

# Evaluation group rating sheet

Stage of rating:

Common rating

Priority area:

Language professionals as agents of change

Rating sheet completed by:

Pair 2

Proposal submitted by:

Polzin-Haumann, Claudia

Project title:

Enhancing language education in border-crossing professional and vocational education

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
<b>Comments (optional):</b> <div></div>		

## 1. The proposed project coordinator...

a. has professional expertise and experience in the relevant priority area.	<input type="text" value="A"/>
b. has knowledge of Council of Europe and other European developments in the field.	<input type="text" value="A"/>
c. has experience in international cooperation.	<input type="text" value="A"/>
d. is involved in relevant networks.	<input type="text" value="A"/>
e. has experience in project management.	<input type="text" value="A"/>
f. indicates C1 in either English or French and at least B2 in other working language of the project.	<input type="text" value="A"/>
<b>Comments (optional):</b> <div>Very well qualified and networked. Good experience of the field.</div>	<b>Summary rating:</b> <input type="text" value="A"/>

## 2. Evaluation of the proposed project

### RELEVANCE: The proposed project ...

a. makes valuable contributions to the field of language education.	<input type="text" value="B"/>
b. addresses one or more national priorities in language education as outlined in the Call for proposals.	<input type="text" value="A"/>
<b>Comments (optional):</b> <div>a. The proposal states that 'specific concepts for language learning and teaching in these contexts are still lacking'. It does not make it absolutely clear what these concepts are. (See final comments)</div>	<b>Summary rating:</b> <input type="text" value="B"/>

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

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

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

<b>g.</b> is feasible.	A <input type="text"/>
<b>h.</b> has clearly stated objectives and target groups.	B <input type="text"/>
<b>i.</b> has a clear starting point.	A <input type="text"/>
<b>j.</b> has clearly defined project phases which make effective use of the possible formats of project activities funded by the ECML.	A <input type="text"/>
<b>k.</b> the envisaged length of the project is reasonable and justified.	A <input type="text"/>
<b>Comments (optional):</b> <div>Very well structured and thought through. Clearly knows how the ECML works.</div>	<b>Summary rating:</b> <div>A <input type="text"/></div>

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

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

All criteria are met. What is not absolutely clear is: a) what are the specific concepts for language learning in border contexts which are 'still lacking'. Is it only 'attitudes', bi-lingual teaching approaches? b) why it is the case that 'the concept of competencies needed for successful communication according to CERF (Companion) and FREPA has to be adapted to border settings.'

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):

- ☐ 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: