

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.	A
2. is presented in clear and acceptable language.	A
Comments (optional): Carefully and exhaustively prepared proposal.	

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.	A
c. has experience in international cooperation.	A
d. is involved in relevant networks.	A
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): 	Summary rating: A

2. Evaluation of the proposed project

RELEVANCE: The proposed project ...

a. makes valuable contributions to the field of language education.	A
b. addresses one or more national priorities in language education as outlined in the Call for proposals.	A
Comments (optional): If the proposal is accepted, it should really focus on learning pathways, not predominantly on evaluation and assessment. 	Summary rating: A

ADDED VALUE: The proposed project ...

c. builds on relevant resources, including those of the Council of Europe.	A
d. bridges theory and practice.	A
e. proposes innovative, user-friendly outputs for specific target groups.	B
f. offers outputs adaptable to different contexts.	B
Comments (optional): Outputs are not very clearly defined. Quality criteria design: there's no piloting plan in the project proposal. The learning pathways part is not sufficiently present in all project phases. If accepted, the project should take into consideration the Framework of Reference for Early Second Language Acquisition and the Guide for curricula for PIE on the CoE website.	Summary rating: B

PROJECT DESIGN: The proposed project ...

g. is feasible.	B
h. has clearly stated objectives and target groups.	A
i. has a clear starting point.	A
j. has clearly defined project phases which make effective use of the possible formats of project activities funded by the ECML.	A
k. the envisaged length of the project is reasonable and justified.	A
Comments (optional): It's a very ambitious project. 	Summary rating: A

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: The proposed project ...

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

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:

The project addresses several national priorities and provides a plan for upgrading the existing ECML tools and resources. Important: be sure that the project focuses predominantly on learning pathways and not on assessing and evaluating only. The project should take into consideration the CoE Framework of Reference for Early Second Language Acquisition and the Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for pluril. and intercul. education on the CoE website NB: if there are other early language learning projects, the one selected should be the most in line with the national priorities of ECML member state

Recommended changes (if applicable):

Integrate piloting of assessment criteria.

☐ **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: