

Evaluation group rating sheet

Stage of rating:

Priority area:

Rating sheet completed by:

Proposal submitted by:

Project title:

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.	<input type="text" value="A"/>
2. is presented in clear and acceptable language.	<input type="text" value="B"/>
Comments (optional): <input type="text" value="Some proofreading and correction of English needed."/>	

1. The proposed project coordinator...

a. has professional expertise and experience in the relevant priority area.	A <input type="text"/>
b. has knowledge of Council of Europe and other European developments in the field.	C <input type="text"/>
c. has experience in international cooperation.	C <input type="text"/>
d. is involved in relevant networks.	D <input type="text"/>
e. has experience in project management.	C <input type="text"/>
f. indicates C1 in either English or French and at least B2 in other working language of the project.	A <input type="text"/>
Comments (optional): <div>The application doesn't show much knowledge of ECML or Council of Europe work and doesn't mention any networks. The project experience given is only on a national level.</div>	Summary rating: C <input type="text"/>

2. Evaluation of the proposed project

RELEVANCE: The proposed project ...

a. makes valuable contributions to the field of language education.	C <input type="text"/>
b. addresses one or more national priorities in language education as outlined in the Call for proposals.	B <input type="text"/>
Comments (optional): <div>Some good ideas for linking CLIL and digital media, but very general - it's difficult to see specifically what the project would provide.</div>	Summary rating: B <input type="text"/>

ADDED VALUE: The proposed project ...

c. builds on relevant resources, including those of the Council of Europe.	C <input type="text"/>
d. bridges theory and practice.	B <input type="text"/>
e. proposes innovative, user-friendly outputs for specific target groups.	C <input type="text"/>
f. offers outputs adaptable to different contexts.	D <input type="text"/>
Comments (optional): <div>The description of the outputs - a Guide for Teachers and a Guide for Learners - is too sketchy to give any idea of what exactly is proposed.</div>	Summary rating: C <input type="text"/>

PROJECT DESIGN: The proposed project ...

g. is feasible.	C <input type="text"/>
h. has clearly stated objectives and target groups.	C <input type="text"/>
i. has a clear starting point.	C <input type="text"/>
j. has clearly defined project phases which make effective use of the possible formats of project activities funded by the ECML.	D <input type="text"/>
k. the envisaged length of the project is reasonable and justified.	C <input type="text"/>
Comments (optional): <div>See comments on added value - the proposal is very general and vague. There is some confusion about the length of the project - marked as lasting for 2 years, the activities are actually planned for three.</div>	Summary rating: C <input type="text"/>

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: The proposed project ...

l. has feasible ideas for how to engage the target audience.	C <input type="text"/>
m. has a realistic plan for mobilising national and international networks, associations and other relevant parties.	C <input type="text"/>
Comments (optional): <div>No thought out plans - "I'm positive we'll have more ideas when the project starts"</div>	Summary rating: C <input type="text"/>

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):

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Key quality aspects of the proposal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Relevance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Added value |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Project design |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Stakeholder engagement |

Comments:

There are some interesting and generous ideas in the proposal, but, at least in the application, it has not been thought through sufficiently to provide a feasible ECML project. The proposal frequently circles back to the Polish educational situation (B3, B6, C4), suggesting project design that might be too much focused on just one country.

☐ **D**

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

Comments: