

Evaluation group rating sheet

Stage of rating:

Common rating

Priority area:

Organising language education

Rating sheet completed by:

Pair 2

Proposal submitted by:

Prodanovic, M. Marijana

Project title:

Standardising the ESP and EAP Teaching/Learning Process

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:

The project is solely concerned with the teaching of English. The coordinator has not familiarised herself with the call documentation and the parameters of the ECML.

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. | C |
| 2. | is presented in clear and acceptable language. | A |
| Comments (optional): <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div> | | |

1. The proposed project coordinator...

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

2. Evaluation of the proposed project

RELEVANCE: The proposed project ...

| | |
|---|--|
| a. makes valuable contributions to the field of language education. | D <input type="text"/> |
| b. addresses one or more national priorities in language education as outlined in the Call for proposals. | D <input type="text"/> |
| Comments (optional): <input type="text"/> | Summary rating: <input type="text"/> |

ADDED VALUE: The proposed project ...

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

PROJECT DESIGN: The proposed project ...

| | |
|---|--|
| g. is feasible. | <input type="text" value="D"/> |
| h. has clearly stated objectives and target groups. | <input type="text" value="NR"/> |
| i. has a clear starting point. | <input type="text" value="D"/> |
| 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="D"/> |
| k. the envisaged length of the project is reasonable and justified. | <input type="text" value="NR"/> |
| Comments (optional): <input type="text"/> | Summary rating: <input type="text" value="D"/> |

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: The proposed project ...

| | |
|---|--|
| l. has feasible ideas for how to engage the target audience. | <input type="text" value="NO"/> |
| m. has a realistic plan for mobilising national and international networks, associations and other relevant parties. | <input type="text" value="D"/> |
| Comments (optional): <input type="text"/> | Summary rating: <input type="text" value="D"/> |

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 solely concerned with the teaching of English. There is no indication of innovative approaches. The coordinator has not familiarised herself with the call documentation and the parameters of the ECML.