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:

TSINAKOS Avgoustos

Project title:

Augmented Reality Education Platform for an autonomous teaching/learning

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 main aim of the project is to present a platform already developed in Greece to an international audience.

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.	B
2.	is presented in clear and acceptable language.	C

Comments (optional):

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.	C
d. is involved in relevant networks.	D
e. has experience in project management.	B
f. indicates C1 in either English or French and at least B2 in other working language of the project.	C
Comments (optional):	**Summary rating:** 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.	B
Comments (optional):	**Summary rating:** 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.	D
f. offers outputs adaptable to different contexts.	D
Comments (optional):	**Summary rating:** D

PROJECT DESIGN: The proposed project …

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

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT: The proposed project …

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

☐ 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:

The main aim of the project is to present a platform already developed in Greece to an international audience. It is not specific to language learning. The coordinator does not possess relative experience to coordinate an ECML project.