

# Evaluation group rating sheet

Stage of rating:

Common rating

Priority area:

Bi-/plurilingual education for a new decade

Rating sheet completed by:

Pair 3

Proposal submitted by:

Wikström Nermina

Project title:

Language of the heart

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.	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.	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.	A
f. indicates C1 in either English or French and at least B2 in other working language of the project.	NO
<b>Comments (optional):</b> <div>The proposal is not clear on proposed second language. This should be specified.</div>	<b>Summary rating:</b> A

## 2. Evaluation of the proposed project

### RELEVANCE: The proposed project ...

a. makes valuable contributions to the field of language education.	B
b. addresses one or more national priorities in language education as outlined in the Call for proposals.	A
<b>Comments (optional):</b> <div>The promotion of minority languages addresses national priorities in a number of areas, although the proposal could benefit from additional detail on what exactly is planned.</div>	<b>Summary rating:</b> B

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

c. builds on relevant resources, including those of the Council of Europe.	A
d. bridges theory and practice.	B
e. proposes innovative, user-friendly outputs for specific target groups.	C
f. offers outputs adaptable to different contexts.	C
<b>Comments (optional):</b> <div>The outputs are not described in any detail so difficult to judge - policy documents as planned in year one already exist. The goal in B3 (collecting and disseminating the examples of promising practices) seems slightly modest for an ECML project that could more directly develop the chosen area, not simply collect existing data.</div>	<b>Summary rating:</b> C

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

<b>g.</b> is feasible.	B <input type="text"/>
<b>h.</b> has clearly stated objectives and target groups.	C <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.	C <input type="text"/>
<b>k.</b> the envisaged length of the project is reasonable and justified.	B <input type="text"/>
<b>Comments (optional):</b> <div>The examples of promising practices and the description of models would be useful - more details needed of how this would be achieved and how the output would be implemented. The length of the project could be better assessed if more detail would be given in C3.</div>	<b>Summary rating:</b> <div>B <input type="text"/></div>

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

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

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Added value                         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Project design                      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Stakeholder engagement              |

Comments:

The area is an interesting one, though it is not clear whether it reproduces existing collection of practices, but the outputs and the working approach are only described in outline and would use further detailing to be developed into a project.

☐ **D**

The project does not correspond sufficiently to the evaluation criteria and/ or does not lend itself to an ECML project.

Comments: