

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): What do occupation-relevant holistic competences mean, what are they composed of: competences that are relevant in interpersonal life, both professionally and non-professionally; didactic methodological competence; social, methodological and human skills ...		

1. The proposed project coordinator...

a. has professional expertise and experience in the relevant priority area.	A
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.	C
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): Limited network involvement, without declared experience in project management, no indication of important ECML projects (CECRT, EPOSTL) ...	Summary rating: C

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): The proposal is not dealing with language teaching competencies, but with social, personal competencies that are definitely important for a teacher, but are not on the ECML agenda, therefore the project proposal is not that relevant	Summary rating: C

ADDED VALUE: The proposed project ...

c. builds on relevant resources, including those of the Council of Europe.	C
d. bridges theory and practice.	C
e. proposes innovative, user-friendly outputs for specific target groups.	C
f. offers outputs adaptable to different contexts.	B
Comments (optional): <div></div>	Summary rating: C

PROJECT DESIGN: The proposed project ...

g. is feasible.	D <input type="text"/>
h. has clearly stated objectives and target groups.	B <input type="text"/>
i. has a clear starting point.	B <input type="text"/>
j. has clearly defined project phases which make effective use of the possible formats of project activities funded by the ECML.	B <input type="text"/>
k. the envisaged length of the project is reasonable and justified.	B <input type="text"/>
Comments (optional): <div>There's a certain enthusiasm behind the proposal, but also some naivete concerning the idea of changing interpersonal competencies of teachers by a teaching module. There's a nice and well prepared video explaining the aims of the project and project design. Interviewing companies about the soft skills?</div>	Summary rating: <div>B <input type="text"/></div>

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: The proposed project ...

l. has feasible ideas for how to engage the target audience.	B <input type="text"/>
m. has a realistic plan for mobilising national and international networks, associations and other relevant parties.	B <input type="text"/>
Comments (optional): <div></div>	Summary rating: <div>B <input type="text"/></div>

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

Comments:

There's a certain enthusiasm behind the proposal and the idea to address future teachers and the tertiary education sector is valuable. It's a bit unusual to define "soft skills" as "holistic competencies". The coordinator is lacking experience in project management, the objectives are not always realistic. It's not clear which companies the coordinator has in mind and how they should be involved.

☐ **D**

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

Comments: