive at a consensus on the commentaries and scores for the consolidated assessment.
- The lead-expert will carry out the quality check ensuring that the scores awarded are compatible and consistent with the commentaries and that these are clear and constructive. In case one of the elements is not satisfactory, the lead-expert may ask for a re-drafting of the consolidated report.

After the lead expert's final quality check, the consolidator encodes the consolidated assessment in the OEET and waits for the notification of the Evaluation Committee member in charge of the Region concerned:

- If the Evaluation Committee member agrees to the consolidation report it will be submitted by the consolidator in OEET and the consolidator will launch the approval by

² In specific cases the Evaluation Committee may decide to allocate the consolidation to the Expert 2 (e.g. for reasons of the content of the proposal, workload of Expert 1, etc.)

the second expert via the "APPROVAL tab" in OEET and afterwards proceed to the final submission in the tool.

- If the Evaluation Committee member considers that a further discussion on the assessment of the proposal is required during the final panel meeting with experts in Brussels, the consolidator introduces the consolidated assessment in the OEET but will postpone the submission in OETT after this discussion.

(b) Significant discrepancy between assessments or consensus cannot be reached

- In this case a third assessment will be organised. The consolidation will take place between the two experts with the closest scores. However, the two consolidating experts will have access to the individual assessment of the other expert and are expected to take into account any relevant observations from him in their final consolidated comments and scores.
- Consolidation follows the same rules as explained in (a).

4.3 Quality assurance

- A mechanism to ensure comparability between experts' scoring will be used. The deviations of experts' scores against the average scores will be captured during the assessment exercise: (i) at the briefing stage when assessing the mock application; (ii) when a significant number of individual assessments have been submitted. Experts who systematically deviate from the average score will be monitored more closely.
- The evaluation reports are checked by the lead-experts and the Evaluation Committee members ensure that the outputs of assessments reach the desired level of quality.

5. Final expert panel: Consolidation, ranking of proposals, debriefing and concluding remarks in the presence of the Evaluation Committee members

In the presence and under the supervision of the Evaluation Committee members, the consolidated assessments will be discussed, completed and submitted on-line by the experts present at the final meeting in Brussels. The discussions of the experts will be organised by regions as follows:

04-05 April 2019

Regions 2 – Eastern Partnership
Region 4 – Russian Federation
Region 7 – Central Asia
Region 8 – Latin America
Region 10 – South Africa
Region 11 – ACP Countries

9-10 April 2019

Region 1 – Western Balkans

8-9-10 April 2019

Region 3 – South Med. Countries
Region 6 – Asia
Region 9 – Middle East

Based on the expert's assessments, the proposals will be *ranked by region* in order of merit according to the final scores obtained and endorsed by the experts.

The lead-experts for the different Regions will collect the outstanding issues concerning the projects' contents, scoring and the assessment exercise as a whole. This includes recommendations (e.g. working methodology, workload, timing, tools etc.) to be presented to the Evaluation Committee.

6. Consultation procedure

In accordance with the Programme Guide (pages 168-169) proposals will be assessed in a two-step procedure:

In Step 1 of the selection procedure, proposals will be assessed on the award criteria: (1) Relevance of the project, (2) Quality of the project design and implementation, (3) Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements and (4) Impact and sustainability.

In Step 2 of the selection procedure, proposals will be assessed against one more criterion, the 'Feasibility of the project in the targeted region(s)'.

In accordance with the Programme Guide, (page 169) "*Following Step 1 of the assessment, proposals meeting the above quality requirements will be ranked in descending order of their total scores. In order to proceed to Step 2, a list of applications per region of two times the estimated number of funded projects (based on the available regional budget) will be established.*"

While respecting the principles of confidentiality, equal treatment and absence of conflict interest, the EU Delegation may consult local stakeholders (e.g. National Authorities, National Erasmus+ Offices) in order to prepare their opinion.

7. Final panel of Evaluation Committee

Considering the development objectives of the action in favour of the eligible Partner Countries (see section "Eligible countries" in Part A of the Erasmus+ Programme Guide), at the end of the evaluation procedure the Evaluation Committee proposes to the Agency's Authorising Officer in charge of taking the grant award decision the final list of proposals to be granted an EU funding considering:

- the ranking list, by regions, resulting from the assessment against the four award criteria *and* the feedback from the consultation process;
- the budget available for each of the regions covered by the call, as defined in the financial instruments of the EU external action - see the list published on the Agency's website for CBHE Call, under Guidelines (https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/funding/capacity-building-higher-education-2019_en);
- the need to achieve a sufficient geographical representation within a region in terms of the number of projects per partner country, within the limits of the available budget and provided that quality is guaranteed. This implies that, within a given region, each country concerned benefits from a fair/minimal share of the regional envelope;
- For multi country proposals preference is given to proposals focusing on subject areas insufficiently covered by past or existing projects.

The CBHE action allows inter and cross-regional (i.e. projects involving more than one region) cooperation. This implies that when a cross-regional application is selected (because of its high merits for one of the regions covered by the partnership), all institutions participating in the project have to be funded as well and the grant has to be provided by the different regional envelopes reflecting the partnership composition.

The combination of two or more of the above-mentioned factors explains why, in the frame of the available budget for each region, a proposal may not be recommended for funding even though it is placed high on the ranking list for the Region concerned.

A maximum of three proposals per applicant organisation will be recommended for funding, in accordance with the Programme Guide (page 164).

The Agency's Authorising Officer takes the award decision based on the Evaluation Committee's recommendation.

8. Feedback to applicants including editing of final comments

All applicants are informed in writing about the selection results once the award decision is signed. The notification letters will include an individual evaluation report for each application.

9. Publication of results

The publication of the projects recommended for an EU funding will be published on the Agency's website after all applicants have been informed in writing.

**ANNEX 2. DECLARATION OF ABSENCE OF CONFLICT OF INTERESTS AND OF CONFIDENTIALITY
(FOR INFORMATION, THE DECLARATION WILL FORM AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE CONTRACT).**



Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

Reference: Call for proposal 2019 – EAC/A03/2018

I. Conflict of interests

I, the undersigned, having been appointed as an expert for the abovementioned call, declare that I am aware of Article 61 of the Financial Regulation, which states that:

"1. Financial actors within the meaning of Chapter 4 of this Title and other persons, including national authorities at any level, involved in budget implementation under direct, indirect and shared management, including acts preparatory thereto, audit or control, shall not take any action which may bring their own interests into conflict with those of the Union. They shall also take appropriate measures to prevent a conflict of interests from arising in the functions under their responsibility and to address situations which may objectively be perceived as a conflict of interests.

2. Where there is a risk of a conflict of interests involving a member of staff of a national authority, the person in question shall refer the matter to his or her hierarchical superior. Where such a risk exists for staff covered by the Staff Regulations, the person in question shall refer the matter to the relevant authorising officer by delegation. The relevant hierarchical superior or the authorising officer by delegation shall confirm in writing whether a conflict of interests is found to exist. Where a conflict of interests is found to exist, the appointing authority or the relevant national authority shall ensure that the person in question ceases all activity in the matter. The relevant authorising officer by delegation or the relevant national authority shall ensure that any further appropriate action is taken in accordance with the applicable law.

3. For the purposes of paragraph 1, a conflict of interests exists where the impartial and objective exercise of the functions of a financial actor or other person, as referred to in paragraph 1, is compromised for reasons involving family, emotional life, political or national affinity, economic interest or any other direct or indirect personal interest"

I hereby declare that I do not fall under any of the following circumstances in which a conflict of interests might exist. I confirm that, if I discover before or during the evaluation that a conflict of interests exists, I will declare it immediately to the Agency.

1/Disqualifying conflict of interests:

- Involvement in the preparation of the proposal;
- Direct benefit in case of acceptance of the proposal;
- Close family relationship with any person representing a participating organisation in the proposal;
- Director, trustee or partner of a participating organisation;
- Current employment by a participating organisation;
- Current involvement in a contract or collaboration with a participating organisation;
- Any other situation that compromises my ability to evaluate the proposal impartially.

2/Potential conflict of interests:

- Employment by one of the participating organisation within the previous three years;
- Involvement in a contract or collaboration with a participating organisation within the previous three years;
- Any other situation that could cast doubt on my ability to evaluate the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of a third party (*Ex. Past or current personal relationships, nationality, political affinity, etc.*).

I hereby declare that I fall under one or more of the above circumstances (please specify which and explain)*:

**Ex. In case of employment by a structure including different departments or institutes, please specify the degree of autonomy between them.*

I hereby declare on my honour that the disclosed information is true and complete to the best of my knowledge.³

II. Confidentiality and personal data protection

I also confirm that I will keep all matters entrusted to me confidential and will process the personal data I receive only for the purposes of the performance of the present evaluation. If unnecessary or excessive personal data are contained in the documents submitted by the applicant, I will not process them further or take them into account for the evaluation of the proposal. I will not communicate outside the panel any confidential information that is revealed to me or that I have discovered. I will not make any adverse use of information given to me.

Signed: Date/Place: .../.../2019;

Name (in capitals):

³ In case of false, incomplete or incorrect statements or failure to provide information in an attempt to obtain the contract or any benefit resulting therefrom, or where this was the effect of the action, this constitutes a breach of the contract between the Agency and the expert. The Agency may decide to terminate the contract and to recover any sums paid to the Contractor (cf. Article 17 of the Terms and Conditions).

ANNEX 3. REFERENCE DOCUMENTS ON POLICY PRIORITIES

Transversal policy priorities for education, training and youth

- **Education and Training 2020 in EUROPE 2020**

- Europe 2020 targets:
https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/economic-and-fiscal-policy-coordination/eu-economic-governance-monitoring-prevention-correction/european-semester/framework/europe-2020-strategy_en
- Education and Training 2020 (ET2020):
http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/index_en.htm
- "Council conclusions on the role of education and training in the implementation of the 'Europe 2020' strategy":
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:070:0001:0003:EN:PDF>
- "Council conclusions of 26 November 2012 on education and training in Europe 2020 — the contribution of education and training to economic recovery, growth and jobs":
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2012:393:0005:0007:EN:PDF>
- "Council Conclusions on investing in education and training — a response to Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes and the 2013 Annual Growth Survey":
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/135467.pdf
- Joint Council/Commission report on education and training 2020:
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52012XG0308%2801%29>
- Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes:
http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/rethinking_en.htm
- "Council Conclusions on the professional development of teachers and school leaders"
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:302:0006:0009:EN:PDF>
- "Council conclusions on effective leadership in education":
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/139715.pdf
- "Programming of the European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI) – 2014-2020"
- "Regional South Multiannual Indicative Programme (2018-2020)"

https://cdn1-eeas.fpfis.tech.ec.europa.eu/cdn/farfuture/3nz4yHliYzibriBarTGN0LcuETICXsrACE0qFOMsr28/mtime:1548864396/sites/eeas/files/regional-south_c_2018_6362_annex_en.pdf

ANNEX 4.A INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT FORM

**ERASMUS+ PROGRAMME
Capacity-building in Higher Education
Joint and Structural Projects**

Selection 2019 – EAC/A03/2018

Individual Assessment Form

EXPERT'S NAME:

DATE: **VERSION NUMBER:**

PROPOSAL INFORMATION:

Activity Type: ☐ CBHE-JP ☐ CBHE-SP

Applicant organisation:

Proposal Number:

Proposal Title:

☐ I hereby confirm that I am not in a position of conflict of interest with regard to this proposal.

Date:

Please identify from the options below any area of concern you have about the compliance of the proposal with the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education action.

In all cases (even in case you have chosen "no") please continue with the detailed assessment:

Is the proposal within the framework of the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education Programme action?

Yes: ☐ **No:** ☐

(Please provide an explanation for your concern.)

Individual Assessment

Each section of the assessment form corresponds to an award criterion. For each section please give a score based on your assessment of how well the proposal addresses the criterion, and provide comments justifying the score for the award criterion.

The scoring system:

The maximum scoring for each award criterion is indicated on the right. The maximum total points that a proposal can obtain is 100

Please note: Proposals which do not receive 60 points in total will not be considered for funding

Please note: Proposals that score less than 50% under the award criterion 'Relevance of the proposal' will not be considered for funding.

The table below shows the ranges of scores for the quality standards depending on the maximum score of the award criterion.

Maximum number of points by criterion	Range of scores			
	Very good	Good	Fair	Weak
30 (Award criteria 1&2)	26-30	21-25	15-20	0-14
20 (Award criteria 3&4)	17-20	14-16	10-13	0-9

Assessment Grid

Summary of the Evaluation report

Strong points:

Weak points:

Award criteria	Maximum Score
1. Relevance of the project	/30 Min. threshold 15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal and the results foreseen are in line with the objectives of the Capacity-Building action in the target country/ies; ▪ The proposal clearly addresses the thematic national or regional priorities set by the programme for its target country/ies or region(s); ▪ The proposal explains why the planned activities and expected results meet the needs of the target groups in the best way; ▪ The proposal inscribes itself in the modernisation, development and inter-nationalisation strategy of the targeted higher education institutions and is in line with the development strategies for higher education in the eligible Partner Countries, including a greater attention to inclusion, diversity and socio-economically disadvantaged participants where relevant; ▪ The objectives of the proposal are clear, realistic and appropriate, based on a genuine and adequate needs analysis; ▪ The proposal is innovative and /or complementary to other initiatives or projects already carried out under the present or past actions; ▪ The proposal demonstrates that similar results could not be achieved through national, regional or local funding. <p><i>Please comment on each of the above bullet points</i></p>	
2. Quality of the project design and implementation	/30
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The activities proposed over the lifetime of the project are of high quality, pertinent and appropriate to achieve the objectives and foreseen results; ▪ The proposed methodology is innovative, feasible and appropriate to achieve the foreseen results; ▪ The proposal is cost-effective and allocates appropriate resources to each activity; ▪ The overall project design ensures consistency between project objectives, methodology, activities and budget proposed; ▪ The work plan is clear and realistic, with well-defined activities, realistic time-lines, clear deliverables and milestones. It demonstrates a logical and sound planning capacity and includes appropriate phases for preparation, implementation, evaluation, follow-up and dissemination of results; ▪ Challenges/risks of the proposal are clearly identified and mitigating actions properly addressed. Quality control measures, including indicators and benchmarks, are in place to ensure that the project implementation is of high quality, completed in time and on budget. Reliable sources are given for verification of indicators to measure the outcomes of the action. <p><i>Please comment on each of the above bullet points</i></p>	

3. Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements	/20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal involves a strong and complementary partnership of higher education institutions ▪ The project team has the necessary skills, experience, expertise and management support to successfully deliver all aspects of the proposal ▪ Where relevant, the proposal also includes the most appropriate and diverse range of non-academic partners, in order to benefit from their different experiences, profiles and specific expertise ▪ The distribution of responsibilities and tasks is clear, appropriate, and demonstrates the commitment and active contribution of all participating organisations in relation to their specific expertise and capacity; ▪ An effective mechanism is proposed to ensure good coordination, decision making and communication between the participating organisations, participants and any other relevant stakeholder ▪ The participating organisations from eligible Partner Countries are satisfactorily involved in the implementation of the action and decision making (including measures for any conflict resolution); ▪ The proposal involves higher education institutions that have not benefited from support for Capacity Building in the past. 	
<i>Please comment on each of the above bullet points</i>	
4. Impact and sustainability	/20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal is likely to have a substantial impact on the capacities of participating organisations (notably higher education institutions) in the eligible Partner Countries, in particular on the development and modernisation of higher education, to assist them in opening themselves up to society at large, the labour market and the wider world and to support their capacity for international cooperation; ▪ The proposal will produce multiplier effects outside the participating organisations at local/regional/national or international level. Measures will be put in place to assess the effective impact achieved by the project ▪ The dissemination plan during and beyond the project lifetime is clear and efficient, with appropriate resources identified in each of the participating organisations, to ensure high quality dissemination of project experiences and outputs to relevant stakeholders ▪ The proposal will ensure a real sustainability of the proposed activities and outputs after the project lifetime, in particular through attracting co-funding or other forms of support. It will also ensure the mainstreaming and effective use/implementation of the project results. 	
<i>Please comment on each of the above bullet points</i>	
Maximum total score	/100

Review of the National / Regional / Cross-regional Priorities addressed by the application:

Please note: Proposals not respecting the national and/or regional will not be considered for funding.

https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/funding/capacity-building-higher-education-2019_en

Yes: ☐ **No:** ☐

Yes: ☐ **Partially:** ☐ **No:** ☐

3. Cross-Cutting priority "refugees"

Yes: ☐ **No:** ☐

4. Involvement of people with fewer opportunities:

Yes: ☐ **No:** ☐

Please detail here your comments on the proposed budget related to Award criteria 2.

--

General comments for the Executive Agency *(to be also reported in the section comments in the assessment tool):*

Please write here any confidential remarks you may have on the proposal.

If you note any similarities (in terms of overall and specific objectives, activities, target groups and consortium compositions) amongst the projects you are assessing, please comment here.

--

ANNEX 4.B CONSOLIDATED QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

ERASMUS+ PROGRAMME
Capacity Building in Higher Education
Joint and Structural Projects
Selection 2019 – EAC/A03/2018
Consolidated Assessment Form

EXPERTS' NAMES:

EXPERT 1

EXPERT 2

EXPERT 3

.....

DATE: **VERSION NUMBER:**

PROPOSAL INFORMATION:

Activity Type: ☐ CBHE-JP ☐ CBHE-SP

Applicant organisation:

Proposal Number:

Proposal Title:

Both of the experts involved in consolidation should sign below:

Signature Expert 1: Date:

Signature Expert 2: Date:

Signature Expert 3: Date:

☐ I hereby confirm that I am not in a position of conflict of interest with regard to this proposal.

Date:

Please identify from the options below any area of concern you have about the compliance of the project proposal with the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education Programme action.

In all cases (even in case you have chosen "no") please continue with the detailed assessment:

Is the proposal within the framework of the Erasmus+ Capacity-building in Higher Education Programme action?

Yes: ☐ **No:** ☐

(Please provide an explanation for your concern.)

Consolidated Assessment

Each section of the assessment form corresponds to an award criterion. For each section please give a score based on your assessment of how well the proposal addresses the criterion, and provide comments justifying the score for the section.

The scoring system:

The maximum scoring for each award criterion is indicated on the right. The maximum total points that a proposal can obtain is 100

Please note: **Proposals which do not receive 60 points in total will not be considered for funding**

Please note: **Proposals that score less than 50% under the award criterion 'Relevance of the proposal' will not be considered for funding.**

The table below shows the ranges of scores for the quality standards depending on the maximum score of the award criterion.

Maximum number of points by criterion	Range of scores			
	Very good	Good	Fair	Weak
30 (Award criteria 1&2)	26-30	21-25	15-20	0-14
20 (Award criteria 3&4)	17-20	14-16	10-13	0-9

Assessment Grid

Summary of the Evaluation report

Strong points:

Weak points:

Award criteria	Maximum Score
1. Relevance of the project	/30 Min. threshold 15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal and the results foreseen are in line with the objectives of the Capacity-Building action in the target country/ies; ▪ The proposal clearly addresses the thematic national or regional priorities set by the programme for its target country/ies or region(s); ▪ The proposal explains why the planned activities and expected results meet the needs of the target groups in the best way; ▪ The proposal inscribes itself in the modernisation, development and inter-nationalisation strategy of the targeted higher education institutions and is in line with the development strategies for higher education in the eligible Partner Countries, including a greater attention to inclusion, diversity and socio-economically disadvantaged participants where relevant; ▪ The objectives of the proposal are clear, realistic and appropriate, based on a genuine and adequate needs analysis; ▪ The proposal is innovative and /or complementary to other initiatives or projects already carried out under the present or past actions; ▪ The proposal demonstrates that similar results could not be achieved through national, regional or local funding. 	
<p><i>Please comment on each of the above bullet points</i></p>	
2. Quality of the project design and implementation	/30
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The activities proposed over the lifetime of the project are of high quality, pertinent and appropriate to achieve the objectives and foreseen results; ▪ The proposed methodology is innovative, feasible and appropriate to achieve the foreseen results; ▪ The proposal is cost-effective and allocates appropriate resources to each activity; ▪ The overall project design ensures consistency between project objectives, methodology, activities and budget proposed; ▪ The work plan is clear and realistic, with well-defined activities, realistic time-lines, clear deliverables and milestones. It demonstrates a logical and sound planning capacity and includes appropriate phases for preparation, implementation, evaluation, follow-up and dissemination of results; ▪ Challenges/risks of the proposal are clearly identified and mitigating actions properly addressed. Quality control measures, including indicators and benchmarks, are in place to ensure that the project implementation is of high quality, completed in time and on budget. Reliable sources are given for verification of indicators to measure the outcomes of the action. 	
<p><i>Please comment on each of the above bullet points</i></p>	

3. Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements	/20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal involves a strong and complementary partnership of higher education institutions ▪ The project team has the necessary skills, experience, expertise and management support to successfully deliver all aspects of the proposal ▪ Where relevant, the proposal also includes the most appropriate and diverse range of non-academic partners, in order to benefit from their different experiences, profiles and specific expertise ▪ The distribution of responsibilities and tasks is clear, appropriate, and demonstrates the commitment and active contribution of all participating organisations in relation to their specific expertise and capacity; ▪ An effective mechanism is proposed to ensure good coordination, decision making and communication between the participating organisations, participants and any other relevant stakeholder ▪ The participating organisations from eligible Partner Countries are satisfactorily involved in the implementation of the action and decision making (including measures for any conflict resolution); ▪ The proposal involves higher education institutions that have not benefited from support for Capacity Building in the past. 	
<i>Please comment on each of the above bullet points</i>	
4. Impact and sustainability	/20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal is likely to have a substantial impact on the capacities of participating organisations (notably higher education institutions) in the eligible Partner Countries, in particular on the development and modernisation of higher education, to assist them in opening themselves up to society at large, the labour market and the wider world and to support their capacity for international cooperation; ▪ The proposal will produce multiplier effects outside the participating organisations at local/regional/national or international level. Measures will be put in place to assess the effective impact achieved by the project ▪ The dissemination plan during and beyond the project lifetime is clear and efficient, with appropriate resources identified in each of the participating organisations, to ensure high quality dissemination of project experiences and outputs to relevant stakeholders ▪ The proposal will ensure a real sustainability of the proposed activities and outputs after the project lifetime, in particular through attracting co-funding or other forms of support. It will also ensure the mainstreaming and effective use/implementation of the project results. 	
<i>Please comment on each of the above bullet points</i>	
Maximum total score	/100

Section "Typology":

Review of the National / Regional / Cross-regional Priorities addressed by the application:

Depending on the Partner Countries involved in the proposal, national, regional or cross cutting priorities may be defined for both categories of projects (Joint Projects and Structural Projects). Should this be the case, projects will have to demonstrate how and to which extent they address these priorities.

Please note: Proposals not respecting the national and/or regional will not be considered for funding.

1. Please confirm that the priorities ticked in Section C3 of the eForm and the project activities comply with the regional or national requirements, i.e., as defined in the Excel tables "Regional Priorities and National Priorities" published on the Call for proposals website:

https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/funding/capacity-building-higher-education-2019_en

Yes: ☐ **No:** ☐

2. Please confirm whether, to your understanding, the project rationale specifically addresses the selected priorities:

Yes: ☐ **Partially:** ☐ **No:** ☐

In case of "No" or "Partially", please make sure that a relevant comment is included in the text box related to the Award criterion 1 "Relevance of the project".

3. Cross-Cutting priority "refugees"

Does the project address the integration in Higher Education of refugees from conflict affected countries?

Yes: ☐ **No:** ☐

In all cases, you should provide a full assessment of the whole proposal:

4. Involvement of people with fewer opportunities:

Does the project involve people with fewer opportunities?

Yes: ☐ **No:** ☐

Comments for the Executive Agency on the budget (to be also reported in the section *Comments in the assessment tool*):

Please detail here your comments on the proposed budget related to Award criteria 2.

--

General comments for the Executive Agency *(to be also reported in the section comments in the assessment tool):*

Please write here any confidential remarks you may have on the proposal.

If you note any similarities (in terms of overall and specific objectives, activities, target groups and consortium compositions) amongst the projects you are assessing, please comment here.

--