



# Erasmus+ International Credit Mobility

Assessment criteria for final beneficiary reports

September 2016

## KA107 mobility projects for single beneficiaries and mobility consortia

For 2015, projects should be evaluated taking into account the specificities of this first year of implementing Erasmus+ International Credit Mobility. 2015 was a transition year, with many changes to be tackled by higher education institutions. Final scoring of the beneficiary reports should reflect this context.

### Scoring of the final report of the project

- The maximum score is 100 points.
- Above 75 points: the project is considered very good to excellent in terms of qualitative and quantitative results and these results are worth disseminating more widely.
- Between 50 and 75 points: the project is considered average to good.
- Below 50 points: there are serious concerns on the compliance with the ECHE and other implementation issues. Such a low score should be applied in exceptional cases. Consequences of the low score are set out in the grant agreement, annex III part B (see below).

At the end of each assessment criterion, the relevant section in the final beneficiary report and the maximum total points for that question are indicated.

### Assessment criteria

1. **Quality of the project implementation - qualitative objectives: the extent to which the original qualitative objectives of the project were met (related to the ECHE commitments and inter-institutional agreements, as well as, where applicable, the mobility consortium accreditation) – Maximum 40 points**

1.1 Did the implementation of the mobility project respect the requirements set out in the ECHE and in the applicable inter-institutional agreements?

In particular, did the beneficiary and its partner(s) efficiently implement the following provisions and how did the beneficiary resolve any related difficulties:

- Support to participants (information, selection, preparation, monitoring and specific support)
- Linguistic support
- Recognition of learning outcomes
- Cooperation with institutions from Partner Countries (setting up of inter-institutional agreements, information, communication)

*In order to evaluate this question, please refer to the following sections of the final beneficiary report: "Description of the Project", "Implementation of the Project : Practical Arrangements and Project Management, Linguistic Support", "Participant Feedback on Erasmus Charter Provisions: Feedback on Charter Provisions", "Compliance with the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education". Maximum score: 30 points.*

- 1.2 The extent to which the outgoing and incoming participants were very satisfied or rather satisfied with their mobility experience in general and relevance of the beneficiary's explanations.

*In order to evaluate this question, please refer to the following section of the final beneficiary report: " Participant Feedback on Erasmus Charter Provisions: Feedback on General Issues". Maximum score: 10 points.*

- 1.3 Question relating exclusively to consortium projects: Did the participating organisations of the consortium effectively and efficiently cooperate and contribute to the project in line with the approved mobility consortium accreditation application?

*In order to evaluate this question, please refer to the following section of the final beneficiary report: "Description of the Project". The maximum score for this question is 5 points and the score of the ECHE compliance question 1.1. is reduced to 25 points.*

**2. Quality of the project implementation – quantitative objectives: the extent to which the original quantitative objectives of the project were met – Maximum 40 points**

- 2.1. The extent to which the planned mobility activities (as set out in the grant agreement) were achieved or exceeded, and relevance of the beneficiary's explanations.

*In order to evaluate this question, please refer to the following section of the final beneficiary report: "Description of the Project", "Activities: Overview of Activities". Maximum score: 30 points.*

- 2.2. The extent to which the mobility grant budget (as set out in the grant agreement) was efficiently managed by the beneficiary to deliver the planned mobility activities (or even more) and relevance of the beneficiary's explanations.

*In order to evaluate this question, please refer to the following section of the final beneficiary report: "Budget". Maximum score: 10 points.*

**3. Impact and dissemination – Maximum 20 points**

- 3.1. The relevance of the expected impact as described in the section "Learning outcomes and impact".

*Maximum score: 10 points.*

- 3.2. The relevance of the dissemination activities as described in the section "Dissemination of Project Results".

*Maximum score: 10 points.*

\* \* \*

## Grant Agreement, Annex III, Part B

### B. Grant reduction for poor, partial or late implementation

- Poor, partial or late implementation of the Project may be established by the NA on the basis of:
  - The final report submitted by the beneficiary;
  - Reports from individual participants taking part in the mobility activities.
- The NA may consider also information received from any other relevant source, proving that the Project is not implemented in accordance with the contractual provisions. Other sources of information may include monitoring visits, desk checks or on the spot checks undertaken by the NA.
- The final report will be assessed on the basis of quality criteria and scored on a total of maximum 100 points. If the final report scores below 50 points in total, the NA may reduce the final grant amount for organisational support on the basis of poor, partial or late implementation of the Project even if all activities reported were eligible and actually took place.
- In the case of accredited organisations, if the NA considers that the implementation of the Project does not respect the quality commitment made by the beneficiary, the NA may in addition or alternatively require the beneficiary to develop and implement an action plan within an agreed timeframe to ensure respect of the applicable requirements. If the beneficiary does not implement the action plan in a satisfactory manner by the due date, the NA may recommend to the European Commission to withdraw the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education of the beneficiary.
- The final report will be assessed in conjunction with the reports from the mobility participants, using a common set of quality criteria focusing on:
  - The extent to which the action was implemented in line with the grant agreement.
  - The extent to which the action was implemented in respect of the quality and compliance requirements set out in the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education and in their applicable inter-institutional agreement(s).
  - The extent to which the grant amounts due to mobility participants were transferred to them in accordance with the contractual provisions set out in the agreement between the beneficiary and the participant following the template provided in Annex IV of the Agreement.
- A grant reduction based on poor, partial or late implementation may be applied to the final grant amount for organisational support and may be of:
  - 25% if the final report scores at least 40 points and below 50 points;
  - 50% if the final report scores at least 25 points and below 40 points;
  - 75% if the final report scores below 25 points.