

# Evaluation group rating sheet

Stage of rating:	Pair rating	
Priority area: O	rganising lang	guage education
Rating sheet completed by		Pair 2
Proposal submitted by:		Poseiko, Solvita
Project title:		Language acquisition by design
Proposed project length:		2 years 3 years • 4 years
This project clearly lends itse In case of 'No' please justify		, rather than a national/local project. Yes • No

Please rate on a scale of A to D:

(A – strongly agree, B – agree, C – disagree, D – strongly disagree, NR – not relevant for project assessment, NO – no opinion due to lack of information in the submission form)

#### 0 The proposed project meets key quality indicators. It...

1.	is complete.	В
2.	is presented in clear and acceptable language.	С
Com	ments (optional):	





## 1. The proposed project coordinator...

B
В
В
С
D
В

## 2. Evaluation of the proposed project

## RELEVANCE: The proposed project ...

<b>a.</b> makes valuable contributions to the field of language education.	С
<b>b.</b> addresses one or more national priorities in language education as outlined in the Call for proposals.	NO
Comments (optional):	Summary rating:

## ADDED VALUE: The proposed project ...

The project is primarily dealing with Latvian	
Comments (optional):	Summary rating:
f. offers outputs adaptable to different contexts.	D
e. proposes innovative, user-friendly outputs for specific target groups.	С
d. bridges theory and practice.	В
<b>c.</b> builds on relevant resources, including those of the Council of Europe.	В

## PROJECT DESIGN: The proposed project ...

g. is feasible.	С
h. has clearly stated objectives and target groups.	С
i. has a clear starting point.	С
<b>j.</b> has clearly defined project phases which make effective use of the possible formats of project activities funded by the ECML.	В
<b>k.</b> the envisaged length of the project is reasonable and justified.	С
Comments (optional):	Summary rating:

#### STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: The proposed project ...

I. has feasible ideas for how to engage the target audience.	D
<b>m.</b> has a realistic plan for mobilising national and international networks, associations and other relevant parties.	D
Comments (optional):	Summary rating:

#### 3. Conclusion


Summary of the evaluation (please cross A, B, C or D):

# Α

This project proposal is of high quality and fully meets the evaluation criteria.

## Comments:

Recommended changes (if applicable):





#### Comments:

The project is primarily about Latvian. It has not been made clear how the output of this project may have an added value for other languages

## D

The project does not correspond sufficiently to the evaluation criteria and/ or does not lend itself to an ECML project.

#### Comments: