

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="B"/>
2. is presented in clear and acceptable language.	<input type="text" value="B"/>
Comments (optional): <input type="text"/>	

1. The proposed project coordinator...

a. has professional expertise and experience in the relevant priority area.	B
b. has knowledge of Council of Europe and other European developments in the field.	B
c. has experience in international cooperation.	D
d. is involved in relevant networks.	NO
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.	A
Comments (optional): <div></div>	Summary rating: <div>C</div>

2. Evaluation of the proposed project

RELEVANCE: The proposed project ...

a. makes valuable contributions to the field of language education.	C
b. addresses one or more national priorities in language education as outlined in the Call for proposals.	C
Comments (optional): <div>The proposal is submitted under "Foreign language learning and teaching in spotlight" but its exact focus is slightly unclear - CLIL, course development, language requirements, adequate training material and best practices are mentioned.</div>	Summary rating: <div>C</div>

ADDED VALUE: The proposed project ...

c. builds on relevant resources, including those of the Council of Europe.	B
d. bridges theory and practice.	C
e. proposes innovative, user-friendly outputs for specific target groups.	C
f. offers outputs adaptable to different contexts.	C
Comments (optional): <div>The proposal suggests that the need for foreign language training is on the rise in the field but that there is a lack of materials. Yet, the project would not fulfill this need, suggesting a survey of learning outcomes and CEFR linked requirements instead. The supposed need for such outputs is not sufficiently elaborated on.</div>	Summary rating: <div>C</div>

PROJECT DESIGN: The proposed project ...

g. is feasible.	<input type="text" value="B"/>
h. has clearly stated objectives and target groups.	<input type="text" value="C"/>
i. has a clear starting point.	<input type="text" value="B"/>
j. has clearly defined project phases which make effective use of the possible formats of project activities funded by the ECML.	<input type="text" value="B"/>
k. the envisaged length of the project is reasonable and justified.	<input type="text" value="C"/>
Comments (optional): <div>If the goal is to produce language requirements linked to the CEFR for health professionals, how are training materials, course design etc. addressed, as is suggested in B3? Health professionals education is such a broad field that it should be clearly narrowed down (beyond B1). The project could be planned for 3 years by condensing the first years.</div>	Summary rating: <input type="text" value="B"/>

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: The proposed project ...

l. has feasible ideas for how to engage the target audience.	<input type="text" value="B"/>
m. has a realistic plan for mobilising national and international networks, associations and other relevant parties.	<input type="text" value="C"/>
Comments (optional): <div>Given the broadness of the field and the need to narrow it for the project, the plan to target specific areas could use some additional detail in the proposal.</div>	Summary rating: <input type="text" value="B"/>

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Relevance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Added value |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Project design |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Stakeholder engagement |

Comments:

Adapting the CEFR to specific fields is a helpful process for targeted language learning/assessment. However, the proposal is not fleshed out enough. For one, is there a need for CEFR-linked descriptors in this field across member states? If the problem seen is the lack of FL teaching materials, it might be more reasonable to begin there. In any case, the field should first be narrowed to make it manageable within an ECML project. Clarify the aim - is it to produce materials, guide course development or formulate language requirements.

☐ **D**

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

Comments: