

In this briefing sheet, detail is provided on the expectations of NA staff and others, in relation to the assessment comments prepared and submitted by experts. On pages 2 and 3 examples are also provided.



Introduction

Final reports for COOPERATION PARTNERSHIPS are required to be assessed by at least two experts, one of which must be external to the National Agency. This initial phase of internal/external assessment is referred to as the INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT phase. Whether undertaken by internal or external assessors, there is a minimum quality requirement for comments and a secondary review should always take place. It is the ultimate responsibility of the NA to ensure that assessment comments and scores meets minimum quality standards and can be used to provide the necessary information and feedback to beneficiaries.

For COOPERATION PARTNERSHIPS involving more than a single expert, a CONSOLIDATION phase also exists. CONSOLIDATION can take place face-to-face or virtually but, in all cases, requires experts to agree on a single set of comments and scores for each final report proposal. Consolidation should result in a single set of harmonised comments for each work package. Consolidation should also result in a single set of scores which must be consistent with the final set of comments rather than being a purely mathematical average of scores awarded by individual assessors.

In all cases, NAs should ensure that each quality assessment is **Coherent, Comprehensive, Consistent, Courteous and Concise** (the Five Cs model) as per the descriptions below:

Coherent	Comprehensive	Consistent	Courteous	Concise
comments should be easy to understand even for a reader that has not read the application or the final report.	comments should cover each aspect of final report assessment, across all work packages, and should address all key aspects.	comments should be easily aligned with the scores that have been awarded criterion and should be within the predefined scoring ranges.	comments should be polite and respectful and should avoid first person references (for example, I think that, I expect that).	comments should be of a standard size, as determined by the online assessment tool (e.g. maximum 3000 characters per work package).

As a result of reviewing a final report assessment, the NA might ask an assessor to revisit or revise their assessment, especially where the Five Cs are not satisfactorily addressed. In no situation, however, should an NA propose changes to the scores attributed by an assessor, asking instead that assessors, themselves, ensure consistency between scores and comments.

Regardless of the score being awarded, experts must assess the final report in full, providing comments for each work package. Additionally, experts must prepare comments on the application as a whole, providing a summative analysis of the final report and highlighting strengths and weaknesses associated with overall project delivery.

Key Action 2:

Cooperation
Partnerships
(KA220)

Final Report Assessment

ASSESSMENT COMMENTS BRIEFING SHEET

Page 1

Erasmus+

Enriching lives, opening minds

Example Comments: Positive Final Report Assessment

📌 WP1: PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Management actions were consistent with original planning, relying on a dedicated Steering Committee of high-level partner representatives and on appointed work package leaders to successfully govern delivery of the targeted tasks and deliverables.

Partner cooperation is clearly evidenced, in work package and project delivery, including coordination and communication efforts and transnational partner meetings where a good level of engagement was achieved, and relevant tools employed.

Early-stage risk analysis informed regular partner discussions on scheduling, progression and achievement, with valid strategies employed for preventing, managing and mitigating risks. Conflict resolution measures were wholly appropriate.

Erasmus+ online digital platforms, mainly EPALE and the EPRP, were effectively employed as a means of promoting emerging results at key stages in the project lifetime.

📌 OTHER WP: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (EXAMPLE ONLY)

Curriculum development activities were delivered as planned, relying on an experienced coordinator to guide remaining partners in needs mapping, gap analysis and the co-creation and delivery of a responsive and high-quality curriculum to meet identified learning and development needs in the targeted sector.

External stakeholder involvement in curriculum validation exceeded original forecasts for engagement, which is positive.

The value and novelty of the emerging curriculum is well argued, confirming its role and importance in subsequent learning content development.

A decision to publish the curriculum in six partner languages, going beyond the initial commitment, further highlights the value of the emerging curriculum, with a positive commitment to wider promotion and with clear potential for impact on participating and wider institutions looking to modernise existing curricula.

Quality assurance and evaluation measures were effectively employed both for the development process (internal partner feedback) and the emerging curriculum (external validation by key stakeholders in partner and wider countries).

Dissemination actions were sufficient in scope, quality and outreach, using existing partner networks to raise awareness of the overall goals of the project and to actively and effectively promote its results, including the newly-developed curriculum.

Key Action 2:

Cooperation
Partnerships
(KA220)

Final Report Assessment

ASSESSMENT
COMMENTS
BRIEFING SHEET

Page 2

Example Comments: Less Positive Final Report Assessment

📌 WP1: PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Management actions are broadly consistent with original planning. A Steering Committee is referenced but with limited insight given into its composition and the role that it played in guiding and governing delivery of the planned tasks and deliverables.

Partner cooperation and engagement is not clearly reported. Lead partner roles are confirmed and are consistent with original planning, yet less is said of how wider partners were engaged. Whilst a significant amount of meetings was held, attendance levels are not detailed and there is no real evidence of the rationale and outcomes of individual meetings and events.

Early-stage risk analysis reportedly informed regular partner discussions yet no supporting evidence is provided. Conflict resolution measures and processes are not specifically referenced.

Whilst envisaging the use of Erasmus+ online digital platforms (EPAL and EPRP) to allow access to the emerging curriculum and resources by key educational stakeholders, this aspect is not distinctly referenced in the final report.

📌 OTHER WP: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (EXAMPLE ONLY)

Curriculum development activities were an important feature yet not all partners were actively engaged in needs mapping, gap analysis and co-creation activities and no insight or explanation is given as to the rationale for reduced partner involvement.

Stakeholder validation activities were limited to partners and their staff, which does not meet the original goal of engaging industry stakeholders to validate the knowledge, skills and competences featured in the newly-developed curriculum.

Some innovation is evident in efforts to map emerging needs to the new curriculum but limited insight is given into how this complements existing programme provision in the participating institutions, as was originally anticipated for this project.

Whilst plans were confirmed for publishing the curriculum in six partner languages, a single language curriculum was eventually delivered, limiting the potential for impact and use in partner and wider institutions and countries.

Quality assurance and evaluation measures were mostly limited to internal partner review with external validation and feedback actions anticipated but ultimately not delivered.

A valid overview of dissemination activities is presented, confirming that a valid range of tools and platforms was employed for this purpose. A detailed breakdown of dissemination activities is lacking, including for individual partners and countries.

Key Action 2:

Cooperation
Partnerships
(KA220)

Final Report Assessment

ASSESSMENT
COMMENTS
BRIEFING SHEET

Page 3