Inspiring innovation
in language education

Evaluation group rating sheet

Stage of rating: Pair rating

Priority area: Organising language education

Rating sheet completed by: Pair 3

Proposal submitted by: Sona Hakobyan

Project title:

Curricula Development 4 Intercural Education

Proposed project length: ☐ 2 years ● 3 years ☐ 4 years

This project clearly lends itself to an ECML, rather than a national/local project. Yes ● No ☐

In case of 'No' please justify:

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.	B
2.	is presented in clear and acceptable language.	D

Comments (optional):

The proposal hasn't been proofread properly and is full of errors - four different (wrong) spellings of "intercultural"

1. The proposed project coordinator…

a. has professional expertise and experience in the relevant priority area.	D
b. has knowledge of Council of Europe and other European developments in the field.	C
c. has experience in international cooperation.	C
d. is involved in relevant networks.	D
e. has experience in project management.	D
f. indicates C1 in either English or French and at least B2 in other working language of the project.	C
Comments (optional): English and French are the project languages but only English skills are listed in A1.3.	**Summary rating:** C

2. Evaluation of the proposed project

RELEVANCE: The proposed project …

a. makes valuable contributions to the field of language education.	D
b. addresses one or more national priorities in language education as outlined in the Call for proposals.	C
Comments (optional): The project addresses the priority area 'Organising language education' and focuses on curriculum reform. However, it is unclear what the intended framework and guidelines would specifically entail. The proposal does not meaningfully return to the competences of student teachers mentioned in the introduction.	**Summary rating:** D

ADDED VALUE: The proposed project …

c. builds on relevant resources, including those of the Council of Europe.	D
d. bridges theory and practice.	C
e. proposes innovative, user-friendly outputs for specific target groups.	C
f. offers outputs adaptable to different contexts.	NO
Comments (optional): It is unclear how the proposal adds to the existing Council of Europe guide for developing and implementing curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education, instead of potentially duplicating it.	**Summary rating:** C

PROJECT DESIGN: The proposed project …

g. is feasible.	NO
h. has clearly stated objectives and target groups.	C
i. has a clear starting point.	C
j. has clearly defined project phases which make effective use of the possible formats of project activities funded by the ECML.	C
k. the envisaged length of the project is reasonable and justified.	NO
Comments (optional): The proposal lacks links to specific educational levels or systems and this makes it difficult to judge its feasibility and design. Documents on the need to include intercultural communicative competence in curriculum design might be better targeted at decision makers, not teachers.	**Summary rating:** C

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: The proposed project …

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

3. **Conclusion**

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

   ☐ **A**

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

Comments:

Recommended changes (if applicable):

☐ **A/B**

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

Comments:

Recommended changes (if applicable):

☐ **B**

This project proposal has many good features and meets most of the evaluation criteria.

Comments:

Recommended changes (if applicable):

☐ **C**

This project proposal has good features, but in a number of respects it does not meet the evaluation criteria and it would need substantial revision for example, in one or more of the following areas (please tick):

☐ Key quality aspects of the proposal

☐ Relevance

☐ Added value

☐ Project design

☐ Stakeholder engagement

Comments:

● **D**

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

Comments:

The project wishes to develop the intercultural competences of student teachers as well as to integrate such elements in the curriculum of formal FL education. However, the proposal is not detailed enough to see how it would move beyond what has already been covered by previous projects, at which levels it would wish to impact curriculum design, etc.. With the current level of detail, it is difficult to recommend it for further development as a potential project. The project activities are limited in scope, being targeted only to experts and project partners over the three years.