

# 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...**

<b>1.</b> is complete.	<input type="text" value="D"/>
<b>2.</b> is presented in clear and acceptable language.	<input type="text" value="B"/>
<b>Comments (optional):</b> The second language of the project proposal is missing, there are no data on the coordinator's personal profile.	

## 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.	D
c. has experience in international cooperation.	B
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.	D
<b>Comments (optional):</b> Apart from English, she doesn't mention any other language competence, not even Greek.	<b>Summary rating:</b> D

## 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.	D
<b>Comments (optional):</b> Migrant education is a very relevant topic, but the project proposal is unfortunately very vague and confused and it doesn't suggest any new solution.	<b>Summary rating:</b> D

### ADDED VALUE: The proposed project ...

c. builds on relevant resources, including those of the Council of Europe.	D
d. bridges theory and practice.	D
e. proposes innovative, user-friendly outputs for specific target groups.	NO
f. offers outputs adaptable to different contexts.	NO
<b>Comments (optional):</b> <div></div>	<b>Summary rating:</b> D

**PROJECT DESIGN: The proposed project ...**

<b>g.</b> is feasible.	NR
<b>h.</b> has clearly stated objectives and target groups.	D
<b>i.</b> has a clear starting point.	C
<b>j.</b> has clearly defined project phases which make effective use of the possible formats of project activities funded by the ECML.	D
<b>k.</b> the envisaged length of the project is reasonable and justified.	D
<b>Comments (optional):</b> The candidate doesn't have any idea of the ECML work and functioning.	<b>Summary rating:</b> D

**STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: The proposed project ...**

<b>l.</b> has feasible ideas for how to engage the target audience.	NO
<b>m.</b> has a realistic plan for mobilising national and international networks, associations and other relevant parties.	NO
<b>Comments (optional):</b>	<b>Summary rating:</b> NO

**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 type="checkbox"/> | Added value                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Project design                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 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 proposal is neither clear nor coherent, probably due to the coordinator's lack of experience in the project work and in the ECML work and functioning. She is not familiar with the CoE documents either. She seems even not to be a language professional (more in intercultural education), but she is well aware of the Greece society needs concerning the integration of