



REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA
**MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC
 DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY**



SLOVENE SCHOLARSHIP FUND SI04

MEASURE 5

INTER-INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION PROJECTS IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Quality Assessment Form

Version 2014

Name of evaluator: _____

Partnership reference N°

Name of coordinating institution:	
Partnership title:	

Note on the points system: Each criterion should be rated on the scale proposed. The ratings of the quality criteria result in a total number of points out of a maximum of 100. Each application is rated by 2 assessors and the average of the marks will be used as the final marking for quality. Experts should use numbers with decimals when giving points for one or more of the items in the quality assessment form in order to avoid too many assessments with the same total number of points. Please refer to the Programme Operator (CMEPIUS) on how to deal with significant differences between the points given by the two assessors.

Please note that applications scoring less than 50 points in the quality assessment will not be selected for funding.

Description of proposed Partnership, Proposed activity data and section relating to Requested EU funding

Indicative question in the application form		Points	Max.	Breakdown			
Objectives of the Partnership and relevance to the objectives of the programme							
5.2, 5.3 and section 6	<p>a) The objectives of the Partnership are relevant for the EEA/Norway Grants programme.</p> <p><i>The objectives and the subject of the partnership are in compliance objectives and policy context outlined in the call. They correspond to the objectives and characteristics of EEA/Norway Grants Scheme.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 -1
	<p>b) The objectives of the Partnership are relevant to the sectors/regions/countries involved.</p> <p><i>Context and motivation indicate clearly that the objectives concern important issues in the participating regions, countries.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 -1
Work programme and project management							
5.4, 8.1 and 8.2	<p>The approach chosen to achieve the objectives is clear and realistic.</p> <p><i>General approach, activities and outcomes/results are well planned and have a clear potential to reach the objectives of the project.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 -1

7.1, 8.1 and 8.2	<p>There is an appropriate balance between the roles and tasks of the different participants in terms of their involvement in the activities to be carried out.</p> <p><i>There is an appropriate and clearly defined distribution of tasks across the Partnership. The contribution of each partner is clearly explained.</i></p> <p><i>The Partnership coordination is well assured by the coordinating institution.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 - 1
7.2	<p>Appropriate measures have been planned to ensure effective communication and cooperation between the participating institutions.</p> <p><i>Appropriate measures are foreseen to ensure communication and cooperation such as meetings, workshops, regular correspondence, newsletters and other forms of exchange of information.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 - 1
Impact and bilateral added value							
5.5 and 5.6	<p>The expected results, impact and benefits of the Partnership on participating regions are clear, realistic and well defined.</p> <p><i>The participating regions have a clear view on the possible impacts and effect of the partnership activities. They demonstrate the ability to steer the project in a way that impacts are relevant for all stakeholders.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 - 1
7.3, 7.4. and 7.5	<p>The Partnership has defined an approach to monitor and evaluate whether the objectives and the expected impact of the Partnership will be achieved in the course of the project lifecycle.</p> <p><i>The monitoring and evaluation plan is well defined and covers aspects such as follow-up of progress made and Partnership performance, satisfaction of participants and other target groups,</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 - 1

	<i>attainment of objectives, measurement of impact.</i>						
Dissemination and use of results - sustainability							
7.6	<p>The planned dissemination and exploitation activities are well defined and ensure optimal use of the results amongst the participating regions.</p> <p><i>The dissemination activities are focused and well defined. They integrate different levels of dissemination (sectoral, regional and national level).</i></p> <p><i>The Partnership demonstrates the interest/potential to make use of the results, experiences and, where applicable, end products of the Partnership.</i></p>		10	Very Good 10-9	Good 8 - 6	Fair 5 - 3	Weak 2 -1
Proposed activity and mobility data							
5.4 and 8.1	The work programme covers the whole period of the project. The planned activities (including mobility if foreseen) of each partner are relevant.		15	Very Good 15-13	Good -12-9	Fair -8-4	Weak 3-1
Coherence of budget planning, value for money							
9	<p>The budget is in line with the work activities.</p> <p>The proposal offers good value for money</p>		5	Very Good 5	Good 4	Fair 3 - 2	Weak 1
	TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT		100				

OVERALL COMMENTS:

Please provide comments on the quality of the application and outline the key strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement, which will enable the applicant to strengthen their project if it is approved or to provide them with information on how they can improve future applications should their application be rejected. Please integrate in particular the comments on individual criteria with very high score in the "Key strengths" section and those with very low score in the "Weaknesses and areas of improvements" section. These comments must be consistent with any scores awarded and serve as input to provide feedback to applicants. Particular attention should be given to clarity, consistency and appropriate level of detail and should be written in the language of the Partnership application, or in English, in a polite and neutral tone.

Key strengths:**Weaknesses and areas of improvement:****Other comments:**

I hereby declare to the best of my knowledge that I have no conflict of interest (including family, emotional life, political affinity, economic interest or any other shared interest) with the organisation(s) or any of the persons having submitted this grant application. Furthermore, I confirm that I will not communicate to any third party any information that may be disclosed to me in the context of my work as an evaluator.

I agree that my name and current position will be communicated to Programme Operator managing the Slovene Scholarship Fund.

Date

Name and signature