2015 ERASMUS+ Guide for Experts on Quality Assessment

Actions managed by National Agencies

Version 1: 24/02/2015

Erasmus+

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

A large part of the Erasmus+ Programme is implemented under the indirect management mode. This means that National Agencies in the Programme Countries are in charge of the selection of projects to be funded at decentralised level and of accreditation of organisations/consortia in certain decentralised actions. National Agencies assess proposals[1] with the assistance of independent experts to ensure that only those of the highest quality are selected for funding and that only organisations/consortia fulfilling specified criteria obtain an accreditation. Thus, the final decision on the selection or rejection of applications and on the granting of accreditations is taken by the National Agencies.

This Guide for Experts is a tool for experts when assessing applications submitted under the Erasmus+ Programme[2]. It provides instructions and guidance in order to ensure a standardised and high quality assessment of applications for the Programme actions managed by the National Agencies.

The Guide for Experts provides information on:

- the role and appointment of experts;
- the principles of the assessment;
- the assessment process in practice;
- information on how to assess the award criteria for each action and field.

2. Experts

2.1 Role of experts

The assessment and selection of grant applications is organised on the basis of a peer review system following a transparent process that guarantees impartiality and equal treatment of all applicants.

The role of experts is very important to provide a fair, impartial, consistent and accurate assessment of project applications according to the objectives of the action and the policy priorities for the concerned action and field of education, training or youth.

The assessment is an essential part in the selection procedure. Based on the experts' assessment, a list of grant applications per action and per field ranked in quality order is established, which serves as a basis for the National Agency to take the grant award decision, following the proposal of the Evaluation Committee.

The assessment of applications for accreditation results in the decision of awarding or refusing the accreditation.
Based on the experts' comments, the National Agency shall provide feedback to the applicants on the quality of their application in order to ensure transparency and help

[1] Please note that the terms "proposal" and "application" are used interchangeably in this Guide.

[2] The Erasmus+ Programme was established by the Regulation (EU) No 1288/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing 'Erasmus+': the Union programme for education, training, youth and sport and repealing Decisions No 1719/2006/EC, No 1720/2006/EC and No 1298/2008/EC/

non-selected applicants to improve the quality of their possible future applications (cf. section 4).

2.2 Appointment of experts, code of conduct and conflict of interest

Experts are appointed on the basis of their skills and knowledge in the areas and the specific field(s) of education, training and youth in which they are asked to assess applications.

To ensure their independence, the names of the experts are not made public.
Experts are required to perform the assessment to the highest professional standards and within the deadline agreed with the National Agency.

Through the appointment by the National Agency experts are bound to a code of conduct as set out in the appointment letter or contract with the expert.
All information related to the assessment process is strictly confidential. Therefore, experts are not allowed to disclose any information about the applications submitted and results of the assessment and selection to the public.[3]

Depending on the action and the level of grant requested, the assessment of applications will be undertaken by minimum one or two experts, which can be either internal or external to the National Agency. Experts can also be appointed from another Erasmus+ Programme country than the one of the National Agency.

Experts must not have a conflict of interest[4] in relation to the proposals on which they are requested to give their opinion. To this end, they sign a declaration provided by the National Agency that no such conflict of interest exists and that they undertake to inform the National Agency of both the existence and its nature should such conflict arise (cf. template in Annex I to this Guide). The same declaration binds experts to confidentiality.

Persons involved in an application in the selection round for the action under assessment are considered as having a conflict of interest for that selection round and will not be appointed experts.

When a potential conflict of interest is reported by the expert or brought to the attention of the National Agency by any means, the National Agency will consider the circumstances and decide either to exclude the expert from the assessment of the given application or the whole selection round or allow the expert to take part in the assessment, depending on the objective elements of information at its disposal.

[3] Please note that any personal data shall be processed in accordance with:
- Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the European Union institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data;
- where applicable, the national legislation on personal data protection of the country where the application has been submitted.

[4] Financial Regulation Art. 57(2): « … a conflict of interests exists where the impartial and objective exercise of the functions of a financial actor or other person, …, is compromised for reasons involving family, emotional life, political or national affinity, economic interest or any other shared interest with a recipient.»

3. Assessment of applications

3.1 Preparation for assessment

Before the start of the assessment, the experts are briefed by the National Agency on the Programme and the action under assessment, as well as on the assessment process and procedures.

Experts are provided with the reference documents for the assessment and get access to the Online Expert Evaluation Tool (OEET), in which they perform the assessment using the standard quality assessment forms.

Before starting the assessment of applications, experts must:

- have a sound knowledge of the Erasmus+ Programme Guide which provides all necessary information to potential applicants on the Programme in general and on the actions for which they can apply for a grant;
- acquire an in-depth knowledge of the action concerned, its objectives, and the policy priorities that apply. For specific guidance on policy priorities, experts are referred also to the documents listed in Annex III to this Guide;
- have an in-depth understanding of the award criteria applicable to the applications under assessment (cf. section 3.3);
- know the content and structure of the application form;
- be familiar with all the reference documents and tools provided by the National Agency.

Experts have to read the whole application carefully before completing the quality assessment form. It is recommended to read several applications before assessing any one of them in full: this allows experts to benchmark answers in different sections of the applications.

Each expert works individually and independently, gives scores and comments for each criterion and summarises his/her assessment in the quality assessment form in the language specified by the National Agency.

For mobility projects between Programme and Partner Countries in the higher education field , the National Agency will provide experts with detailed information regarding the eligibility of mobility flows. Taking into account the Programme Guide, it will brief the experts on whether the National Agency applies secondary criteria for certain budget envelopes and whether the National Agency has decided to make available funds from the Heading 1 budget in order to fund outgoing, short-, first and second cycle students to Partner Higher Education Institutions from DCI countries (non-industrialised Asia, Latin America, South Africa).

3.2 Assessment forms

Experts carry out their assessment using the Online Expert Evaluation Tool (OEET). The applications to be assessed as well as the quality assessment forms are accessible through OEET. Experts are provided with technical instructions for the use of OEET by the National Agency as part of their briefing.

The standard quality assessment forms are established by the European Commission and used in all Programme Countries in order to ensure a coherent assessment of applications across Programme Countries. Experts examine the issues to be considered under each award criterion, enter their scores for each applicable criterion

and provide comments on each criterion and on the application as a whole (cf. section 3.3).

On completion of the assessment, experts validate the individual assessment in the Online Expert Evaluation Tool, thereby confirming that they have no conflict of interest with respect to the assessment of that particular proposal.
As part of the quality assessment, experts may be required to provide information on data included in the applications that are collected for statistical purposes. Experts will have to register this information in OEET.

3.3 Assessment of award criteria and scoring

Experts assess applications only against the award criteria defined in the Programme Guide and in the call for awarding the VET Charter.

Each of the award criteria is defined through several elements which must be taken into account by experts when analysing an application. These elements form an exhaustive list of points to be considered before giving a score for the given criterion.

They are intended to help experts arrive at the final assessment of the criterion in question; however they must **not** be scored separately.

In order to give clear guidance to experts as to how individual elements of analysis should be assessed, further complementary information is provided in Annex II to this Guide.

When assessing applications against award criteria experts make a judgement on the extent to which applications meet the defined criteria. This judgement must be based on the information provided in the application. Experts cannot assume information that is not explicitly provided. Information relevant for a specific award criterion may appear in different parts of the application and experts take all of it into account when scoring the award criterion.

Experts must duly consider the type of project, the scale of the activities and the grant request when analysing the grant applications. As projects may vary widely in terms of their size, complexity, experience and capacity of the participating organisations, whether they are more process or product oriented etc., experts have to integrate the proportionality principle into the assessment of all award criteria, as indicated in the relevant annexes.

An application can receive a maximum of 100 points for all criteria relevant for the action. The table below shows the relative weight of each criterion in the different actions managed by the National Agencies.

Award criteria	Maximum scores of award criteria per Action				
	Key Action 1			Key Action 2	Key Action 3
	Accreditation of higher education mobility consortia	Mobility projects in the field of Higher Education between Programme and Partner Countries	Mobility projects in the fields of school education, vocational education and training, adult education and youth	Strategic Partnerships in the field of Education, Training and Youth	Structured Dialogue: meetings between young people and decision makers in the field of youth
Relevance of the project[5]	30	30	30	30	30
Quality of the project design and implementation[6]	20	30	40	20	40
Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements[7]	20	20	N.A.	20	N.A.
Impact and dissemination	30	20	30	30	30
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100

These maximum scores for award criteria apply as such for all applications submitted under a given action, irrespective of the education, training or youth field as well as of the country in which the application is submitted.

Experts assess the application on the basis of the given award criteria and score each criterion with maxima at 20, 30 or 40 points as set out in the table above. The total number of points out of a maximum of 100 for the application is calculated automatically by the OEET and is the sum of the scores given to each award criterion. Experts cannot use half points or decimals in their individual assessment.

Within the maximum number of points per award criterion, ranges of scores are defined that correspond to a fixed definition of the expected quality standard so that an as coherent approach as possible is implemented, across experts as well as across countries. The standards are as follows:

- Very good – the application addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question convincingly and successfully. The answer provides all the information and evidence needed and there are no concerns or areas of weakness.

[5] Corresponding criterion for higher education mobility consortia: "relevance of the consortium"
[6] Corresponding criterion for higher education mobility consortia: "quality of the consortium activity design and implementation"
[7] Corresponding criterion for higher education mobility consortia: "quality of the consortium composition and the cooperation arrangements"

- Good – the application addresses the criterion well, although some small improvements could be made. The answer gives clear information on all or nearly all of the evidence needed.

- Fair – the application broadly addresses the criterion, but there are some weaknesses. The answer gives some relevant information, but there are several areas where detail is lacking or the information is unclear.

- Weak – the application fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. The answer does not address the question asked, or gives very little relevant information.

The table below shows the ranges of scores for the individual quality standards depending on the maximum score that can be awarded to the relevant award criterion.

Maximum score for a criterion	**Range of scores**			
	Very good	**Good**	**Fair**	**Weak**
40	34-40	28- 33	20- 27	0-19
30	26-30	21-25	15-20	0-14
20	17-20	14-16	10-13	0-9

Experts are expected to give comments on each award criterion and, in their comments, refer explicitly to the elements of analysis under the relevant criterion. The comments on each award criterion have to reflect and justify the score given for it.

At the end of the assessment, experts give overall comments on the application as a whole. In the comments, experts must provide a thorough analysis of the application highlighting its relative strengths and weaknesses and indicating what improvements could be made.

As their comments will be used by National Agencies to provide feedback to applicants, experts must pay particular attention to clarity, consistency and appropriate level of detail and draft their comments in the language requested by the National Agency.

As part of the quality assessment, experts check the grant application for accuracy and consistency. In particular, they analyse the coherence of the grant request in relation to the activities and outputs proposed. In case the application is of sufficient quality to receive a grant but such coherence is missing, experts can suggest a reduction of the grant amount requested, specifying clearly the grant items and the reasons why they are considered incoherent or excessive. However, it is the National Agency that ultimately decides on the grant amount that is awarded to successful applicants. N.B. Experts may not suggest a higher grant than the amount requested by the applicant.

In mobility projects between Programme and Partner Countries in the higher education field, experts will analyse whether all mobility flows are eligible and flag the ineligible ones. They may suggest any reduction in eligible flows if necessary based on the assessment of the applicant's answer to the qualitative questions. Experts may

give a range of advice concerning each requested mobility project for a given Partner Country.

The National Agency monitors the quality of expert assessments and can require the expert to revise the assessment should the necessary quality standard not be met. Experts must assess all applications in full, regardless of the score given to any award criterion.

3.4 Thresholds

In order to be considered for funding under the Erasmus+ Programme, an application submitted to a National Agency has to:

- score at least 60 points in total[8] **and**
- score at least half of the maximum points for each award criterion.

3.5 Assessment of higher education international mobility

For mobility projects between Programme and Partner Countries in the higher education field, the expert shall first assess the eligibility of the mobility flows. In addition to the general criteria (as outlined in the Programme Guide), and only where the National Agency budget envelope is below 60,000 EUR, a National Agency may choose to limit demand by adding one or more of the following s**econdary criteria** listed in the Programme Guide:

a. The degree level (for example limiting applications to one or two cycles only – Bachelor, Master or PhD);

b. Privileging only staff or student mobility;

c. Limiting the duration of mobility periods.

If the application concerns a Partner Country for which the National Agency has set secondary criteria, the experts will first check that the application respects all the secondary criteria published by the National Agency and exclude those mobility flows which fall outside the secondary criteria. The implementation of these secondary criteria must be explained in detail by the National Agency during the expert briefing session.

The expert will also take into account whether the National Agency has decided to make available **funds from Heading 1 budget** in order to fund outgoing, short cycle, first and second cycle students to higher education institutions from DCI Partner Countries (these flows would not be eligible if heading 1 budget is not used).

The expert will undertake a single assessment per Partner Country answering the 4 quality questions relating to all intended mobilities with that particular country. Each application is likely to request mobility support for a number of different Partner Countries. The intended mobility for a given Partner Country may vary in terms of the number of flows requested (students at different study cycles or staff involved in teaching or training; incoming and/or outgoing).

[8] At least 70 points for the VET Mobility Charter and least 70 points in total (per mobility project with a Partner Country) for mobility project between Programme and Partner Countries in the higher education field.

According to the assessment of the quality criteria, the expert may recommend to the National Agency to select only mobilities with certain Partner Countries (e.g. retention of the mobility with Albania but rejection of the mobility involving Australia), or, only some mobility flows within a given Partner Country (e.g. retention of the incoming first cycle students from Albania but rejection of the outgoing staff to Albania).

Example:

University X in Finland envisages mobility with a number of Albanian universities based on previous experience with these partners. These mobilities foresee incoming Albanian student mobility for first and second cycle and outgoing Finnish staff mobility for teaching and training.
The experts may give a range of advice to the Finnish NA such as:

- Recommend retention of all the mobility flows requested.
- Recommend retention of only certain mobility flows (e.g. only incoming student first cycle and outgoing staff teaching and training).
- Recommend reduction of some or all mobility flows (e.g. recommend retention of only X% of incoming student first cycle and only Y% second cycle; etc.)
- Recommend rejection of all the mobility flows.

The rejection of the mobilities with Albania, based on the expert evaluation of the four award criteria, is without prejudice to the mobilities involving other Partner Countries in the same application from University X. The experts may decide that the justifications given by University X for the Albanian mobilities are not convincing, but the justifications provided for mobilities with China, Brazil or South Africa are very good.

3.5 Possible problems with applications

Under all actions, experts are in no case allowed to contact applicants directly. In case of any problems arising during the assessment, experts contact the National Agency. The National Agency decides whether the applicant will be asked to provide additional information or clarifications or if the application should be assessed in the form it was submitted.

Also, if experts notice during the assessment that the same or similar text appears in two or more applications submitted under a given selection round, as well as any other indications of possible double submissions and overlaps, they inform the National Agency about that immediately.

4. General principles of qualitative assessment

4.1 Consolidated assessment and final score

In case an application is assessed by only one expert, that assessment determines the final score and assessment comments.

In case of applications assessed by two experts, the two individual assessments will be consolidated in order to arrive at the final score and comments for the application. The

final score may include decimals. The consolidation is an integral part of the tasks of the expert.

If the difference between the assessments of the two experts is less than 30 points of the total score for the application, one of both experts is requested to prepare a consolidated assessment in terms of scores and comments, based on the two already completed individual assessments and in agreement with the other expert. The consolidation includes giving a final recommendation to the NA on the grant amount to be awarded to the applicant, if the two experts agree that the units that determine the grant should be decreased (see below 4.2). In case the two experts fail to agree on the consolidation, the National Agency will decide on the need for an independent assessment by a third expert.

In case there is a difference of 30 points or more in the assessment results of both experts, the National Agency will always ask a third expert to undertake an additional independent assessment of the application[9]. The final score will then be determined by the two assessments that are closest in terms of their overall score and the most extreme assessment in terms of overall score is not taken into account for the consolidated assessment. Consolidation of the individual assessments follows the same rules as explained above.

The consolidated assessment is considered the final assessment of a given application. It means that in case of applications for a grant, the consolidated assessment forms the basis for ranking the application on the list of eligible grant applications, while in case of applications for accreditation, it determines if the applicant will receive the accreditation or not.

4.2 Proportionality

To ensure that the Erasmus+ Programme fully reaches its objectives, experts shall assess the qualitative level of the planned activities, intended goals, expected impact and results of the project in a proportional way, in relation to the size and profile of the applicant organisations and, if applicable, project partners. Quantity (of activities planned, of priorities met or results produced, etc.) will not be judged in absolute terms but in relation to the capacities and potential of the applicants and partners.

4.3 Quality, cost-efficiency, value for money of the activities

The funding rules of Erasmus+ actions managed by National Agencies are largely based on unit costs (i.e. amounts are calculated per day, per participant, per staff category etc.). Experts may judge that some of the units indicated in an application form are not to be considered, even for projects deserving a high qualitative scoring. They may therefore propose a reduction of these units, which consequently will determine a reduction of the grant awarded by the NA, if the project is selected for funding. This approach applies to all actions of the Programme managed by National Agencies.

[9] This requirement does not apply in case both experts have scored the application under the thresholds for acceptance for the action.

Annex I - Declaration on the prevention of conflicts of interest and disclosure of information

[Erasmus+], [Call for Proposals N° [XXX], [action], [selection round [final submission date]]

I, the undersigned, am informed of

(1) Art.57 of the Financial Regulation following which:

"1. Financial actors and other persons involved in budget implementation and management, including acts preparatory thereto, audit or control shall not take any action which may bring their own interests into conflict with those of the Union.

Where such a risk exists, the person in question shall refrain from such action and shall refer the matter to the [responsible person at the National Agency] who shall confirm in writing whether a conflict of interest exists. Where a conflict of interest is found to exist, the person in question shall cease all activities in the matter. The [responsible person at the National Agency] shall personally take any further appropriate action.

2. For the purposes of paragraph 1, a conflict of interest exists where the impartial and objective exercise of the functions of a financial actor or other person, as referred to in paragraph 1, is compromised for reasons involving family, emotional life, political or national affinity, economic interest or any other shared interest with a recipient."

(2) Art. 32 of the Rules of Application of the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union following which a conflict of interest may, inter alia, take one of the following forms:

"(a) granting oneself or others unjustified direct or indirect advantages;

(b) refusing to grant a beneficiary the rights or advantages to which that beneficiary is entitled;

(c) committing undue of wrongful acts or failing to carry out acts that are mandatory."

I hereby declare[10] to the best of my knowledge that I have no conflict of interest with any of the persons or organisations/institutions having submitted an application in the framework of the above selection round, including with regard to persons or members of consortia or subcontractors or other partners proposed.

I confirm that if I discover the existence of any such potential conflict of interest while exercising my duties in relation to the above selection round, I will immediately notify the [responsible person at the National Agency] thereof and that I will refrain from any further activity in relation to the above selection round if required.

Furthermore, I confirm that I will respect the principle of professional secrecy. I will not communicate to any third party any confidential information that may be disclosed to me intentionally or unintentionally in the context of my work in relation to the above selection round. I will not make any unauthorised use of the information that may be disclosed to me.

Name:

Signature:

Date:

[10] In case of false, incomplete or incorrect statements or failure to provide information in an attempt to obtain the contract or any benefit resulting therefrom, or where this was the effect of the action, this constitutes a breach of the contract between the National Agency and the expert. The National Agency may decide to terminate the contract and to recover any sums paid to the expert under the order.

Annex II – Interpretation of award criteria

Notwithstanding the general principles of proportionality and quality, cost-efficiency, value for money of the activities, as described in chapter 4 of this Guide, this annex aims to provide further explanation to experts as to how on how to assess the award criteria (only when relevant for specific elements of analysis) of the Erasmus+ actions which are described in the Erasmus+ Programme Guide. It contains the following tables:

Key Action 1: Mobility of individuals

- Mobility project for School education staff
- Mobility project for VET learners and staff
- Mobility project for Adult education staff
- Mobility project for young people and youth workers
- Mobility project for Higher education students and staff from/to Partner Countries

Key Action 2: Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices

- Strategic Partnerships – General interpretation
- Additional interpretation specific to a field of education, training and youth

Key Action 3: Support for policy reform

- Structured Dialogue: meetings between young people and decision-makers in the field of youth

Key Action 1: Mobility of individuals

Mobility project for School education staff

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of award criteria for school education
The relevance of the proposal to the objectives and priorities of the Action	The proposal corresponds to the objectives of the Action and the priorities of the field, which are defined in Part B of the Programme Guide. The application clearly falls within the scope of school education and addresses target group(s) relevant for this action, i.e. school staff. Staff mobility should particularly enhance the professional skills and competences of school staff, for example: ▪ improve their abilities to respond to individual learners' needs and to deal with their social, cultural and linguistic diversity; ▪ contribute to develop new and better teaching methods and innovative approaches to learning; ▪ improve the skills and competences of those managing and leading schools; ▪ promote the formal recognition of skills and competences acquired through professional development activities abroad; ▪ to be able to develop a European dimension in school education.
The relevance of the proposal to the needs and objectives of the participating organisations and of the individual participants	The proposal identifies and addresses clearly specified needs of the applicant school in terms of professional development of staff. It also describes how the project will be aligned with the profile of the school education staff who are to be selected.
The extent to which the proposal is suitable for producing high-quality learning outcomes for participants	The expected learning outcomes are clearly explained and in line with the identified needs of school education staff. The planned activities are likely to produce the envisaged learning outcomes.
The extent to which the proposal is suitable for reinforcing the capacities and international scope of the participating organisations	The proposal explains the current or planned involvement of the sending school in other international activities and the place of the mobility project in this context. The mobility project should ideally be a start, continuation or follow-up of other international activities. If the project includes partner organisations abroad, the proposal supports the sending school in strengthening its capacity and ability to successfully cooperate with international partners in the field of school education.
The clarity, completeness and quality of all the phases of the project proposal (preparation, implementation of mobility activities, and follow-up)	The proposal shows that all the phases of the project have been properly developed in order for the project to realise its objectives. It contains a clear and well-planned timetable. The sending school will ensure good preparation of the project implementation in cooperation with the receiving organisation and with the participants. The programme of activities is clearly defined, comprehensive and realistic.

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of award criteria for school education
	The proposal includes a clear method and regular and concrete activities to monitor progress and address any problems encountered.
The consistency between project objectives and proposed activities	The proposed activities are appropriate for achieving the objectives of the project. The type, number and duration of mobility activities are appropriate, realistic and match the capacity of the participating organisations. The project provides good value for money.
The quality of the European Development Plan of the applicant organisation	The European Development Plan provides information on: ▪ the needs of the school in terms of quality development and internationalisation (e.g. as regards management competences, staff competences, new teaching methods or tools, European dimension, language competences, curriculum, organisation of teaching and learning, reinforcing links with partner institutions) and how the planned activities will contribute to meeting these needs; ▪ the impact expected on the pupils, teachers and other staff, and on the school overall; ▪ how the school will integrate the competences and experiences the staff will acquire through their mobilities into the curriculum and/or the school's development plan, ▪ if and how the school intends to use eTwinning in connection with the planned mobility activities.
The appropriateness of measures for selecting and/or involving participants in the mobility activities	The proposal clearly shows that the school intends to organise an open, just and transparent process for selection of staff to participate in mobility activities. The criteria for selection are clearly defined, and ensure that the selected staff have the relevant profile.
The quality of the practical arrangements, management and support modalities	The roles of all actors (sending and – if identified in the application – receiving organisation as well as the participants) are clearly defined. The proposal includes a well-developed approach for how to deal with practical arrangements (venue, transfers, accommodation, etc.). The proposal explains how the sending school intends to support the participants before, during and after the mobility.
The quality of the preparation provided to participants	The proposal shows that participants will receive good quality preparation before their mobility activity, including linguistic, cultural and/or pedagogical preparation as necessary.
The quality of arrangements for the recognition and validation of participants' learning outcomes, as well as the consistent use of European transparency and recognition tools	The proposal describes concrete and appropriate ways in which the sending school intends to recognise and validate the competences gained during the mobility. Where possible, European recognition tools are used. Recommended EU recognition tool for school education staff: Europass.
The quality of measures for evaluating the outcomes of the	The proposal includes adequate activities to evaluate the outcomes of the individual mobilities and of the project as a whole. The evaluation will address whether the expected outcomes of the project have been

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of award criteria for school education
project	realised and whether the expectations of the sending schools and the participants have been met.
The potential impact of the project: - on participants and participating organisations during and after the project lifetime; - outside the organisations and individuals directly participating in the project, at local, regional, national and/or European levels.	The project is likely to have a substantial positive impact on the participants' competences and future professional practice but also on the sending and, if relevant, receiving organisation. The project will contribute to developing a European dimension in the participating schools. The project includes relevant measures to have a longer-term multiplier effect and sustainable impact both within and, if relevant, outside the sending school (e.g. in other schools or in the community). In the long-term perspective, the project will benefit learners of the participating schools. The project results will be incorporated in the management and/or pedagogical/curricular framework and practice of the sending school.
The appropriateness and quality of measures aimed at disseminating the outcomes of the project within and outside the participating organisations	The proposal includes a clear and good quality plan to disseminate the results of the mobility project within and outside the participating organisation(s). It describes the chosen methods and channels, and identifies target groups and multipliers (e.g. teachers of the same subject within the school but also with the community, local school authorities, teachers associations, educational magazines, on-line professional groups, regional/national events for teachers). The dissemination includes the transfer of competences acquired during the mobility, and actively involves the participant.

Mobility project for VET learners and staff

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of award criteria for vocational education and training (VET)
The relevance of the proposal to the objectives and priorities of the Action	The proposal corresponds to the objectives of the Action and priorities of the field described in Part B of the Programme Guide. The application clearly falls within the scope of vocational education and training and addresses target group(s) relevant for this action, i.e. VET staff and learners.
The relevance of the proposal to the needs and objectives of the participating organisations and of the individual participants	The proposal identifies and addresses clearly specified needs and objectives of the participating organisations and of the individual participants in the field of VET.
The extent to which the proposal is suitable to producing high-quality learning outcomes for participants	The expected learning outcomes of the participants are clearly explained and in line with the identified needs of the VET staff and/or learners. The proposal provides *VET staff* with appropriate training opportunities in view of developing their professional knowledge, skills and competences. And/or: The proposal provides *learner*s with appropriate opportunities in view of acquiring knowledge and skills for their personal development and employability.
The extent to which the proposal is suitable to reinforcing the capacities and international scope of the participating organisations	The proposal clearly supports the participating organisations in strengthening their capacity and ability to successfully cooperate with international partners in the field of VET.
The clarity, completeness and quality of all the phases of the project proposal (preparation, implementation of mobility activities, and follow-up)	The proposal shows that all the phases of the project have been properly designed in order for the project to realise its objectives. The programme of activities is clearly defined, comprehensive and realistic. The project contains a clear and well-planned timetable. The proposal foresees a clear method and regular and concrete activities to monitor progress and address any problems encountered.
The consistency between project objectives and activities proposed	The proposed activities are appropriate for achieving the objectives of the project. The proposed activities are appropriate to address the identified needs of the organisations and participants involved in the project. The type, number and duration of mobility activities applied for are appropriate, realistic and match the capacity of the participating organisations. The project provides good value for money.
The quality of the practical arrangements, management and support modalities	The proposal demonstrates that efficient measures are put in place and appropriate resources allocated by the participating organisations to ensure high quality mobility activities.

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of award criteria for vocational education and training (VET)
The quality of the preparation provided to participants	The proposal shows that participants will receive good quality preparation before their mobility activity, including linguistic, cultural and/or pedagogic preparation as necessary.
The quality of arrangements for the recognition and validation of participants' learning outcomes, as well as the consistent use of European transparency and recognition tools	The proposal shows that the learning outcomes of the participants will be appropriately recognised or validated. Where possible, European recognition tool - ECVET or Europass - will be used.
The appropriateness of measures for selecting and/or involving participants in the mobility activities	The proposal clearly defines the criteria on the basis of which each organisation will select learners/staff to participate in mobility activities. The criteria are fair and transparent and allow for selecting individuals whom the project aims to address and with a high potential of achieving the intended learning outcomes.
If applicable, the quality of cooperation and communication between the participating organisations, as well as with other relevant stakeholders	The proposal shows that appropriate cooperation arrangements are established between the participating organisations. It indicates appropriate channels for communication between the participating organisations. The proposal shows that the distribution of responsibilities and tasks of all participating organisations is balanced.
The quality of measures for evaluating the outcomes of the project	The proposal includes adequate activities for evaluating the outcomes of the project, in particular the quality of the learning outcomes of mobility activities and the effectiveness of support measures put in place by the participating organisations, as well as the outcomes of the project as a whole.
The potential impact of the project on participants and participating organisations during and after the project lifetime	The project is likely to have a substantial positive impact on the participating organisations and participants. The proposal describes the measures that will be taken to ensure lasting effects of the project, including after the end of the project. If the project foresees mobility of VET staff, it will benefit learners of the sending organisations in the long-term perspective.
The potential impact of the project outside the organisations and individuals directly participating in the project, at local, regional, national and/or European levels	The project is likely to benefit individuals and organisations other than those directly participating in the project. Relevant potential beneficiary organisations and individuals are identified in the proposal.
The appropriateness and quality of measures aimed at disseminating the outcomes of the project within and outside the participating organisations	The proposal includes a clear and good quality plan for the dissemination of the project results, concretely describes the dissemination activities and identifies the right target group(s) of these activities. The proposal includes proactive measures that will be taken to reach out to these target groups.

Mobility project for adult education staff

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of award criteria for adult education
The relevance of the proposal to the objectives and priorities of the Action	The proposal corresponds to the objectives of the Action and priorities of the field described in Part B of the Programme Guide. The application clearly falls within the scope of adult education and addresses target group(s) relevant for this action, i.e. adult education staff.
The relevance of the proposal to the needs and objectives of the participating organisations and of the individual participants	The proposal identifies and addresses clearly specified needs and objectives of the participating organisations and of the individual participants. Staff mobility contributes to the internationalisation and capacity building of the participating organisations and to the professional development of adult education staff (Cf. European Development Plan).
The extent to which the proposal is suitable of producing high-quality learning outcomes for participants	The expected learning outcomes of the participants are clearly explained and in line with the identified needs of adult education staff. The proposal provides adult education staff with appropriate training opportunities in view of developing their professional knowledge, skills and competences.
The extent to which the proposal is suitable of reinforcing the capacities and international scope of the participating organisations	The proposal clearly supports the participating organisations in strengthening their capacity and ability to successfully cooperate with international partners in the field of adult education.
The clarity, completeness and quality of all the phases of the project proposal (preparation, implementation of mobility activities, and follow-up)	The proposal shows that all the phases of the project have been properly designed in order for the project to realise its objectives. The programme of activities is clearly defined, comprehensive and realistic. The project contains a clear and well-planned timetable. The proposal foresees a clear method and regular and concrete activities to monitor progress and address any problems encountered.
The consistency between project objectives and activities proposed	The proposed activities are appropriate to address the identified needs of the organisations and participants involved in the project. The type, number and duration of mobility activities applied for are appropriate, realistic and match the capacity of the participating organisations. The project provides good value for money.
The quality of the European Development Plan of the applicant organisation	The European Development Plan provides information on: ▪ the needs of the organisation in terms of quality development and internationalisation (e.g. as regards management competences, staff competences, new teaching methods or tools, European dimension,

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of award criteria for adult education
	language competences, curriculum, organisation of teaching and learning, reinforcing links with partner institutions) and how the planned activities will contribute to meeting these needs; ▪ the impact expected on learners, teachers and other staff, and on the organisation overall; ▪ how the organisation will integrate the competences and experiences the staff will acquire through their mobilities into the curriculum and/or the organisation's development plan.
The quality of the practical arrangements, management and support modalities	The proposal demonstrates that efficient measures are put in place and appropriate resources allocated by the participating organisations to ensure high quality mobility activities.
The quality of the preparation provided to participants	The proposal shows that participants will receive the good quality preparation before their mobility activity, including linguistic, cultural and/or pedagogic preparation as necessary.
The quality of arrangements for the recognition and validation of participants' learning outcomes, as well as the consistent use of European transparency and recognition tools	The proposal shows that the learning outcomes of the participants will be appropriately recognised or validated. Where possible, European recognition tools are used. Recommended EU recognition tool for adult education staff: Europass.
The appropriateness of measures for selecting and/or involving participants in the mobility activities	The proposal clearly defines the criteria on the basis of which each organisation will select staff to participate in mobility activities. The criteria are fair and transparent and allow for selecting individuals whom the project aims to address and with a high potential of achieving the intended learning outcomes. N.B. The mobility of adult learners cannot be supported.
If applicable, the quality of cooperation and communication between the participating organisations, as well as with other relevant stakeholders	The proposal shows that appropriate cooperation arrangements are established between the participating organisations. It indicates appropriate channels for communication between the participating organisations. The proposal shows that the distribution of responsibilities and tasks of all participating organisations is balanced.
The quality of measures for evaluating the outcomes of the project	The proposal includes adequate measures for evaluating the outcomes of the project, in particular the quality of the learning outcomes of mobility activities and the effectiveness of support measures put in place by the participating organisations, as well as the outcomes of the project as a whole.
The potential impact of the project on participants and participating organisations during and after the project lifetime	The project is likely to have a substantial positive impact on the participating organisations and participants. The project results will be integrated into the management and/or pedagogical/curricular framework and practice of the participating organisations. The proposal describes the measures that will be taken to ensure lasting effects of the project, including after the end of the project. In the long-term perspective, the project will benefit learners of the participating organisation.

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of award criteria for adult education
The potential impact of the project outside the organisations and individuals directly participating in the project, at local, regional, national and/or European levels	The project is likely to benefit individuals and organisations other than those directly participating in the project. Relevant potential beneficiary organisations and individuals are identified in the proposal.
The appropriateness and quality of measures aimed at disseminating the outcomes of the project within and outside the participating organisations	The proposal includes a clear and good quality plan for the dissemination of the project results, concretely describes the dissemination activities and identifies the right target group(s) of these activities. The proposal includes proactive measures that will be taken to reach out to the target groups.

Mobility project for young people and youth workers

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of award criteria for youth
The relevance of the proposal to: - the objectives and priorities of the Action - the needs and objectives of the participating organisations and of the individual participants The extent to which the proposal is suitable of: - producing high-quality learning outcomes for participants - reinforcing the capacities and international scope of the participating organisations The extent to which the project involves young people with fewer opportunities	The proposal corresponds to the objectives of the Action, which are defined in Part B "what are the aims of a mobility project" of the Programme Guide. In particular, Youth Exchanges and European Voluntary Service correspond to the objectives of learners' mobility, while mobility of youth workers correspond to the objectives of the mobility of staff. The proposal corresponds to the priorities in the field of youth, which are defined in Part B, introductory section "Youth" of the Programme Guide. If Youth Exchanges or European Voluntary Service activities are planned in the project, the proposal involves as participants young people with fewer opportunities, as described in Part A "Equity and Inclusion" of the Programme Guide. The learning outcomes for the participants are clearly explained and in line with the identified needs of young people or youth workers concerned. The learning outcomes are in line with the expected impact of the action on individuals, as described in Part B of the Programme Guide, "Key Action 1: Learning mobility of individuals", section "Which actions are supported?"
The clarity, completeness and quality of all the phases of the project proposal (preparation, implementation of mobility activities, and follow-up) The consistency between project objectives and activities proposed The quality of the practical arrangements, management and support modalities The quality of the preparation provided to participants	The proposal is compliant with the principles and provisions described in the Programme Guide, Annex I, section "Mobility project for young people and youth workers". In case of European Voluntary Service, the activities are compliant with the principles of the EVS Charter. ▪ **Quality of the preparation phase** The description of the preparation phase is clear and shows that the participating organisations and the participants have agreed on a division of tasks, programme of activities, working methods, practical arrangements (venue, transfers, accommodations, support material etc.). The preparation phase furthermore enhances the participants' involvement in the activities and shows that the participants will be prepared for intercultural encounters with other people with different backgrounds and cultures. In case of Youth Exchanges, the proposal shows that the young people have been planning the project. The

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of award criteria for youth
The quality of the non-formal participative methods proposed and active involvement of young people at all levels of the project The quality of arrangements for the recognition and validation of participants' learning outcomes, as well as the consistent use of European transparency and recognition tools The appropriateness of measures for selecting and/or involving participants in the mobility activities The quality of cooperation and communication between the participating organisations, as well as with other relevant stakeholders	young people have chosen the theme(s) of the planned activities, the working methods, and agreed on the profile of the participants. In case of European Voluntary Service, the proposal shows that volunteers will receive personal, learning/Youthpass process, task-related, linguistic and administrative support. The support will be reinforced by a mentor responsible for providing personal and learning/Youthpass process support to the volunteer(s) and for helping them to integrate into the local community. In the preparation phase, the participating organisations have addressed the issue of protection and safety of participants. The proposal demonstrates that participating organisations have put in place emergency procedures and have settled a common "code of behaviour" to help both group leaders/facilitators/trainers/mentors and participants, to respect commonly agreed standards of behaviour during the activity. For Youth Exchanges, a sufficient number of group leaders will be present in order to enable young people to share their learning experience in a reasonably safe and protected environment. In the preparation phase, the participating organisations have addressed the issue of recognition of participant's learning outcomes. The fact that - beyond making available the Youthpass certificate to participants - the participating organisations intend to use the Youthpass tool to stimulate participants' reflection on their learning process is considered as an element of quality of the project. ▪ **Quality of the activity programme** The activity programme is clearly defined, realistic, balanced and linked to the objectives of the project. It provides learning opportunities for the participants involved. The programme uses a variety of working methods and is adapted to the profile of participants in order to ensure the potentially best learning outcomes. In case of European Voluntary Service, effective matching between tasks and volunteer profiles is targeted. Their tasks reflect, as far as possible, their individual abilities, desires and learning expectations. The proposal shows that volunteers do not carry out tasks of professional staff, in order to avoid job substitution and/or excessive responsibility for the volunteers. Routine tasks are also limited to the maximum extent. The tasks of the volunteers include contact with the local community. ▪ **Quality of the follow-up phase** The proposal shows that participating organisations intend to carry out a final evaluation of the activities and of the project. The final evaluation will make it possible to assess whether the objectives of the

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of award criteria for youth
	activities/project have been achieved and the expectations of the participating organisations and participants have been met. The evaluation will also highlight the learning outcomes of individuals and participating organisations involved. Besides the final evaluation, the proposal shows that participating organisations will monitor the implementation of the mobility activities to ensure the smooth running of the project and fine-tuning, if necessary. ▪ **Non-formal learning methods applied** The project leads to the acquisition/improvement of competences resulting in the personal, socio-educational and professional development of all participants and participating organisations involved. This will be achieved through non-formal and informal learning, in line with the principles described in Annex I to the Programme Guide, section "Mobility project for young people and youth workers". The project is based on a learning process stimulating creativity, active participation and initiative (entrepreneurial spirit). The proposal shows that such learning process will be planned and analysed throughout the project: participants will be provided with a place for reflection on learning experiences and outcomes, also with the support of the Youthpass tool. The proposal indicates that participants will play an active role in the implementation of the project to the maximum possible extent: participants will be actively involved in the preparation and follow-up phases of the project. Participants will be able to explore different topics on an equal basis, regardless of their language abilities or other skills. In case of Youth Exchanges and mobility of youth workers, the activity has a clear thematic concept, which participants wish to explore together. The chosen theme is commonly agreed and reflects the interests and needs of participants. ▪ **Quality of cooperation and communication between the participating organisations, as well as with other relevant stakeholders** The proposal shows that the participating organisations have established and will run a cohesive consortium with active involvement of all partners and with common goals to be achieved. In this respect, the following factors should be taken into consideration during the assessment:

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of award criteria for youth
	▪ the level of networking, cooperation and commitment of each participating organisation in the project; ▪ the profile and background of participating organisations when the nature or target of the activity would necessitate the possession of certain qualifications; ▪ a clear and commonly agreed definition of roles and tasks of each participating organisation involved in the project; ▪ the capacity of the consortium to ensure effective implementation, follow-up and dissemination of the results achieved through the project.
The quality of measures for evaluating the outcomes of the project The potential impact of the project: - on participants and participating organisations during and after the project lifetime - outside the organisations and individuals directly participating in the project, at local, regional, national and/or European levels The appropriateness and quality of measures aimed at disseminating the outcomes of the project within and outside the participating organisations	▪ **Impact** The impact of the project is not limited to the participants in the activities. When appropriate and notably for European Voluntary Service, the proposal shows that participating organisations will involve other stakeholders from the local community as much as possible in the project activities. The project is framed within a longer-term perspective, and planned with a view to achieve a multiplier effect and sustainable impact. The proposal shows that the participating organisations have identified possible target groups that could act as *multipliers* (young people, youth workers, media, political leaders, representatives of local or regional public bodies, opinion leaders, EU decision makers, etc.) in order to spread the project objectives and results. In this regard, the proposal shows that participating organisations will put in place effective measures to make the project learning outcomes visible. ▪ **Visibility of the project/visibility of Erasmus+** The proposal shows that participating organisations have reflected together on measures aimed at enhancing the visibility of their project and the visibility of the Erasmus+ Programme in general. - Visibility of the project: The proposal shows that participating organisations and participants will "publicise" the activities planned by the project as well as its aims and objectives. In order to raise awareness of the project they could for example develop information material; do a mail shot or SMS mailing; prepare posters, stickers, promotional items; invite journalists to observe; issue press releases or write articles for local papers, websites or newsletters; create an e-group, a web space, a photo-gallery or blog on the Internet, etc.

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of award criteria for youth
	- Visibility of the Programme: Whenever appropriate, the proposal shows that participating organisations intend to include information about the Programme (for instance, information on the Programme Actions, or their objectives and important features, target groups, etc.) in all measures undertaken to increase visibility of the project. The proposal could also include information sessions or workshops in the programme of the activities or as tasks of the EVS volunteers. The proposal could also envisage the participation in events (seminars, conferences, debates) organised at different levels (local, regional, national, international). ▪ **Dissemination and exploitation of results** The proposal shows that each participating organisation will put in place measures to disseminate and exploit the results of the project, including its learning outcomes for the benefit of all actors involved. Dissemination and exploitation measures may have the same format as visibility measures indicated in the section above; the main difference is that dissemination and exploitation measures focus on a project's results, rather than on the planned activities and intended project objectives. Disseminating project results could simply mean "spreading the word" about the project among friends, peers or other target groups. Other examples of dissemination and exploitation measures are organising public events (presentations, conferences, workshops…); creating audio-visual products (CD-Rom, DVD…); setting up long-term collaboration with media (series of radio/TV/press contributions, interviews, participation in different radio/TV programmes…); developing information material (newsletters, brochures, booklets, best practice manuals…), etc.

Mobility project for higher education students and staff from/to Partner Countries

Elements of analysis under award criteria	Interpretation of award criteria for HE between Programme and Partner Countries
The extent to which the planned mobility is relevant to the internationalisation strategy of the higher education institutions involved (both in the Programme and in the Partner Country) and the rationale for choosing staff and/or student mobility.	a. The evaluator should assess how the chosen Partner Country fits the applicant's internationalisation strategy. b. The evaluator should assess to what extent the planned mobility reinforces the capacities and international scope of the participant organisations. Applicants should be specific about which Partner Country Higher Education Institution(s) they will work with and demonstrate how mobility fits the internationalisation strategy of these partner organisation(s). c. The evaluator should assess the explanations given for the choice of requested incoming and outgoing mobility flows of staff (training or teaching) and/or students (different cycles) with respect to the internationalisation strategies of the HEIs involved.
The extent to which the applicant organisation has previous experience of similar projects with higher education institutions in the Partner Country and the clarity of the description of responsibilities, roles and tasks between partners.	a. The evaluator should assess the planned cooperation arrangements. A previous mobility project with the chosen Partner Country should be considered an advantage, regardless of whether this was supported by the EU (e.g. Erasmus Mundus) or other funds. b. The existence of previous or running cooperation agreements between the applicant HEI and the HEI in the partner country setting out respective roles and tasks is also an advantage.

The completeness and quality of arrangements for the selection of participants, the support provided to them and the recognition of their mobility period (in particular in the Partner country).	The evaluator will assess the planned practical implementation of the mobilities, in particular: a. The clarity, completeness and quality of all the phases of the mobilities (preparation, implementation of mobility activities and follow-up). b. The appropriateness of measures for selecting participants. Special attention should be given by the expert to measures planned by the applicant and its partner organisation(s) for ensuring equal opportunities, social equity and promoting participation of disadvantaged persons. c. The information and support provided prior to the mobility, e.g. accommodation services, language training, learning/mobility agreements and administrative support (insurance, visa, etc.). d. The mechanisms envisaged for recognition of student learning outcomes (e.g. ECTS or other mechanisms). e. The way in which the HEIs will recognise and reward the outcomes of outgoing staff mobility.
The potential impact of the mobility on participants, beneficiaries and partner organisations at local, regional and national levels, as well as the quality of measures aimed at disseminating the results of the at faculty and institution level (and beyond, where applicable), in both the Programme and Partner Countries.	The evaluator will assess the potential impact and dissemination of the planned mobility in terms of: a. The potential impact of the mobility on individuals and HEIs, at local, regional and national level during and after the project lifetime. b. How the results of the mobility will be disseminated at faculty and institution level, and beyond where applicable, in both the Programme and Partner Countries. c. The strategy for monitoring and evaluating the outcomes of the mobility.

Key Action 2: Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices

Strategic Partnerships – General interpretation

Elements of analysis	General interpretation of award criteria relevant for all Strategic Partnerships
The relevance of the proposal to the objectives and the priorities of the Action	The project addresses in a qualitative way the objectives and the priorities of the Action, as described in the section "what are the aims and priorities of the Strategic Partnership" of the Programme Guide. The project must address at least one of the priorities (either horizontal or sector-specific) of the action, as indicated in the Programme Guide. **NB: If the proposal does not provide convincing evidence that is relevant to at least one priority, the proposal must be scored as "Weak" (score between 0-9 points) for the award criterion "Relevance of the project" as a whole, and rejected as a consequence.**
The extent to which the proposal is based on a genuine and adequate needs analysis	The proposal proves that a solid analysis, drawing on existing knowledge, know-how and practice, has been carried out to identify needs of the target group(s), and organisations. The needs identified are relevant for the field under which the proposal was submitted.
The extent to which the objectives are clearly defined, realistic and address issues relevant to the participating organisations and target groups	The objectives of the project are clearly stated and can be achieved taking into account the nature and experience of the partnership. The proposal identifies and adequately addresses clearly specified needs of the target group of the project.
The extent to which the proposal is suitable of realising synergies between different fields of education, training and youth	The project is likely to produce outcomes that may be relevant also for other fields of education, training and youth than the field that is expected to be most impacted by the project.
The extent to which the proposal is innovative and/or complementary to other initiatives and projects already carried out by the participating organisations	The project is likely to produce outputs that will be innovative for its field/area or use innovative working methods, for example it will produce something significantly new in terms of learning opportunities, skills development, access to information, recognition of learning outcomes etc. AND/OR: If the application is based on a previous project, it demonstrates significant added value compared to the previous project results. In so far as the initial developer of these previous results is not participating in the project, the relationship between the participating organisations and the initial developer are transparent and respect pre-existing rights.

Elements of analysis	General interpretation of award criteria relevant for all Strategic Partnerships
	The proposed innovation or complementarity is proportional to the scale of the project and the experience of the participating organisations.
The extent to which the proposal brings added value at EU level through results that would not be attained by activities carried out in a single country	The transnational dimension clearly adds value in terms of project outcomes; the participating organisations will be able to achieve results that would not be reached by organisations from a single country.
The clarity, completeness and quality of the work programme, including appropriate phases for preparation, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and dissemination	The proposal shows that all phases of the project have been properly designed in order for the project to realise its objectives. The work programme is clearly defined, comprehensive and realistic. The project contains a clear and well-planned timetable.
The consistency between project objectives and activities proposed	The proposed activities are well suited to address the identified needs and reach the objectives that were set for the project.
The quality and feasibility of the methodology proposed	The proposed methodology is realistic and appropriate for producing the expected results. The methodology builds on solid arguments/evidence basis and takes account of existing knowledge and practice.
The existence and relevance of quality control measures to ensure that the project implementation is of high quality, completed in time and on budget	The proposal foresees appropriate evaluation activities at critical stages of the project, which will allow measuring the progress and quality of the project activities and outcomes, the appropriate use of funds. The quality control measures will allow the project to take any necessary corrective measures in time.
The extent to which the project is cost-effective and allocates appropriate resources to each activity	The proposal provides value for money in terms of the results planned as compared to the grant requested. The grant request is realistic for a good quality implementation of the planned activities.
If the project plans training, teaching or learning activities: ▪ the extent to which these activities are appropriate to the project's aims and involve the appropriate number of participants	In case transnational teaching, training or learning activities are proposed, these contribute directly to the objectives of the project and are strongly embedded in the project logic as a whole. The teaching, training or learning activities proposed are of the appropriate volume, bring an added value and will have a direct impact on the achievement of the project results. The teaching, training or learning activities are well conceived, i.e. the proposal demonstrates good quality management, support and practical arrangements, selection and preparation of participants, training, teaching or learning agreements, monitoring of teaching, training or learning activities, ensuring the safety of participants.

Elements of analysis	General interpretation of award criteria relevant for all Strategic Partnerships
▪ The quality of arrangements for the recognition and validation of participants' learning outcomes, in line with European transparency and recognition tools and principles	In case transnational teaching, training or learning activities are proposed, relevant transparency and recognition tools and/or policy approaches developed in the framework of policy cooperation at European level will be used for recognising and validating the learning outcomes of participants, such as: European / national qualifications frameworks; European framework of key competences and the European guidelines for the validation of non-formal and informal learning.
The extent to which the project involves an appropriate mix of complementary participating organisations with the necessary profile, experience and expertise to successfully deliver all aspects of the project	Taking into account the nature of the project and its expected impact, the participating organisations have the skills and competences required to ensure that the work programme can be implemented efficiently, effectively and professionally. The proposal concretely identifies which skills, experiences, expertise and management support each of the participating organisations will make available to implement all aspects of the project proposed.
The extent to which the distribution of responsibilities and tasks demonstrates the commitment and active contribution of all participating organisations	There is an appropriate distribution of tasks and a balanced participation and input of the participating organisations in the implementation of the work programme, taking into account the complementary competencies, the nature of the activities and the know-how of the partners involved.
The extent to which, if relevant for the project type, the project involves participation of organisations from different fields of education, training, youth and other socio-economic sectors	If it is necessary for the project's success to use expertise of organisations from different fields, and/or the project intends to impact more than one field of education, training and youth, relevant organisations of all concerned fields participate in the project. The proposal demonstrates convincingly why the participation of the organisations from different fields of education, training, youth and/or other socio-economic sectors is best suited to produce the outputs that respond to the identified needs.
The extent to which the project involves newcomers to the Action	The proposal includes one or more participating organisations that are newcomers to this action and on which the impact expected from the participation in the project would be particularly high.
The existence of effective mechanisms for coordination and communication between the participating organisations, as well as with other relevant stakeholders	The methods of project coordination and means of communication are clearly described in the proposal. They are appropriate for the project to ensure a good cooperation between the participating organisations.

Elements of analysis	General interpretation of award criteria relevant for all Strategic Partnerships
If applicable, the extent to which the involvement of a participating organisation from a Partner Country brings an essential added value to the project (if this condition is not fulfilled, the project will not be considered for selection)	The participation of organisations from Partner Countries provides genuine added value to the project because of the specific skills, experiences or expertise that these organisations bring to the project and that prove to be essential for the achievement of the project's objectives and/or to ensure a significantly higher quality of the project outputs. **NB: If the proposal does not provide convincing evidence of such added value of a Partner Country organisation's participation in the project, the proposal must be scored as "Weak" (score between 0-9 points) for the award criterion "Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements" as a whole, and rejected as a consequence.**
The quality of measures for evaluating the outcomes of the project	The evaluation methods proposed will make it possible to assess effectively whether and to which extent the project is producing the intended outcomes.
The potential impact of the project on participants and participating organisations, during and after the project lifetime	The project is likely to have a substantial positive impact on the participating organisations and on their staff and/or learners. The impact of the project on the participants and organisations involved is likely to occur during and remain after the lifetime of the project.
The potential impact of the project outside the organisations and individuals directly participating in the project, at local, regional, national and/or European levels	The project results have the potential to be transferred and exploited in other European countries. The proposal identifies relevant stakeholders, including policy-makers at the most appropriate level, whether local, regional, national and/or European. Taking due account of the scope and size of the project: ▪ it is likely to have a positive impact at local, regional, national and/or European level; ▪ it is likely to lead to innovative developments at system level and/or provide useful input to policy developments; ▪ it shows potential for scalability and synergies with other Erasmus+ actions and/or other European Programmes.
The quality of the dissemination plan: the appropriateness and quality of measures aimed at sharing the outcomes of the project within and outside the participating organisations	The proposal identifies the project results that can be transferred to the relevant target groups. An appropriate and effective set of measures and tools will be used to reach the target groups for dissemination. The planned dissemination and exploitation activities will ensure an optimal use of the results at local, regional, national and/or European level depending on the scope and size of the project. In each of the participating organisations specific and adequate resources are allocated to the dissemination activities.

Elements of analysis	General interpretation of award criteria relevant for all Strategic Partnerships
If relevant, the extent to which the proposal describes how the materials, documents and media produced will be made freely available and promoted through open licences, and does not contain disproportionate limitations	If the project foresees tangible results and deliverables, participating organisations will allow open access to materials, documents and media produced within the project. If the proposal foresees limitations to open access, they are not disproportionate and will not significantly affect the dissemination and possible impact of the project.
The quality of the plans for ensuring the sustainability of the project: its capacity to continue having an impact and producing results after the EU grant has been used up	The project is placed in a perspective that goes beyond the project period. It plans to achieve a multiplier effect and sustainable impact that are within its reach considering the scope and size of the project. If relevant for the type of project, its results will be integrated in the management / pedagogical framework of the participating organisations. If relevant for the type of project, the participating organisations have the intention and are able to attract external co-funding or other support from diverse sources to ensure sustainability of the activities developed by the project and continued use of outputs and results.

Strategic Partnerships – Additional interpretation specific to a field of education, training and youth

Elements of analysis	Complementary interpretation for school education	Complementary interpretation for VET	Complementary interpretation for higher education	Complementary interpretation for adult education	Complementary interpretation for youth
The extent to which the proposal is relevant to the objectives and to the priorities of the Action	The project must be relevant for the school education field. If the project addresses a horizontal priority, it must do it in a way that impacts in a convincing manner the school education field.	The project must be relevant for the VET education field. If the project addresses a horizontal priority, it must do it in a way that impacts in a convincing manner the VET field.	The project must be relevant for the higher education field. If the project addresses a horizontal priority, it must do it in a way that impacts in a convincing manner the higher education field.	The project must be relevant for the adult education field. If the project addresses a horizontal priority, it must do it in a way that impacts in a convincing manner the adult education field.	The project must be relevant for the youth field. If the project addresses a horizontal priority, it must do it in a way that impacts in a convincing manner the youth field.
The extent to which the proposal is based on a genuine and adequate needs analysis	The needs identified are relevant for the school education field.	The needs identified are related to clearly identified problems and relevant to the European VET policy objectives (see above).	The needs identified are relevant in the context of the HE Modernisation agenda.	The needs identified are relevant for the adult education field.	The needs identified are relevant in the context of the European policy cooperation framework in the youth field.
The extent to which the proposal is suitable of realising synergies between different fields of education, training and youth					In the case the proposal addresses several fields of education, training and youth, there is a clear benefit for the youth field.
The extent to which the proposal is innovative and/or complementary to other initiatives and projects already carried out by the participating organisations		If the proposal is based on existing innovative content or previous project results, it should represent a significant innovative added value towards a new target group, economic sector or region and contribute to improving the quality of	The project will add to the existing knowledge, know-how and/or practices of the organisations and persons involved.		

Elements of analysis	Complementary interpretation for school education	Complementary interpretation for VET	Complementary interpretation for higher education	Complementary interpretation for adult education	Complementary interpretation for youth
		VET teaching/training and/or VET regulations in the countries participating in the project.			
The consistency between project objectives and activities proposed					Typically, activities undertaken in projects relevant for youth are the ones described in Annex I of the Programme Guide, section "Strategic Partnerships" and relevant to youth.
The quality and feasibility of the methodology proposed					The project is based on non-formal and informal learning methods stimulating creativity, active participation and initiative. A variety of non-formal learning methods and techniques may be applied in order to address the different needs of participants and desired outcomes.
If the project plans training, teaching or learning activities: The extent to which these activities are appropriate to the project's aims and involve the appropriate number of participants	If the project includes activities for pupils, these activities are integrated into the curriculum and contribute to achieve defined learning goals.	The proposal proves that teaching, training or learning activities relevant for VET (blended mobility; training placements; long-term teaching assignments; short-term joint staff training events) are embedded in a coherent package of activities and that they effectively contribute to the	The proposal proves that the teaching, training or learning activities for higher education (blended mobility; Intensive Study Programmes; long-term teaching assignments; short-term joint staff training events) are embedded in a coherent package of activities and that they effectively	If the proposal provides for long-term teaching, training or learning activities of staff: ▪ The proposal describes the measures put in place for ensuring the quality of the mobility activities, comprising 1) preparation including linguistic and subject	

Elements of analysis	Complementary interpretation for school education	Complementary interpretation for VET	Complementary interpretation for higher education	Complementary interpretation for adult education	Complementary interpretation for youth
		achievement of the specific project objective(s).	contribute to the achievement of the broader project objective(s).	preparation before and during the mobility and 2) support to and monitoring of participants during their mobility by the sending and/or hosting organisation. If the proposal provides for blended mobility of adult learners, the proposal clearly demonstrates that the learning activities are embedded in a coherent set of activities and that they effectively contribute to the achievement of the project objectives.	
The quality of arrangements for the recognition and validation of participants' learning outcomes, in line with European transparency and recognition tools and principles	The proposal clearly describes how the learning outcomes of participating pupils and school staff will be recognised/validated within the context of the school and the curriculum. Recommended EU recognition tool for school education staff and pupils: Europass.	The learning outcomes are recognised / validated following the same arrangements and criteria used in mobility activities under Key Action 1. Recommended recognition tools: ECVET, Europass.	The learning outcomes are recognised / validated following the same arrangements and criteria used in mobility activities under Key Action 1, in line with the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education (ECHE). Recommended recognition tool: ECTS.	The proposal comprises the necessary measures to facilitate the validation of non-formal and informal learning and its permeability with formal education pathways (cf. priorities of the Action). Recommended EU recognition tool for adult education staff: Europass.	Learning outcomes are recognised following the same arrangements and criteria used in mobility activities under Key Action 1, and notably through the use of Youthpass.
The extent to which the project involves an appropriate mix of complementary participating	For Strategic Partnerships promoting cooperation between local/regional school authorities, it is particularly important				The proposal shows that the participating organisations have established and will run a cohesive consortium with

Elements of analysis	Complementary interpretation for school education	Complementary interpretation for VET	Complementary interpretation for higher education	Complementary interpretation for adult education	Complementary interpretation for youth
organisations with the necessary profile, experience and expertise to successfully deliver all aspects of the project	that the proposal demonstrates the direct involvement and leadership of the project by the local/regional authorities involved.				active involvement of all partners and with common goals to be achieved. In this respect, the following factors should be taken into consideration during the assessment: ▪ the level of networking, cooperation and commitment of each participating organisation in the project; ▪ the profile and background of participating organisations when the nature or target of the activity would necessitate the possession of certain qualifications; ▪ a clear and commonly agreed definition of roles and tasks of each participating organisation involved in the project; the capacity of the consortium to ensure effective implementation, follow-up and dissemination of the results achieved through the project.

Elements of analysis	Complementary interpretation for school education	Complementary interpretation for VET	Complementary interpretation for higher education	Complementary interpretation for adult education	Complementary interpretation for youth
The existence of effective mechanisms for coordination and communication between the participating organisations, as well as with other relevant stakeholders	If the project involves schools, the proposal explains if and how eTwinning will be used to support the implementation of the project.				
The potential impact of the project on participants and participating organisations, during and after the project lifetime		The proposal demonstrates which benefits (trans-national, interdisciplinary, cross-sectoral) the proposed cooperation brings to the partners – also in the long run, after Erasmus+ funding, e.g. how it contributes to the internationalisation strategies of the participating organisations			
The quality of the dissemination plan: the appropriateness and quality of measures aimed at sharing the outcomes of the project within and outside the participating organisations	For Strategic Partnerships promoting cooperation between local/regional school authorities, it is important that the proposal demonstrates that the regional/local authorities will be actively engaged in the dissemination activities in their area. If the project involves schools, the proposal explains if and how eTwinning will be used to support the dissemination of the project results.				

Elements of analysis	Complementary interpretation for school education	Complementary interpretation for VET	Complementary interpretation for higher education	Complementary interpretation for adult education	Complementary interpretation for youth
The quality of the plans for ensuring the sustainability of the project: its capacity to continue having an impact and producing results after the EU grant has been used up	For Strategic Partnerships promoting cooperation between local/regional school authorities, it is important that the proposal demonstrates that the regional/local authorities will continue to sustain the local networks created. If the project involves schools, the proposal explains if and how eTwinning will be used to support the sustainability of the project.	The proposal is likely to have the foreseen positive impact on the target groups beyond the project lifetime. The proposal explains which project activities and results are supposed to be continued and maintained after the end of Erasmus+ funding (i.e. continuation of new courses, use and maintenance of new teaching tools…) and how and with which resources other than from the EU (finance, staff, equipment) this will be done.			

Key Action 3: Support for policy reform

Structured Dialogue: meetings between young people and decision-makers in the field of youth

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of the award criteria
The relevance of the proposal to: - the objectives and priorities of the Action - the needs and objectives of the participating organisations and of the individual participants The extent to which the proposal is suitable of: - producing high-quality outcomes for participants - reinforcing the capacities of the participating organisations The extent to which the project involves: - young people with fewer opportunities - decision-makers, youth experts, representatives of public authorities in charge of youth	The proposal corresponds to the objectives of the Action, which are defined in Part B "What are meetings between young people and decision-makers?" of the Programme Guide. The proposal corresponds to the priorities in the field of youth, which are defined in Part B, introductory section "Youth" of the Programme Guide. The proposal involves as participants young people with fewer opportunities, as described in Part A "Equity and Inclusion" of the Programme Guide.
The clarity, completeness and quality of all the phases of the project proposal (preparation, implementation of mobility activities, and follow-up) The consistency between project objectives and activities proposed The quality of the practical arrangements, management and support modalities The quality of the non-formal learning	▪ **Quality of the preparation phase** The description of the preparation phase is clear and shows that the participating organisations and the participants: ▪ have agreed on the theme(s) of the planned mobility activities. ▪ have reflected on a division of tasks, programme of activities, working methods, profile of participants, practical arrangements (venue, transfers, accommodations, support material etc.). The preparation phase furthermore enhances the participants' involvement in the activities and – for transnational or international meetings - ensures that the participants will be prepared for

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of the award criteria
participative methods proposed and the active involvement of young people during all the stages of the project The appropriateness of measures for selecting and/or involving participants in the activities If appropriate, the quality of cooperation and communication between the participating organisations, as well as with other relevant stakeholders	intercultural encounters with other people with different backgrounds and cultures. As part of the preparation phase of the project, the participating organisations have adequately addressed the issue of protection and safety of participants. ▪ **Quality of the activity programme** The activity programme is clearly defined, realistic, balanced and linked to the objectives of the project. It provides learning opportunities for the participants involved. The programme uses a variety of working methods and be adapted to the profile of participants in order to ensure the potentially best learning outcomes. ▪ **Quality of the follow-up phase** The proposal shows that participating organisations intend to carry out a final evaluation of the activities and of the project. The final evaluation makes it possible to assess whether the objectives of the activities/project have been achieved and the expectations of the participating organisations and participants have been met. The evaluation will also highlight the learning outcomes of individuals and participating organisations involved. Besides the final evaluation, the proposal shows that participating organisations will monitor the implementation of the activities so as to ensure the smooth running of the project and fine-tuning, if necessary. ▪ **Non-formal learning methods applied** The project is based on non-formal and informal learning methods stimulating creativity, active participation and initiative. A variety of non-formal learning methods and techniques may be applied (workshops, role plays, outdoor activities, ice-breakers, round-tables, etc.) in order to address the different needs of participants and desired outcomes. The proposal shows that such learning process will be planned and analysed throughout the project: participants will be provided with a place for reflection on learning experiences and outcomes, also with the support of the Youthpass tool.

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of the award criteria
	The proposal demonstrates that participants will play an active role in the implementation of the project. Participants will also be actively involved in the preparation and follow-up phases of the project. Participants will be able to explore different topics on an equal basis, regardless of their language abilities or other skills. ▪ **Quality of cooperation and communication between the participating organisations, as well as with other relevant stakeholders** The proposal shows that the participating organisations have established and will run a cohesive consortium with active involvement of all partners and with common goals to be achieved. In this respect, the following factors should be taken into consideration during the assessment: ▪ the level of networking, cooperation and commitment of each participating organisation in the project; ▪ the profile and background of participating organisations when the nature or target of the activity would necessitate the possession of certain qualifications; ▪ a clear and commonly agreed definition of roles and tasks of each participating organisation involved in the project; ▪ the capacity of the consortium to ensure effective implementation, follow-up and dissemination of the results achieved through the project. Projects centred on the Structured Dialogue are intended for those youth organisations that are active players in debates on youth issues at local, regional, national or European level. This type of projects should however aim at developing innovative and efficient ways to address and involve other target groups, in particular young people who are not actively engaged in society or connected to an organisation.
The quality of measures for evaluating the outcomes of the project The potential impact of the project: - on participants and participating organisations during and after the project lifetime - outside the organisations and individuals directly participating in the project, at local, regional, national and/or European	▪ **Impact** The impact of the project will not be limited to the participants in the activities. When appropriate, the proposal shows that participating organisations will involve, as much as possible, other stakeholders from the local community in the project activities. The project is framed within a longer-term perspective, and planned with a view to achieve a multiplier effect and sustainable impact. In the proposal, the participating organisations have identified possible target groups that could act as *multipliers* (young people, youth workers, media, political leaders, representatives of local or regional public bodies, opinion leaders, EU decision makers, etc.) in order to spread the project objectives and results. In this regard, the proposal shows that participating organisations will put in place effective measures to make the project outcomes visible. For recognising and validating these learning outcomes, the fact that the

Elements of analysis	Interpretation of the award criteria
levels The appropriateness and quality of measures aimed at disseminating the outcomes of the project within and outside the participating organisations If relevant, the extent to which the proposal describes how the materials, documents and media produced will be made freely available and promoted through open licences, and does not contain disproportionate limitations	participating organisations intend to use the Youthpass tool to stimulate participants' reflection on their learning process should be considered as an element of quality of the project. ▪ **Visibility of the project/visibility of Erasmus+** The proposal should show that participating organisations have reflected together on measures aimed at enhancing the visibility of their project and the visibility of the Erasmus+ Programme in general. - Visibility of the project: The proposal shows that participating organisations and participants will "publicise" the activities planned by the project as well as its aims and objectives. In order to raise awareness of the project they could for example develop information material; do a mail shot or SMS mailing; prepare posters, stickers, promotional items; invite journalists to observe; issue press releases or write articles for local papers, websites or newsletters; create an e-group, a web space, a photo-gallery or blog on the Internet, etc. - Visibility of the Programme: Whenever appropriate, the proposal shows that participating organisations intend to include information about the Programme (for instance, information on the Programme Actions, or their objectives and important features, target groups, etc.) in all measures undertaken to increase visibility of the project. The proposal could also include information sessions or workshops in the programme of the activities. ▪ **Dissemination and exploitation of results** The proposal shows that each participating organisation will put in place measures to disseminate and exploit the results of the project, including its learning outcomes for the benefit of all actors involved. Dissemination and exploitation measures may have the same format as visibility measures indicated in the section above; the main difference is that dissemination and exploitation measures focus on a project's results, rather than on the planned activities and intended project objectives. Disseminating project's results could simply mean "spreading the word" about the project among friends, peers or other target groups. Other examples of dissemination and exploitation measures are organising public events (presentations, conferences, workshops…); creating audio-visual products (CD-Rom, DVD…); setting up long-term collaboration with media (series of radio/TV/press contributions, interviews, participation in different radio/TV programmes…); developing information material (newsletters, brochures, booklets, best practice manuals…), etc.

Annex III - Reference policy documents

Transversal policy priorities for education, training and youth

- **Overall policy priorities**

- Europe 2020: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm
- Europe 2020 targets: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/targets/eu-targets/
- Education and Training 2020 (ET2020): http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/index_en.htm
- Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0669:FIN:EN:PDF
- Council Resolution on a renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field (2010-2018) - EU Youth Strategy. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32009G1219%2801%29
- The EU Youth report: http://ec.europa.eu/youth/policy/implementation/report_en.htm

- **Recognition and transparency**

- Europass: http://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/home
- European Qualifications Framework: http://ec.europa.eu/eqf/home_en.htm
- Youthpass: https://www.youthpass.eu/en/youthpass/

- **Entrepreneurship education:**

- "Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan" - http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/entrepreneurship-2020/index_en.htm
- "Entrepreneurship education: A Guide for Educators": http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/promoting-entrepreneurship/education-training-entrepreneurship/index_en.htm
- "Towards Greater Cooperation and Coherence in Entrepreneurship Education" – Report of the High Level Reflection Panels on Entrepreneurship Education initiated by Directorate General Enterprise and Industry and Directorate General Education and Culture: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/promoting-entrepreneurship/education-training-entrepreneurship/reflection-panels/files/entr_education_panel_en.pdf

- **Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and Open Education Resources (OER):**

- The Future of Learning: New Ways to Learn New Skills for Future Jobs: http://is.jrc.ec.europa.eu/pages/EAP/ForCiel.html
- Opening up Education: http://www.openeducationeuropa.eu/en/initiative
- Open Educational Resources and practices in Europe: http://is.jrc.ec.europa.eu/pages/EAP/OEREU.html
- Up-scaling Creative Classrooms in Europe http://is.jrc.ec.europa.eu/pages/EAP/SCALECCR.html
- Digital Competence: Identification and European-wide validation of its key components for all levels of learners: http://is.jrc.ec.europa.eu/pages/EAP/DIGCOMP.html

- **Multilingualism:**

– Commission Staff Working Document: "Language Competences for employability, mobility and growth": http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52012SC0372&from=EN
– Report from the Thematic Working Group "Languages for Jobs – providing multilingual communication skills for the labour market": http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/strategic-framework/documents/languages-for-jobs-report_en.pdf

Policy priorities in school education

- Improving the attainment of young people, particularly those at risk of **early school leaving**

- Council recommendation on policies to reduce early school leaving: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:191:0001:0006:EN:PDF
- Commission communication "Tackling early school leaving: A key contribution to the Europe 2020 Agenda": http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0018:FIN:EN:PDF
- Final Report of the Thematic Working Group on Early School Leaving http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/doc/esl-group-report_en.pdf
- Further background reading on early school leaving can be found at: http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/school/early-school-leavers_en.htm

- Improving the attainment of young people with low **basic skills**

- The European Framework for Key Competences: http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/education_training_youth/lifelong_learning/c11090_en.htm
- "Council conclusions of 26 November 2012 on literacy": http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2012:393:0001:0004:EN:PDF
- Final Report of the EU High Level Group of experts on Literacy: http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/school/doc/literacy-report_en.pdf
- Commission staff working document: "Assessment of Key Competences in initial education and training: Policy Guidance": http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2012:0371:FIN:EN:PDF
- "Council conclusions on increasing the level of basic skills in the context of European cooperation on schools for the 21st century": http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:323:0011:0014:EN:PDF
- Further background reading on basic skills can be found at: http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/school/math_en.htm

- Developing high quality and accessible **Early Childhood Education and Care** services

- Commission communication: "Early Childhood Education and Care: Providing all our children with the best start for the world of tomorrow": http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0066:FIN:EN:PDF
- "Council conclusions on early childhood education and care: providing all our children with the best start for the world of tomorrow": http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:175:0008:0010:EN:PDF
- Further background reading can be found on the Early childhood education and care (ECEC) website on Europa: http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/school/early-childhood_en.htm

▪ Revising and strengthening the professional profile of **the teaching professions**

- Commission staff working document: "Supporting the Teaching Professions for Better Learning Outcomes": http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2012:0374:FIN:EN:PDF
- "Council conclusions of 26 November 2009 on the professional development of teachers and school leaders": http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:302:0006:0009:EN:PDF
- "Council conclusions on effective leadership in education": http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/139715.pdf
- Further background reading on the teaching professions can be found at: http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/school/teacher-training_en.htm

Policy priorities in vocational education and training (VET)

- The Bruges Communiqué on enhanced European cooperation in vocational education and training, 2011-2020 http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/publications/2011/bruges_en.pdf
- "Vocational education and training for better skills growth and jobs" http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2012:0375:FIN:EN:PDF
- "Work-based Learning in Europe. Practices and policy pointers" http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/vocational-policy/doc/alliance/work-based-learning-in-europe_en.pdf

More information can be found at: http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/vet_en.htm

Policy priorities in higher education

- Higher Education Modernisation Agenda: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0567:FIN:EN:PDF

More information can be found at: http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/higher-education/index_en.htm

Policy priorities in adult education

- European agenda for adult learning
  http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/adult-learning/adult_en.htm
- The Survey of Adults Skills (PIAAC)
  http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/indicators-benchmarks_en.htm
- http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-922_en.htm
- Education and Training Monitor 2013
  http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/publications/monitor13_en.pdf

See Agenda for more information: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:372:0001:0006:EN:PDF

Policy priorities in the field of youth

- Council Resolution on a renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field (2010-2018) - EU Youth Strategy.
- http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32009G1219%2801%29
- Declaration of the 1st European youth work Convention.
  http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/youth/Source/Resources/Documents/2010_Declaration_European_youth_work_convention_en.pdf
- Pathways 2.0 towards recognition of non-formal learning/education and of youth work in Europe.
  http://youth-partnership-eu.coe.int/youth-partnership/documents/EKCYP/Youth_Policy/docs/Youth_Work/Policy/Pathways_II_towards_recognition_of_non-formal_learning_Jan_2011.pdf

More information can be found at: http://ec.europa.eu/youth/index_en.htm