Every participant in the **Erasmus+ Assessor Training** event will be sent a real COOPERATION PARTNERSHIP proposal from a previous year, which they need to assess. In most cases, the application will be relevant to the field that they normally assess, or will assess in the future. In all cases, proposals are subject to strict confidentiality arrangements, as per the agreement signed with the national agency.   
  
**INSTRUCTIONS**

* READ THE FULL PROPOSAL: this will provide an overview of all planned actions and activities.
* REVIEW THE AWARD CRITERIA: look at the sub-criteria within the *CLEAR Assessor Notes Template* and make a decision on how well the proposal addresses the sub-criteria for RELEVANCE and for QUALITY OF PARTNERSHIP.
* MAKE NOTES: For this event, there is no requirement to submit written comments but please make notes for yourself, using the *Assessor Notes Template -* these notes will allow you to actively participate in field-based group discussions during the assessor training event.
* SUBMIT SCORES: using the scoring table below, provide a separate score for RELEVANCE (score out of 25) and QUALITY OF PARTNERSHIP (score out of 20); submit scores to *[add email address for your event]* and confirm the FIELD of the application reviewed.
* BE ON TIME: in all cases, scores must be submitted by the end of **[add deadline for your event]**.

**SCORING TABLE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Maximum Score** | **Very Good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Weak** |
| **25** | 22-25 | 18-21 | 12-17 | 0-11 |
| **20** | 17-20 | 14-16 | 10-13 | 0-9 |
| **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.  **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. | | | | |